

M3 Junction 9 Improvement

Scheme Number: TR010055

5.1 Consultation Report

**Appendix K - Summary of Relevant Responses to
the 2021 Statutory Consultation and 2021 Targeted
Consultation**

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

**Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

Volume 5

November 2022

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

M3 Junction 9 Improvement
Development Consent Order 202[x]

<p style="text-align: center;">5.1 CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDIX K – SUMMARY OF RELEVANT RESPONSES TO THE 2021 STATUTORY CONSULTATION AND 2021 TARGETED CONSULTATION</p>
--

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR010055
Application Document Reference:	5.1
BIM Document Reference:	HE551511-VFK-LSI-X_XXXX_XX-RP-LE-0004
Author:	M3 Junction 9 Improvement Project Team, National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	November 2022	Application Submission

Appendix K – Summary of relevant responses to the 2021 statutory consultation and 2021 targeted consultation

K.1 – Section 42 statutory consultation comments and Applicant’s response (May-July 2021)

- K.1.A: Civil Aviation Authority 1
- K.1.B: Environment Agency 2
- K.1.C: ESP Utilities Group Ltd 20
- K.1.D: Forestry Commission 21
- K.1.E: Health and Safety Executive 22
- K.1.F: Historic England 23
- K.1.G: Instalcom Limited 24
- K.1.H: Itchen Valley Parish Council 25
- K.1.I: Kings Worthy Parish Council 30
- K.1.J: Natural England 32
- K.1.K: National Rail 56
- K.1.L: Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust 57
- K.1.M: Southern Water 59
- K.1.N: Hampshire Constabulary 60
- K.1.O: SGN 62
- K.1.P: Lumen Technologies 63
- K.1.Q: Winchester City Council 64
- K.1.R: Hampshire County Council 104
- K.1.S: South Downs National Park Authority 125
- K.1.T: Eastleigh Borough Council 156
- K.1.U: New Forest District Council 164
- K.1.V: PIL ID 159 165
- K.1.W: PIL ID 209 166
- K.1.X: PIL ID 170 173
- K.1.Y: PIL ID 211 174
- K.1.Z: PIL ID 151 175
- K.1.AA: PIL ID 185 176

K.2 - Section 47 and Section 48 statutory consultation comments and Applicant's response (May-July 2021)

K.2.A	Introduction	184
K.2.B	Air quality	188
K.2.C	Cultural heritage.....	202
K.2.D	Landscape and visual	218
K.2.E	Biodiversity.....	253
K.2.G	Material assets and waste.....	296
K.2.H	Noise and vibration	297
K.2.I	Population and human health.....	330
K.2.J	Road drainage and the water environment	336
K.2.K	Climate.....	341
K.2.L	In-combination and cumulative effects	370
K.2.M	Environment – general	371
K.2.N	Design	425
K.2.O	Safety.....	477
K.2.P	Mitigation.....	485
K.2.Q	Land ownership.....	512
K.2.R	Consultation	514
K.2.S	Traffic and transport.....	546
K.2.T	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.....	574
K.2.U	Legislation and policy	663
K.2.V	Lighting	675
K.2.W	Principle of development.....	681
K.2.X	Construction – general	714
K.2.Y	Construction – spoil deposition areas	742
K.2.Z	Construction – compound locations	774

K.3 - Targeted consultation comments and Applicant’s response (November-December 2021)

K.3.A: SGN 786
K.3.B: PIL ID 256..... 787
K.3.C: Royal Mail..... 788
K.3.D: SSE 789
K.3.E: PIL ID 219..... 790
K.3.F: PIL ID 240 791
K.3.G: Southern Water 794
K.3.H: PIL ID 288..... 795

Appendix K.1 Section 42 statutory consultation comments and the Applicant's response (May – July 2021)

K.1.A: Civil Aviation Authority

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Safety; Aviation	No comment to make on the proposed scheme. If the proposed scheme might have aerodrome safeguarding implications the proposal should be forwarded directly to the relevant aerodrome licence holder / operator.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

K.1.B: Environment Agency

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Consultation	We have previously been consulted on the EIA Scoping Report and most of our advice provided in our response has been acknowledged in the PEIR.	N	This comment has been noted. The Applicant's response to the Environment Agency's comments on the 2020 Scoping Report can be found in Appendix 4.2 (Scoping Comments and Responses) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.3) .
		Road drainage and the water environment	Our primary concerns regarding the scheme relate to the protection of groundwater, and protection/enhancement of the ecological balance and species within the River Itchen and surrounding areas. The River Itchen is a designated main river, and the river and the associated floodplain is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).	N	<p>In its DCO submission, the Applicant has submitted several documents that address the Environment Agency's primary concerns, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1), specifically Chapter 8 (Biodiversity), which presents the findings of the assessment of the construction and operation of the Scheme on designated sites, habitats and species and Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment), which presents the findings of the assessment of the construction and operation of the Scheme on the water environment including groundwater • Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Document Reference 7.5) • Water Framework Directive (WFD) (Document Reference 7.7) • Drainage Strategy Report (see Appendix 13.1 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) <p>The Applicant has engaged with the Environment Agency throughout the pre-application and will be continuing a level of engagement post submission of the DCO application.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	Flood risk matters are of lesser concern to us since the majority of works will be taking place within Flood Zone 1, albeit the small amount of works within Flood Zone 3 will need to be appropriately assessed to ensure risks are mitigated and that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.	N	A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Document Reference 7.4) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application. The FRA (Document Reference 7.4) concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed works would not result in increased flood risk to nearby residents and therefore there would be no detrimental impacts on third parties. The Scheme complies with the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN), National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and local planning policy with respects to flood risk and is an appropriate development for this location.
		Biodiversity	We have reviewed the PEIR (dated May 2021). In general, we support	Y	The Applicant is working to maximise biodiversity

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>the proposals outlined within the PEIR and the intended information to be included within the Environmental Statement (ES). However, we do have concerns in respect of the proposals for mitigation measures and providing Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) which requires further clarification and work.</p>		<p>improvements on the land available and has been working collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revised the landscape strategy and Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) to respond to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that ‘embedded avoidance and mitigation measures’ for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it has evolved. These measures include the provision of habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) presents the results of a biodiversity metric calculation which assesses the predicted habitat losses and gains from the Scheme.</p>
		Biodiversity	<p>Section 1 – Biodiversity (focusing on the River Itchen)</p> <p>Overarching comments on environmental mitigation and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) proposals</p> <p>Highways England’s proposals as set out in the PEIR are currently missing the opportunity to contribute to the Government’s commitment to nature recovery (as set out in the Governments’ 25 year Environment Plan). We consider that the scheme as it stands is failing to deliver on one of the stated 5 strategic objectives (as set out in section 2.2.2) namely ‘an improved environment – endeavour to maximise positive biodiversity outputs from the proposed scheme.’ In addition, we consider that there are some potential effects and impacts which have been omitted from the Biodiversity chapter in the PEIR. These omissions should be addressed as part of the ES.</p>	Y	<p>The 2021 PEIR is a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals and level of Environmental Impact Assessment at the time of the 2021 statutory consultation. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. Specifically, Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents the findings of the assessment of the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. The assessment concludes that, following the inclusion of mitigation measures, effects to all designated sites, habitats of importance and protected and notable species identified within the study areas will not be significant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant is working to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been working</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revised the landscape strategy and Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) to respond to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that ‘embedded avoidance and mitigation measures’ for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it has evolved. These measures include the provision of habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to exiting habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p>
		Biodiversity	<p>Highways England also has its own Key Performance Indicator to deliver improved biodiversity (as set out in Highways England’s Biodiversity Plan (June 2015)). As part of this Biodiversity Plan, Highways England are expected to deliver (amongst other things):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ landscape scale biodiversity projects that reduce habitat fragmentation; ▪ new projects which enhance biodiversity value of land and therefore reduce their impacts; and ▪ an increased number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest which are in favourable or recovering condition. 	Y	<p>The Scheme design contributes to meeting the requirements of the Applicant’s Biodiversity Plan.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the mitigation measures for the Scheme have been reviewed and refined.</p> <p>Habitat provision as set out on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to exiting habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction.</p> <p>The design aims to maximise the biodiversity outputs from the Scheme in accordance with National Highways performance targets, and has been demonstrated to deliver a net gain in biodiversity within the Application Boundary. Stakeholders</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>including South Downs National Park Authority have been consulted on the design of the habitat compensation and enhancement package to make certain it is appropriate to the surrounding landscape and habitats, and future climatic conditions. The design of the habitat creation package draws on the successes of other mitigation schemes designed for highways in the local area.</p> <p>The Scheme includes provision of a road drainage scheme that would capture pollutants within road runoff and remove pollutants before the treated runoff is discharged. The Scheme would provide a betterment on the existing road drainage system and improve the quality of water discharged into the River Itchen.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) identifies areas of the River Itchen where enhancement measures will be provided. Measures will align with the Environment Agency’s River Itchen Restoration Strategy. These areas are likely to include riparian planting and / or channel narrowing by marginal planting. A commitment to delivering this is set out in the Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments within the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (Document Reference 7.3).</p>
		Biodiversity	<p>The Biodiversity Plan also states:</p> <p><i>“We [Highways England] will look for the opportunities provided by our management and construction work to provide biodiversity enhancements.”</i></p> <p><i>“Where we [Highways England] are investing in network improvements this may mean that projects will need to budget for additional work to support biodiversity”</i></p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant is working to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available. As noted in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p>
		Biodiversity	<p>Outcome 3 of the Biodiversity Plan is as follows:</p> <p><i>“We [Highways England] have delivered biodiversity enhancements whilst implementing a capital programme of network improvement.”</i></p> <p>Actions listed in the Biodiversity Plan to ensure delivery of Outcome 3 include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Projects will identify biodiversity opportunities and deliver actions that will achieve net biodiversity gain, wherever possible. The identification of such opportunities should be included within the Environmental Assessment Report. If no such opportunities are found then a clear statement explaining</i> 	Y	<p>As noted above, the Applicant is working to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been working collaboratively with statutory environmental bodies and local environmental stakeholders to develop its proposals.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that ‘embedded avoidance and mitigation measures’ for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it has evolved. These measures include the provision of habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p><i>why should be provided instead.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Project teams to liaise with local wildlife partners as part of their project design and development to identify how the project could best contribute towards landscape scale biodiversity gains. Information on these opportunities to be provided to the relevant regional programme board and technical working group.</i> 		<p>the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to exiting habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity (as noted in the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment Report (see Appendix 8.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)). These details can be found on the Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)).</p> <p>Furthermore, the DCO application is accompanied by an ES (Document Reference 6.1) that has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)) Regulations 2017. The ES (Document Reference 6.1) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment, resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity and appropriate mitigation to reduce potential effects is set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
		Biodiversity	The Government has recently announced that the Environment Bill will be amended to legislate for BNG for new Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, albeit the timescales for implementation are yet to be announced. Whilst there is mention of using the biodiversity metric calculation in the PEIR, there is no information or any suggestions or ideas of what Highways England are looking to include within the scheme proposals to achieve BNG.	N	Relevant biodiversity legislation is covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current programme indicates the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.
		Biodiversity	We, along with other stakeholders, have spent significant amounts of time putting together a package of environmental mitigation and BNG	Y	The 2021 PEIR is a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals and level of Environmental Impact

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>proposals, which have been presented to Highways England for consideration as part of development of the scheme. We are very disappointed with the environmental mitigation proposals that have been presented as part of the PEIR consultation. The current proposals for environmental mitigation are very limited in their scope and at present do not go far enough in preventing deterioration and addressing the significant adverse effects that will occur, nor the legacy impacts of the M3, A34 and A33. Equally, we do not consider that the mitigation measures in their present form will deliver overall environmental improvements as a result of this scheme.</p>		<p>Assessment at the time of the 2021 statutory consultation. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has been working with stakeholders, including the Environment Agency, to develop its environmental mitigation and BNG proposals.</p> <p>The design has sought to avoid adverse effects on biodiversity in the first instance through an iterative approach (e.g. moving the alignment to avoid sensitive receptors where possible). In this way the mitigation hierarchy has been embedded with the design process. Additionally, the proposed new foot / cycle bridge over the River Itchen SAC / SSSI will be a clear span structure and set back from the riverbank to allow for continued wildlife movement.</p> <p>The design includes habitats of ecological value which are appropriate to the local area, including chalk grassland, species rich grassland and woodland, with the aim of maximising biodiversity outputs from the Scheme. This will include creation of areas of chalk / calcareous grassland, broadleaved and native scrub and species rich grassland which are presented on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2). Where hedgerows cannot be retained, these will be replaced or re-located where possible.</p> <p>Additional mitigation measures include a sensitive lighting design and a drainage design with features including wetlands and swales which will provide semi-natural habitats of value to biodiversity. Other mitigation measures to be implemented during construction and outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) include fencing to prevent access to important habitats, timing the construction works to avoid bird breeding and bat roosting periods, obtaining the correct licenses to undertake ecological works and supervision from an ecological specialist whilst construction works are being undertaken.</p> <p>During operation, mitigation will include the management and monitoring of habitat creation and enhancement measures, as detailed in Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). Monitoring of badger and dormice populations will be undertaken as part of the licensing requirements and will be agreed with Natural England.</p> <p>Enhancement measures include the removal of invasive species in areas of retained woodland and measures to</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>enhance areas of the River Itchen including riparian planting.</p> <p>The Applicant is working to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available. The Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Unit 107 of the River Itchen SSSI (River from Easton to Highbridge) is in 'unfavourable' (unchanged) condition under the Water Framework Directive (WFD). Other SSSI units adjacent to the river channels around the road crossings are in 'unfavourable declining' condition. There are opportunities, through river restoration, to help this unit (and potentially others) start to recover and move towards favourable condition.</p>	Y	<p>The environmental mitigation has been designed to respond to the specific impacts of the Scheme. Principally this focuses on large scale terrestrial habitat creation. However, since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has now included river restoration measures of the River Itchen (that is in the Application Boundary) within the Scheme design. Additionally, the drainage design is likely to improve the quality of water discharged into the River Itchen from the Scheme.</p> <p>A Water Framework Directive (WFD) Assessment (Document Reference 7.7) has been prepared to support the DCO Application, The assessment concludes that the Scheme does not result in a significant change away from baseline conditions for the overall WFD water bodies, and will not result in deterioration of the current WFD potential of the River Itchen, Nun's Walk Stream and Itchen Navigation Canal surface water bodies. As such, the works are compliant with the WFD and will not prevent the water bodies from achieving Good status in the future</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the Environment Agency throughout the pre-application (including discussions regarding river restoration measures) and is continuing a level of engagement post submission of the DCO application.</p>
		Mitigation	<p>Historically the construction of the A34, A33 and M3 road bridges over the River Itchen have led to hydro-geomorphological impacts on the river which are still present today. As part of the proposed scheme, remedial works to make good this historic damage to the River Itchen should be undertaken in addition to mitigation measures, to address the proposed scheme's operational and construction impacts, net biodiversity gain to deliver additional biodiversity improvements and fulfil Highways England's own Biodiversity Plan aims and the environmental strategic aim for this proposed scheme.</p>	Y	<p>The environmental mitigation has been designed to respond to the specific impacts of the Scheme. Principally this focuses on large scale terrestrial habitat creation. However, since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has now included river restoration measures of the River Itchen (that is in the Application Boundary) within the Scheme design. Additionally, the drainage design is likely to improve the quality of water discharged into the River Itchen from the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant is working to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available. As set out in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the Environment Agency</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					throughout the pre-application (including discussions regarding river restoration measures) and is continuing a level of engagement post submission of the DCO application.
		Mitigation	Where possible, some mitigation measures could be delivered in advance of scheme construction to help minimise impacts on, and help resilience of, species and habitats impacted as a result of the scheme.	Y	Opportunities for advanced planting as part of an early stage of the construction programme have been identified on the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) . Advanced planting would be undertaken at the start of construction works to provide opportunity for establishment during the construction period to provide improved mitigation at the opening of the Scheme. This is also reflected in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
		Mitigation	Ongoing management and maintenance of habitats, especially those created as part of the scheme, should be included in any mitigation plan.	N	Details of ecological monitoring and maintenance are set out in Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) .
		Biodiversity	Whilst it is recognised that more work and assessment is ongoing and that a comprehensive environmental mitigation plan will be developed (it is noted that section 2.4.64 says “a comprehensive environmental mitigation design is in development”), we hope that serious consideration will be given to the environmental mitigation and BNG proposals identified by us, Natural England, the South Downs National Park Authority and Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust. We welcome continued dialogue with Highways England to develop further the environmental mitigation and BNG designs.	Y	<p>The Applicant has engaged with stakeholders with regards to mitigation and the aim of maximising biodiversity outputs from the Scheme in accordance with National Highways performance targets. Since the 2021 statutory consultation the Applicant revised the landscape strategy and Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) to respond to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that ‘embedded avoidance and mitigation measures’ for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it has evolved. These measures include the provision of habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity. Further details are presented in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). Furthermore,</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					the Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and not affected by the proposals. This was in response to comments received from stakeholders including Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust.
		Biodiversity	As set out before in our response to previous Scoping Reports, the ES should address consideration of mitigation options (including a green bridge option), a conclusion upon whether to take those options forward and the factors underpinning that conclusion. Further details of suitable allowances for wildlife crossings, avoidance of habitat fragmentation, protection of sensitive habitats and species, supporting nature recovery networks and maintaining habitat connectivity should be included within the ES as part of any mitigation proposals.	Y	<p>The Applicant's response to the Environment Agency's comments on the 2020 Scoping Report can be found in Appendix 4.2 (Scoping Comments and Responses) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.3).</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has developed its biodiversity and landscaping mitigation package in consultation with stakeholders (including Natural England, the Environment Agency and South Downs National Park Authority).</p> <p>New areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape during operation. Much of the additional woodland and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for wildlife in a north-south direction. Please refer to Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The design has sought to avoid adverse effects on biodiversity in the first instance through an iterative approach (e.g. moving the alignment to avoid sensitive receptors where possible). In this way the mitigation hierarchy has been embedded with the design process. Additionally, the proposed new foot / cycle bridge over the River Itchen SAC / SSSI will be a clear span structure and set back from the riverbank to allow for continued wildlife movement.</p> <p>A green bridge is not proposed as part of the Scheme with the of linking ecology corridors as there are no instances of new severance</p>
		Construction – deposition areas	<p>Comments on specific sections of the PEIR</p> <p>Section 2.4.5 suggests that the IAB could be extended around areas of search for excess spoil management. We and others have</p>	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the design of the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk has been revisited and redesigned to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>previously spoken to Highways England about extending the IAB to include areas where environmental mitigation and BNG could be delivered. This has been consistently dismissed. If the IAB can be extended to address issues of spoil management, we see no reason why this couldn't also be done to enable Highways England to maximise biodiversity outputs, bring about improvement to designated sites, deliver significant BNG and deliver long term benefits to the environment and aid nature recovery.</p>		<p>National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. This design has progressed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority who confirmed they were generally content with the progress the design was showing to respond to some of the concerns, specifically changes to landform and topography.</p> <p>In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase was sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, has prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and reduced best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land take.</p> <p>As part of the DCO application, the Applicant has submitted a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report which presents the results of the biodiversity net gain assessment for the Scheme. The assessment concludes that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity. Further details are presented in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p>
		Construction – general	<p>Section 2.4.23 suggests that Kings Worthy Bridge will require modification. It is not clear what this modification will be and this element of work is not considered further within the Biodiversity chapter (only the new footbridge is considered). All potential effects on the River Itchen and surrounding habitats must be considered and addressed within the ES.</p>	N	<p>The existing Kings Worthy Bridge may require strengthening of the existing concrete edge beams. This is subject to further investigation during detailed design. If required, this strengthening would be in the form of carbon fibre plates that are stuck to the underside of the edge beams. following some concrete removal removed via grinding. In order to fix the carbon fibre plates onto the bridge, beam access is required either from a pontoon or from an overhung system from the bridge deck. Further description of works to the Kings Worthy Bridge is presented in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and assessed in relevant ES chapters (Document Reference 6.1). Measures to prevent dust entering the river would be utilised.</p> <p>For all works within 8m of the River Itchen, including improvements to the Kings Worthy Bridge, method statement Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP) applications would be prepared for Environment Agency approval.</p>
		Mitigation	<p>In regard to section 2.4.65, we would welcome the provision of an ecologically informed habitat compensation and enhancement package and the production of the Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy as</p>	N	<p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it has evolved.</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			part of an Environmental Masterplan.		<p>These measures include the provision of habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>The OLEMP (Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) and the Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) have been developed in consultation with key stakeholders and discussed in relevant ES chapters (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
		Biodiversity	<p>In regard to section 8.1.2, we consider that the proposed scheme also has the potential for habitat loss, disturbance or fragmentation during operation due to the proposed new bridge and potential changes to Kingsworthy Bridge. There may also be effects to habitats due to changes to groundwater conditions during site preparation construction and/or operation. As the scheme details are still being developed these points should be included as a potential effect on biodiversity and considered within the ES.</p>	N	<p>A new cycle and footbridge over the River Itchen would be located between the existing Itchen Bridge, (which carries the A34 Northbound carriageway), and the existing Kingsworthy Bridge (which upon completion of strengthening works, would carry the A33 north and southbound carriageways and the A34 southbound carriageway, respectively).</p> <p>The proposed cycle/footbridge would comprise a single-span (clear span) through truss supported on reinforced concrete abutments founded on piled foundations without the need for direct or intrusive works within the River Itchen. It is envisaged that piled foundations would be pre-cast or cased in-situ to seek to avoid the use of wet concrete reaching the river system through ground fissures. Timber and steel are being considered for the proposed structure, which would be lifted into place as a pre-constructed item with the crane situated on the adjacent highway. Separate reinforced concrete wing walls perpendicular to the abutments would likely be required on all four corners. The abutments, which are envisaged to be precast units to seek to avoid the use of wet concrete, would be set back from the riverbank and outside the SAC and SSSI to reduce environmental impact and to allow preventative measures should wet concrete be required. The design would allow passage of wildlife, in particular otter, to be maintained along the riverbank. Where possible, the final design would be sympathetic to the surrounding's vegetation.</p> <p>Depending on the bridge deck installation detail, access may be required to potential bolt connections. If this is necessary, pontoons could be used to support an access system to the bridge. It is anticipated that this pontoon would only be in place for a few days and would be across the river width. The design of any pontoon configuration would be undertaken in consultation with an ecologist.</p> <p>The Scheme design, including the new bridge, is considered within the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Specifically, an</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					assessment of potential effects from the new bridge to biodiversity receptors is set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and an assessment of potential effects from the new bridge on road drainage and the water environment is set out in Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Pollution control measures are included in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
		Biodiversity	Section 8.3.1 states that <i>“the scope of data collection for otter should be increased to include survey of some terrestrial habitats adjacent to the proposed working route to Kings Worthy.”</i> This additional requirement has not been included in other sections or tables in the Biodiversity chapter.	N	Results of additional otter surveys in 2021 are presented in Appendix 8.1x (Otter Survey 2021) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) with a summary included in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Consultation	We would welcome additional consultation and ongoing dialogue around ecological survey works, assessment of effects, scheme design, mitigation and BNG requirements and proposals.	N	The Applicant has engaged with the Environment Agency throughout the pre-application (including discussions regarding Scheme design, mitigation and BNG requirements) and is continuing a level of engagement post submission.
		Biodiversity	Section 8.4.7 does not mention additional otter surveys of areas that might be affected by the updated proposals, particularly the terrestrial habitats around the proposed new walking route and new and altered bridges (see point raise in relation to section 8.3.1. above).	N	Results of additional otter surveys in 2021 are presented in Appendix 8.1x (Otter Survey 2021) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) with a summary included in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Biodiversity	In regard to Table 8-4, we note it has been requested that additional data collection for otter is required as a result of changes to the proposed scheme. This should be reflected in this table.	N	An additional otter survey was undertaken in June 2021, please refer to Appendix 8.1x (Otter Survey 2021) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) .
		Biodiversity	We consider that Water Vole should not be scoped out of the ES. It is acknowledged that this species is likely to be present in adjacent habitats, and whilst not located within the IAB itself, any effects on the river channels or hydrologically connected wetlands outside of the IAB (which is still to be assessed as part of the ES as the scheme design is refined) may also have an effect on this species. It is not necessarily that more survey work is necessary, just that effects on this species, even if it occurs outside the IAB, must be considered within the ES.	N	Water voles are considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and surveys have been undertaken in 2017 and updated in 2020. Please refer to Appendix 8.1i (Water Vole Survey Report 2017) and Appendix 8.1t (Water Vole Survey Report 2020) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . Presence of water vole has been confirmed in habitats west of the Application Boundary. However, surveys found no evidence of water voles within the extent of the Application Boundary and reported that the riparian woodland habitats along the River Itchen corridor within the Application Boundary were of limited suitability for water vole due to shading and lack of bankside vegetation. The implementation of mitigation would avoid significant adverse impacts. As such, potential impacts from construction

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					activities would result in no change to water voles.
		Biodiversity	Table 8-4 states that the River Itchen supports a diverse fish community and fish are classified at High quality under the WFD. However, it must be noted that Atlantic Salmon are a species in crisis and the populations in the Test and Itchen are in a critical state. Since 1983, overall abundance and the egg-to-adult survival rate have both more than halved. In 2017, the Atlantic Salmon population was assessed as being 'Probably at Risk' and has been substantially below its Conservation Limit for a number of years. Diffuse pollution, poor habitat quality and insufficient water quantity are some of the identified key pressures.	N	Atlantic salmon are a qualifying feature of the River Itchen SAC. The River Itchen SAC is of international importance and has been recognised as a highly sensitive receptor throughout the design and assessment process. Measures have been put in place to avoid or mitigate impacts to the River Itchen and its qualifying features, including Atlantic salmon. The drainage design is likely to improve the quality of water discharged into the River Itchen from the scheme relative the existing situation. Further details are included in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Water Framework Directive Assessment (Document Reference 7.7) .
		Biodiversity	Section 8.9.4 onwards covering the River Itchen SAC/SSSI makes no reference to possible alterations to Kingsworthy Bridge, yet this is mentioned earlier in the PEIR and also in the drainage chapter. Whilst is it accepted that the amount of alteration is as yet unknown it should be included here as there is the potential for both construction and operational impacts.	N	Improvement works to the Kings Worthy Bridge are described and assessed within the ES (Document Reference 6.1) including Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) and Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Biodiversity	Table 8-6 (Otter) again fails to include possible disturbance due to the new footpath and the requirement for additional survey in the terrestrial habitat there. In addition, Water Vole are not included within this table. As mentioned previously we consider that this sensitive receptor should be included in the ES.	N	Potential operational disturbance impacts to otter and water vole from the new footpath and cycleway are assessed within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The assessment presented in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation measures, effects to otters and water voles from the construction and operation of the Scheme would be not significant.
		Biodiversity	Operational impacts for freshwater fish should include pollution events and habitat degradation due to siltation/pollutants from road run-off. Whilst it is expected that improved surface water management should reduce this, we have not yet seen those details so consider there is a potential impact, especially given the pressures on Atlantic Salmon.	N	The operational drainage design includes a multi-phase drainage system, which includes a number of measures to remove pollutants such as silt and other pollutants. The new drainage system is likely to improve the quality of water discharged into the River Itchen from the scheme relative the existing situation. Potential operational impacts to fish from changes in water quality are assessed within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . In accordance with <i>Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (CIEEM, 2019)</i> , the assessment presented in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that construction and operational effects from the Scheme to freshwater fish

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					would be not significant.
		Geology and soils	<p>Section 2 - Groundwater quality</p> <p>2.1 Solution features</p> <p>The area is likely to have solution features present. The presence of these features in the region indicate that rapid fracture flow is occurring. This hydrogeological process has been known to enable groundwater to flow in excess of 10 km²/day (which is greater than the general stated travel time applied to Source Protection Zone 1 areas i.e. a 50 day travel time of pollutant to source with a 50m default minimum radius).</p>	N	<p>A Stage 1 Tier 2 Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment in respect of Controlled Waters can be found appended to the Ground Investigation Report (Document Reference 7.11). This has not identified any significant sources of existing potential contamination and therefore there is a Low risk to controlled waters. On this basis the requirement for a Tier 3 risk assessment, including modelling of specific aquifer properties is not required.</p> <p>As part of ongoing engagement with stakeholders, the Applicant issued a Cavities Occurrence Assessment and Preliminary Risk Assessment to the Environment Agency for comment. The Environment Agency provided comments in October 2022. The Applicant is committed to working with the Environment Agency to develop the assessment post submission and into the Examination.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment; Geology and soils	<p>Whilst this process may not be as exaggerated in this area, the potential for rapid movement of potential contaminants exists and should be factored into the Controlled Waters Risk Assessment and ES.</p>	N	<p>Appendix 13.2 (Hydrogeological Risk Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) considers potential sources and pathways for contaminants (including solution features) and is reported in Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of this ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides further detail on solution features.</p> <p>As part of ongoing engagement with stakeholders, the Applicant issued a Cavities Occurrence Assessment and Preliminary Risk Assessment to the Environment Agency for comment. The assessment identifies a predominantly very low and low risk from natural cavities. The Environment Agency provided comments in October 2022. The Applicant is committed to working with the Environment Agency to develop the assessment post submission and into the Examination.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	<p>2.2 Highway drainage</p> <p>The overall aim should be to improve the highway drainage (particularly regarding soakaways) so as to minimise the impact on groundwater quality. Particular attention should be paid to the condition of existing soakaways and how these assets will be renovated/decommissioned.</p>	N	<p>The Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) has assessed the condition of the existing soakaways and confirms which are to be retained, improved, or removed. The strategy also includes consideration of maintenance of proposed drainage features. This is reported in the Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
		Road drainage and the water	<p>Further information about how highway drainage will be improved so as to minimise the impact on groundwater quality should be included</p>	N	<p>A proposed maintenance schedule is included in Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		environment	within the ES. Long-term maintenance of the drainage systems should also be covered within the ES.		Reference 6.3). It details the frequency of maintenance activities to demonstrate that the performance of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) features, and drainage systems can be maintained over the lifetime of the network.
		Road drainage and the water environment	2.3 Public water abstractions and turbidity We support the understanding demonstrated in the PEIR of the relationship between groundwater and surface water within the scheme area, and also support the understanding of the potential impacts on public water abstractions and the aim to ensure there is no impact on those abstractions.	N	Appendix 13.2 (Hydrogeological Risk Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) considers public groundwater and private water supply abstractions as potential receptors to the Scheme.
		Road drainage and the water environment	It should be borne in mind that intrusive activities may cause the liberation of legacy contaminants, but the more likely risk is the creation of a turbidity risk at these abstractions. Turbidity is a major issue for water providers, and we would strongly recommend a proactive dialogue with the local water company (Southern Water Services Ltd). Further information about the assessment of the above risks (i.e. legacy contaminants and turbidity risk) should be included within the Controlled Waters Risk Assessment and ES, and any mitigation measures should be reflected within the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).	N	A Foundation Works Risk Assessment (FWRA) will be prepared by the Principal Contractor during the detailed design stage and included within the siEMP, as outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . A FWRA would focus on the potential hazards of piling/excavation activities on local groundwater, and the methods that might mitigate the risk of those hazards, including turbidity, having a detrimental impact. This risk assessment will be prepared by the Principal Contractor during the detailed design stage and included within the siEMP. A FWRA will be consulted with the Environment Agency. This commitment is listed in Section 3 , the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC), of the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
		Geology and soils	2.4 Unexpected contamination We would continue to stress that vigilance should be maintained throughout construction works in regard to encountering unexpected contamination, especially when conducting piling/penetrative investigations or works. We would anticipate that an approach to monitoring such risk is reflected in the Controlled Waters Risk Assessment and ES, and any mitigation measures should be reflected within the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).	N	The Ground Investigation Report (GIR) (Document Reference 7.11) has identified a low risk of significant site wide contamination that could be mobilised during any excavation and penetrative works. The fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) has been included as part of the submission for Development Consent and there are commitments in the REAC for dealing with unexpected contamination. The requirement for an EMP is secured through Requirement 3 of the DCO. This would include measures (including the requirement for a watching brief if necessary) for dealing with any unexpected contamination.
		Geology and soils	Ad hoc investigation, testing and remediation may be required and will need to be coordinated with us.	N	The Applicant notes this comment
		Geology and soils	2.5 Groundwater levels We are pleased to see that the ES will consider the impacts and management of high groundwater levels in the area.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. These matters are considered in Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Road drainage and the water environment	<p>2.6 Dewatering</p> <p>We note that section 13.8.12 states that it is not anticipated that temporary dewatering will be required. If this changes, we should be informed and it is likely that an abstraction licence would then be required from us for any dewatering activities.</p>	N	This comment is noted by the Applicant. The dewatering would be undertaken in accordance with all required licences and permits, in agreement with the Environment Agency.
		Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Section 3 – Flood risk</p> <p>3.1 Forthcoming update to climate change allowances</p> <p>As already notified to Highways England and their consultants, we are in the process of updating the allowances for peak river flow and Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances following research completed in 2020. This research sought to better understand how different river catchments respond to changes in rainfall due to climate change within river basin districts. It uses the latest rainfall projections in UKCP18.</p> <p>We are currently developing new allowances that represent the findings of this research. We anticipate that the new peak river flow allowances will be published in July 2021. The updated allowances will need to be considered as part of the Flood Risk Assessment for the scheme.</p>	N	<p>Allowances for peak river flow are outlined in Section 4 of the Flood Risk Assessment (Document Reference 7.4).</p> <p>Correspondence with the Environment Agency, which is included as an appendix to the Flood Risk Assessment, confirms that the assessment of H++ (+120%) gives a more conservative assessment as the new climate change allowance result in a lower value. The Environment Agency confirmed that the models did not need to be re-run.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	<p>3.2 Proposed new footbridge over the River Itchen</p> <p>We note the addition of a footbridge over the River Itchen, which will be clear span with the abutments set back from the riverbank (sections 8.8.5 & 13.8.22). We support a clear span structure as this type of structure will minimise potential effects upon the floodplain and watercourse.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Road drainage and the water environment	<p>3.3 Advice: Flood Risk Activity Permit</p> <p>Any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the River Itchen bank (designated as a 'Main River') is likely to require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from us under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016.</p>	N	This comment is noted by the Applicant. Further details are set out in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement (Document Reference 3.3)
		Road drainage and the water environment	<p>If applicable, we will consider disapplication of Flood Risk Activity Permits for the construction of the scheme under section 150 of the Planning Act 2008, provided our protective provisions are agreed and included within the DCO. We will engage with Highways England to understand whether they wish to disapply the need for such permits as part of their application.</p>	N	Engagement is ongoing with the Environment Agency regarding the FRAPs and this position will be reviewed during Examination.
		Road drainage and the water	<p>3.4 Table 13-1</p> <p>We note the following in Table 13-1 (in relation to the column for 24</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		environment	February 2021) which says the Environment Agency are to respond: “Climate change allowances applied within the available hydraulic model are inputted differently to the standard approach due to the detailed hydrological study completed which took account of non-stationarity. Confirmation requested by the Applicant that it was appropriate to continue to apply climate change allowances in a consistent manner.”		
		Road drainage and the water environment	For the purposes of record-keeping, we have now responded to that enquiry (our response was provided by email to Stantec dated 28 May 2021). We confirmed that “the approach to calculating the H++ value seems reasonable, and is in line with how the other values were produced in the 2019 Itchen model.”	N	
		Geology and soils	Section 4 – General advice 4.1 Storage of hazardous substances We would expect to see details about how the storage of any hazardous substances to be utilised during works will be managed within the ES and/or CEMP.	N	Section 3 of the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) outlines appropriate pollution control requirements for the storage of chemicals.
		Geology and soils	It should be noted that depending on the substances, hazardous substances consent may well be required separate to the DCO process.	N	This is noted by the Applicant. Details of other consents and licences required for the Scheme are set out in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement (Document Reference 3.3) .
		Geology and soils	4.2 Pollution prevention All precautions must be taken to avoid discharges and spills to the ground both during and after construction. Further details regarding pollution prevention for the long-term maintenance of the road post-construction should also be included within the ES and/or CEMP.	N	During construction, specific areas will be designated for the storage of chemicals, waste oils and fuel and refuelling activities. These areas will be bunded and placed on an impermeable base, where appropriate, to prevent migration of contaminants. Section 3 , the REAC, of the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) lists environmental commitments relating to reducing the risks associated with spills and action to be taken. The third iteration EMP will be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval within 28 days of the opening of the Scheme for public use. On completion of construction the second iteration EMP must be updated and converted to the third iteration EMP to reflect the latest information regarding the stage of the Scheme, the project team, known environmental constraints for operation and maintenance and has been approved by the Secretary of State in consultation with the relevant planning authorities. The EMP at this stage will set out post construction maintenance and monitoring requirements, incorporate the latest evaluation of change

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					register and all other sections refined as required.

K.1.C: ESP Utilities Group Ltd

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Utilities	ESP Utilities Group Ltd has no gas or electricity apparatus in the vicinity of this site address and will not be affected by your proposed works.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

K.1.D: Forestry Commission

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Landscape and visual; Mitigation; Biodiversity	<p>The Forestry Commission has no further comment to make on this scheme at this time; all previous comments submitted still stand, and we look forward to viewing the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) and Environmental Statement in due course</p>	Y	<p>Comments from stakeholders have been considered in developing the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and supporting documents including the Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) and the OLEMP (Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)).</p> <p>Specifically, Chapter 5 (Air Quality) and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the effect from construction and operation of the Scheme on ancient woodland.</p> <p>No parcels of ancient woodland, ancient trees, or veteran trees have been identified within the Application Boundary. A number of parcels of ancient woodland have been identified on the ancient woodland inventory within 2km, the closest being 475m north-west of the Scheme, as presented on Figure 8.4 (Non-Statutory Designated Areas) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2). Further parcels of ancient woodland are present beyond the 2km study area, but within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN).</p> <p>No irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland or veteran trees would be affected during construction. Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Appendix 8.3 (Assessment of Air Quality Impacts on Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) shows the effects from localised changes in air quality from the Scheme to the ancient woodlands within 200m of the ARN and concludes that this would not be significant to these habitats of national importance.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant is working to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been working collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revised the landscape strategy and Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) to respond to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it has evolved. These measures include the provision of habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. Habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity. Further details are presented in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p>

K.1.E: Health and Safety Executive

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Safety	<p>According to HSE's records the proposed DCO application boundary for this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project is within the consultation zones of one major accident hazard site.</p> <p>This is based on the current configuration as illustrated in, for example, the M3 junction 9 improvement scheme Preliminary Environmental Information Report, Appendix 2.1 – General Figures (Part 1 of 2) May 2021.</p> <p>The M3 and junction 9 is already within these consultation zones; HSE would not advise against the current proposal</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Safety	<p>Hazardous Substance Consent</p> <p>The presence of hazardous substances on, over or under land at or above set threshold quantities (Controlled Quantities) will probably require Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC) under the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 as amended. The substances, alone or when aggregated with others for which HSC is required, and the associated Controlled Quantities, are set out in The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment. As set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) , it will be the responsibility of the Principal Contractor and separately the statutory undertakers and their contractors, to ensure all licences, consents and permits (including Hazardous Substances Consent, if required) are obtained within the relevant timescales. The details included in Section 4 of the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) will be updated by the Principal Contractors, as part of the final EMP, to cover developments through the detailed design and construction planning phase and throughout the operational phase to capture all relevant items.
		Safety	<p>HSC would be required to store or use any of the Named Hazardous Substances or Categories of Substances at or above the controlled quantities set out in Schedule 1 of these Regulations.</p>	N	Section 3 , the REAC, of the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) outlines appropriate pollution control requirements for the storage of chemicals. During construction, specific areas will be designed for the storage of chemicals, waste oils and fuel and refuelling activities. These areas will be bunded and placed on an impermeable base, where appropriate, to prevent migration of contaminants. It will be the responsibility of the Principal Contractor and separately the statutory undertakers and their contractors, to ensure all licences, consents and permits (including Hazardous Substances Consent, if required) are obtained within the relevant timescales.
		Safety	<p>Explosive sites - HSE has no comment to make as there are no licensed explosives sites in the vicinity.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Safety	<p>Electrical Safety - No comment from a planning perspective.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

K.1.F: Historic England

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Cultural heritage	<p>We have reviewed the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline and broadly agree with the conclusions and assessments of impact put forward. We also agree that as the proposals currently stand those highly designated heritage assets most likely to be affected include the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Worthy Park House (Grade II* 1095892) ▪ Late Iron Age Settlement N of Grace’s Farm (scheduled monument 1001825) ▪ Site of St Gertrudes Chapel (scheduled monument 1005518) ▪ Round Barrow Cemetery on Magdalen Hill Down (scheduled monument 1016746) 	N	<p>The key heritage assets as identified by Historic England are all confirmed to fall within the 1km study area as outlined in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The setting of these designated heritage assets is assessed in Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) with likely impacts assessed in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The assessment concluded that following mitigation there would not be any significant residual effects upon the historic environment (archaeology, built heritage or historic landscape) from the construction or operation of the Scheme.</p>
		Landscape and visual	<p>We do note that the additional signage, gantries and lighting required have not been considered as part of this assessment to date. These all have the potential to have adverse effects on the designated heritage assets with longer ranging views as well as ones with a close proximity to the improvement scheme. We advise that these will need to be subject to further assessment. We would be keen to explore the requirements for these at an early stage so that ways to avoid and minimise harm can influence the final design of the proposals.</p>	N	<p>These elements are included within Figure 7.10 (Landscape and Visual: ZTV of the Scheme) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) and have been considered within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). A walkover survey of designated heritage assets likely to be affected by signage, gantries and lighting was carried out between the Applicant and Historic England in June 2022. It was noted during the survey that there is limited intervisibility and therefore minimal potential impacts from these Scheme features. Discussions with Historic England regarding potential impacts of designated heritage assets will continue into the detailed design stage.</p>
		Cultural heritage; Noise and vibration	<p>There may also be additional road noise as a consequence of the proposals within the setting of a number of heritage assets. The use of a noise attenuating road surface should be explored to minimise this.</p>	N	<p>The use of low road surface noise finishing would be used on new road surfaces; please refer to Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
		Cultural heritage	<p>We note that comments raised within our scoping response and during the cultural heritage working group meetings have been integrated and considered within Table 6.1 of the PEIR.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment</p>

K.1.G: Instalcom Limited

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Utilities	We only have network on the rail network anywhere close to this scheme. This interaction is on the A34 South of the Woodhams Farmhouse that is shown on your drawings.	N	The Applicant confirms that Network Rail was consulted under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 about the Scheme. Following refinements to the Application Boundary after the 2021 consultation, the Applicant no longer requires this area of land and will not affect the rail network. The Applicant sent a letter to Instalcom Limited and Network Rail informing them of the Application Boundary changes in December 2021.

K.1.H: Itchen Valley Parish Council

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Traffic and transport; Design	<p>Road Layout</p> <p>It is pleasing to see that our concerns on the previous scheme regarding the dangers to local traffic travelling from Winnall onto the A33 have been taken into account. The key point to note is that the road layout has been significantly improved since the previous plan. Our concerns on safety have been addressed and as part of the plan the A33 to and from the Winnall roundabout from and to the Cart and Horses junction will be entirely separate from the A34. It also has the advantage that accessing the M3 northbound from the Itchen Valley and Kings Worthy will not require going up to the Winnall roundabout.</p> <p>It is understood that the intention is not to have traffic lights on the new Winnall roundabout on the basis that the volume of traffic accessing the roundabout will be much less than at present. As raised at one of the webinars, it is requested that ducting for cabling is installed as part of the proposed project to allow traffic lights to be installed with minimum cost and disruption should they be considered necessary at some future date.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant welcomes Itchen Valley Parish Council's support for the design changes presented at the 2021 statutory consultation to address safety concerns raised at the 2019 consultation.</p> <p>Even though the current traffic modelling outlines there is no requirement for signals, to futureproof the Scheme the new bridges across the M3 will cater for a number of spare ducts with surrounding verges wide enough for duct installation avoiding existing drainage/utility infrastructure.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	<p>Footpaths, Cycle paths and Bridleways</p> <p>The proposed footpath from Junction 9 to Long Walk would in effect connect existing Bridleway 502 (pedestrians, cyclists & horse-riders permitted) with Restricted Byway 19 (pedestrians, cyclists, horse-riders, horse-drawn vehicles permitted). The new path should therefore be created as a multi-use path classified as a Bridleway or Restricted Byway.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Construction - deposition areas	<p>Spoil Dumps</p> <p>The proposed soil heap behind Lone Barn is not supported, if spoil needs to be removed we suggest this should be used to create bunds to</p>	Y	<p>Comments relating to deposition areas:</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>prevent noise and air quality issues. We question the access to the spoil site given the proposal to use routes at the end of long walk close to the Itchen, currently designated as footpaths.</p> <p>If access to the Northern spoil dump (behind Lone Barn) is via Footpaths 20 & 21 and also via 19 at its juncture with Long Walk, this could be very disruptive to the rights of way network. Long Walk is a narrow single track lane passing under a narrow bridge, which then becomes very steep and would seem unsuitable for heavy traffic. Its use for heavy plant would potentially have particular impact on access to Fulling Mill and possibly businesses and other properties on Long Walk. If access to the Central spoil dump and Compound 1 is via Easton Lane (crossing Sustrans 23) this will be disruptive for pedestrians and cyclists accessing Winnall and Winchester from Easton, and may affect property access during works particularly Whitehill Cottage and Shoulder of Mutton Farm field access. Residents along Long Walk (crossroads to Fulling Mill) and Easton Lane (Lone Barn to J9) will experience disruption during construction, and long-term changes to the settings of their properties, but details provided at this stage seem limited. How much spoil will be dumped, how will it look afterwards? Will access to existing rights of way be restricted during construction and to what extent? How long will each spoil dump/compound be in use and during what hours - would floodlights be used? Will there be site-worker accommodation in the compound? How will the works affect the supply or quality of water to nearby properties that have boreholes?</p>		<p>redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>Site arisings are now proposed to be utilised in the landscaping proposals through more sympathetic ground reprofiling. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and accompanying Figure 2.8 (Scheme Long Sections) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) provide detail on the existing and proposed topography and how the new features sit within the landscape. The sections provide greater detail on how the proposals relate to the surrounding existing landscape and landform profiles.</p> <p>Comments relating to construction compounds:</p> <p>The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the location of the construction compounds during the refinement of the current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been studied by the Applicant and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has reduced the impact of the central construction compound (presented as construction compound 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation) by reducing its footprint and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant has reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area of the tree line. The northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 in the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>proposals and will therefore not be required.</p> <p>The construction of the Scheme would therefore require the following construction compounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A central temporary construction compound (presented as number 1 in the 2021 statutory consultation) located to the immediate east of Junction 9. Activities within this compound would include plant storage, car parking, fuel and water storage, 'skills school', staff welfare facilities, waste segregation areas and a wheel wash. The area would also be used for material storage, a tree and hedging nursery area and material processing (earthworks and pavements) and storage of topsoil. • Two smaller areas within the footprint of the Junction 9 gyratory roundabout (presented as number 2 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to facilitate construction of the new gyratory bridge. • A small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities. <p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the Applicant's approach to construction, including phasing details, the proposed working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme. The construction phase of the Scheme is estimated to commence in early 2024. It is currently envisaged that the construction phase would be spilt into four main phases (0 to 3), with compound establishment being within Phase 0 (site set up and construction prep).</p> <p>Working hours would be restricted to the following core hours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07.00 to 19.00 Monday to Friday • 07.00 to 13.30 Saturday • No Sunday working <p>Works outside of the core working hours are likely to be required in certain circumstances and would be carried out following consultation with Winchester City Council.</p> <p>It is anticipated that standard temporary fencing for the main</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>construction compound would be used to screen and secure compound locations. This would reduce visual intrusion, assist in noise attenuation and ensure public safety.</p> <p>The temporary compounds would also be subject to surface water drainage measures to avoid significant environmental effects. Such measures would include (refer to the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) for further details):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the amount of topsoil stripping where possible and soil stockpiles would be located as far from watercourses as practicable • Use of silt fences • Plant and wheel washing and haul road damping in designated areas • Plant to be re-fuelled in designated locations at a safe distance from water courses and good practise to be in place with relation to pollution prevention (adequate bunding, storage etc) • Spill kits are to be positioned at strategic locations on site and thorough training provided for staff to ensure a rapid and effective response to any pollution incidents that occur on site • Use of an Ecological Clerk of Works / Environmental Manager, along with toolbox talks and training to promote contractor awareness of pollution risks <p>The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited. Works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p> <p>Furthermore, Appendix 13.2 (Hydrogeological Risk Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) considers public groundwater and private water supply abstractions as potential receptors to the Scheme.</p> <p>Comments relating to public rights of ways and access:</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>The effects on existing PRowS during construction are outlined in Chapter 12 (Population and Human health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The impacts of the construction of the Scheme on these routes are considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted an outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) as part of its DCO application. The Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) provides details of how the construction works will be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measure, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase. The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13). Furthermore, access to the central temporary construction compound will be from Spitfire Link.</p>

K.1.I: Kings Worthy Parish Council

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Principle of development	We are the Parish Council representing the parishes who will be most affected by the proposed improvements to Junction 9 of the M3. This junction is pivotal to travel for our parishioners who work or shop in the Winnall area of Winchester.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Design, Traffic and transport	We and our parishioners are therefore very appreciative of the changes made to the improvement proposals following the first round of consultation, particularly those affecting the route to and from our parishes and this important junction. The creation of a separate route which does not require our parishioners to merge with and cross the fast-moving A34 traffic, is in our view a very major step to ensuring their safety when using this important junction. However, the creation of this route will require major modification of the London Road (B3047) and the A33 junction where it passes through our parish. This is a known accident black spot, but there are no details included within the proposals as to how this dangerous junction will be reconfigured. This situation requires urgent attention with more detail being provided for both this council and our parishioners before we can support the wider proposal.	N	The Applicant notes this comment, and the matter is under discussion with Hampshire County Council. The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047 and a reduction in delay at the B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme. It is not considered a requirement within this Scheme to undertake improvements at this junction.
		Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	We also applaud the creation of a rural footpath to and from Junction 9 which utilises part of the existing carriageway of the north bound A33, which will become surplus to requirements following the improvements. We would however like to point out what we feel is a major oversight in that there does not appear to be a plan to utilise part of this redundant carriageway to create a cycleway linking our parishes to the Winnall area. The recent lockdowns have shown us that family cycling has increased substantially within our parishes and the inclusion of part of this redundant carriageway into a two-way cycle path would provide a safe and environmentally friendly way of allowing travel to the Nature Reserve at Winnall Moors, shopping at Winnall and as a safe route to Winchester City. This would truly be an incredibly positive “Green Benefit” of these improvement works and something we believe would not add very much to the overall cost to provide.	Y	The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme. The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Walkers, cyclists and	We would also point out that from the drawings displayed, this much needed pathway appears to utilise what appears to be the central	N	In the early stages of preliminary design, a walking, cycling and horse-riding optioneering exercise was carried out by the Applicant

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		horse-riders	<p>reservation of the A34 for nearly half its length. Since there are no contours shown on the drawing, we are unable to determine if the pathway is above, level with, or below the roadway at this point. We do however feel that this is a major safety issue, particularly for the elderly and those with young children who will rightly feel that this is a far too dangerous path to use. The path will be subject to both noise and air pollution, as well as the risk of vehicles leaving the carriageway and possibly colliding with people on the path. We would ask that serious consideration to be given to providing a safer route for the pathway, possibly utilising some of the existing footpaths lying to the west of the existing carriageway.</p>		<p>along with the contractor to assess the buildability, routing feasibility against the existing site constraints. The outcome of this exercise defined the optimum route as illustrated within the 2021 statutory consultation.</p> <p>The route level will be at existing ground where feasible. Information on proposed and existing levels for the Scheme can be in the Engineering Plans and Sections (Document Reference 2.6). The footway / cycling route along the entirety of the A34 section will be protected by a Vehicle Restraint System (VRS).</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the effects on public access / walkers, cyclists and horse riders and health and amenity during construction and operation. The impacts on footpaths from noise and air pollution isn't assessed within the ES (Document Reference 6.1) because the exposure is transient. This is in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards.</p>

K.1.J: Natural England

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Consultation	<p>Given the nature of the consultation, the limited information provided on the results of the environmental studies and the lack of a detailed impact assessment and mitigation/compensation measures our comments are, in the main, high-level. We will of course continue working with the Project Team and Highways England to ensure that, wherever possible, the avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures for biodiversity and landscape impacts within our remit can be agreed ahead of the Development Consent Order submission.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged with Natural England during the pre-application process. The level of information shown during the 2021 statutory consultation was preliminary and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. As part of the 2021 statutory consultation documents, the Applicant included a PEIR (which included details on the assessment, baseline conditions, study and indicative design, mitigation and enhancement measures) and an Environmental Mitigation Design Plan. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. The Applicant considers that the information presented at the 2021 statutory consultation aligns with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements and the Infrastructure EIA Regulations 2017.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant developed its mitigation proposals and has discussed these with stakeholders such as South Downs National Park Authority and Natural England.</p>
		Biodiversity	<p>In addition, we welcome the proposed objective for an improved environment which endeavours to reduce where possible the number of households adversely affected by noise, improve the air quality at sensitive receptors and maximise biodiversity outputs from the scheme. With this in mind Natural England considers that there is significant scope for additional, visionary design and construction to ensure that the project can deliver an exemplar environmental net gain approach in accordance with the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan and the recent announcement that the Environment Bill will include a requirement for NSIP's to achieve net gain. There is a great opportunity for this development to be one of Highways England's exemplar projects to deliver ecological and landscape benefits as you work towards all schemes achieving this standard as part of your environmental commitment. Again, Natural England would be pleased to work with you and the wider Defra family and environmental stakeholder network to realise this ambition in the coming months.</p>	Y	<p>Relevant biodiversity legislation is covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. It is calculated that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity, refer to the assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.
		Consultation	The comments provided in this response are intended to provide feedback on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report specifically, but also we seek to provide further information on the opportunities presented by a project of this scale to achieve a lasting legacy for the environment in this area.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Mitigation	<p>Annex A – Natural England’s detailed comments in relation to the Preliminary Environmental Information Report for the M3 Junction 9 Improvements Scheme</p> <p>1. General comments</p> <p>Natural England welcomes the principle of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) to identify “the project’s likely significant effects and the measures that are being considered to avoid and minimise them” (Page 1). The principles of the ‘avoid, mitigate compensate’ hierarchy are paramount for this project. We welcomed the work undertaken at the design stage with the preferred option avoiding direct loss to statutory nature conservation sites.</p>	N	<p>This application is accompanied by an ES (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 (‘the Infrastructure EIA Regulations’) and in consultation with the relevant local planning authorities and statutory environmental bodies, including Natural England. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The mitigation hierarchy has been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design, e.g. informing alignment to avoid sensitive receptors where possible. In areas where avoidance is not possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant negative effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate negative effects have also been included, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p> <p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies.</p> <p>The assessment of effects from the Scheme on biodiversity has not identified effects which are considered likely to be significant. During operation of the Scheme, essential mitigation in relation to important biodiversity receptors would include the management and monitoring of habitat creation and enhancement measures. Further details are provided within Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), with a full LEMP secured through DCO Requirement in agreement with statutory consultees.</p>
		Legislation and policy	<p>Guidance from the Planning Inspectorate states that: PEI [Preliminary Environmental Information] is defined in the EIA Regulations as: <i>'information referred to in Part 1 of Schedule 4 (information for inclusion in environmental statements) which:</i> <i>(a) has been compiled by the applicant; and</i> <i>(b) is reasonably required to assess the environmental effects of the development (and of any associated development)</i></p>	N	<p>The level of information shown during the 2021 statutory consultation was preliminary and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. As part of the 2021 statutory consultation documents, the Applicant included a PEIR (which included details on the assessment, baseline conditions, study and indicative design, mitigation and enhancement measures) and an Environmental Mitigation Design Plan. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. The Applicant considers that the information presented at the 2021 statutory consultation aligns with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements and the Infrastructure EIA Regulations 2017.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant developed its mitigation proposals and has discussed these with Natural England.</p>
		Consultation	<p>It also states that 'The focus of the PEIR is to enable the local community to understand the environmental effects of the proposed development so as to inform their responses regarding the proposed development. This is reflected in the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Guidance which advises applicants to provide 'sufficient preliminary environmental information to enable consultees to develop an informed view of the project. The information required will be different for different types and sizes of projects and it may differ depending on the audience of a particular consultation... The key issue is that the information presented must provide clarity to all consultees'</p>	N	
		Consultation	<p>Based upon the information provided, and the guidance above Natural England does not consider that the PEIR contains sufficient information for us to provide detailed advice on the nature, scale and significance of the impacts to designated sites, protected landscapes, protected species and wider biodiversity at present. Similarly, we do not feel there is sufficient information for us to be able to provide in depth advice on the appropriateness or otherwise of the indicative mitigation and compensation measures.</p>	N	

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Consultation	<p>In the absence of more detailed information, supported by the results of the detailed studies Natural England’s advice provided at this stage is necessarily limited in scope and detail. That said, Natural England remains committed to build upon the excellent partnership working approach with the project to ensure that, where possible, our continued working with the Project Team over the next few months ensures that the biodiversity and landscape impacts can be fully addressed ahead of the Development Consent Order submission. This is likely to require engagement over the coming months and we will of course be pleased to provide this on a cost recovery basis through the Discretionary Advice Service contract.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged with Natural England throughout the pre-application and will continue to engage with Natural England post submission. The Applicant has given Natural England the opportunity to comment on relevant draft application documents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) • fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) • OLEMP (Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) • Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) which includes summaries of the surveys undertaken and results • Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)).
		Mitigation	<p>Natural England would encourage the project to be an exemplar in sustainable development demonstrating how it is helping to achieve the outcomes within the Government’s 25 Year Environment Plan. Natural England would be pleased to work with the Project Team and Highways England over the coming months to realise the ambition for this to be an exemplar project for delivering environmental net gain. The PEIR makes reference to enhancements, but we do not consider they realise the ambitions of the Environment Plan for a scheme of this size. We welcome the intention on page 2-15 to include comprehensive environmental mitigation design and seek to maximise biodiversity outputs from the Proposed Scheme.</p>	Y	<p>The mitigation hierarchy has been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design, e.g. informing alignment to avoid sensitive receptors where possible (see Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1)). In areas where avoidance is not possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant negative effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate negative effects have also been included, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided. This is outlined in Chapter 4 (EIA Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. It is calculated that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity, refer to the assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain)</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p>
		Mitigation	<p>We would highlight the need for any associated habitat creation works (whether for species or habitats) to be timetabled such as to allow sufficient maturation time in order for the habitats created to function effectively for target species, and/or to display sufficient functionality. The aim where possible should be to avoid the net loss of habitat availability at any given point in the project construction, moving to a position of long-term net gain, consistent with the direction of environmental policy. Any likely temporal shortfall in habitat availability may need to be taken into account through upscaling to offset that deficit.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Landscape and Ecological Management and Monitoring Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)). The OLEMP describes the proposed management and monitoring of the landscape and ecological mitigation and compensation features of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation and compensation measures are provided in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) to reduce and alleviate significant effects of the Scheme. These include creation of new habitats and natural features such as woodland and grassland, and improvements to existing habitats, such as the river corridors. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity. Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) presents the results of a biodiversity metric calculation which assesses the predicted habitat losses and gains from the Scheme.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor would be responsible for restoration and reinstatement of existing habitats and features and for constructing any new structures, landscape elements and habitats in accordance with Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), in any temporary or permanent land take areas.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor would be responsible for monitoring the establishment of new planting and seeding and in line with the detailed landscape scheme specification. They would also be responsible for replacing planting defects during the contracted 5-year establishment period, and any other management prescriptions that are scheduled to be undertaken during the establishment period.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor would appoint an appropriately experienced and qualified landscaping contractor. The contractor is to be competent at identifying plant species, including those proposed as part of seeded and planted mixes, as well as any undesirable species, and experienced in the various habitat creation and enhancement works required on this Scheme. Specialist work (such as pond creation) may be carried out by specialist sub-contractors appointed by the Principal Contractor where particular specific skills, equipment and/or experience are</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					required.
		Construction - compound locations	We note that the final number, location and dimensions of the construction compounds is not yet known and is subject to ongoing design work. The Indicative Land Use Plan shows 4 locations for construction compounds, we advise that these should be scoped into impact assessments for the project as a whole.	Y	<p>The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the location of the construction compounds during the refinement of the current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been studied by the Applicant and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects. The ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the impacts of the construction compounds.</p> <p>In order to facilitate construction of the Scheme, a number of temporary construction compounds would be required as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A central temporary construction compound (presented as construction compound number 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation), located to the immediate east of Junction 9. • Two smaller areas within the footprint of the Junction 9 gyratory roundabout (presented as construction compound number 2 at the 2021 statutory consultation) • A small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as construction compound number 3 at the 2021 statutory consultation). <p>The northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 in the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals and will therefore not be required.</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has reduced the impact of the central construction compound (presented as construction compound 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation) by reducing its footprint and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant has reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area of the tree line.</p>
		Construction - compound	In particular we have concerns regarding the following issues:	Y	The Applicant has noted the comments received.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The location of the ‘A33/A34 construction compound’ which is in close proximity to the River Itchen SSSI and SAC. See further comments below under Water Quality – Construction impacts. ▪ The location the attenuation ponds in close proximity to the River Itchen SSSI and SAC. See further comments below under Water Quality – Surface water drainage ▪ The PEIR does not acknowledge that the scheme constitutes “Major” development. See further comments below under Protected Landscapes ▪ The level of proposed mitigation and enhancements. See further comments below under Environmental Legacy 		<p><i>In response to point 1:</i></p> <p>The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the location of the construction compounds during the refinement of the current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been studied by the Applicant and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.</p> <p>Specifically, Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents the findings of the assessment of the construction on the Scheme on road drainage and the water environment. Surface water runoff from temporary construction compounds in the vicinity of the River Itchen would be subject to pollution control measures as part of the proposed temporary works drainage strategy to ensure minimal changes on water quality of surface water runoff. It is considered that following the inclusion of the mitigation measures outlined in Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), construction activities are unlikely to affect the integrity of the water environment and therefore result in a negligible impact to the River Itchen. Furthermore, the temporary drainage strategy for construction compounds and the wider Scheme would ensure minimal impacts on groundwater quality due to pollution control measures.</p> <p><i>In response to point 2:</i></p> <p>A National Highways Water Risk Assessment Tool (HEWRAT) assessment for acute and chronic pollution of watercourses has been undertaken for all attenuation basins. The assessment confirms that each detention basin provides sufficient removal of sediments and pollutants to preclude exceedance of the thresholds for acute and chronic pollutant contaminations. The lowest return for a spillage incident is 1 in 253 (for the proposed drainage system) years which meets the minimum 1 in 200-year return period expected for spillage probability in the context of River Itchen SAC. Further details are provided in the Water Framework Directive Assessment (Document Reference 7.7).</p> <p><i>In response to point 3:</i></p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and the</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) set out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy. The Applicant has had regard to the South Downs Local Plan (2019) and has developed the Scheme design in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority.</p> <p>The Scheme constitutes major development within a National Park, and therefore strong justification for the project is required. The Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) demonstrates the rationale for the Scheme and the designs sensitive approach to the South Downs National Park, and how it has positively responded to the special qualities of the designation. Of particular note the Scheme increases opportunities for the public to access and enjoy by positively responding to severance issues caused by the existing M3.</p> <p>The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes.</p> <p><i>In response to point 4:</i></p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, a number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3). Mitigation measures have been developed in consultation with stakeholders, including Natural England.</p>
		Biodiversity	<p>2. Internationally and Nationally Designated Sites</p> <p>We welcome the ecological studies that have been undertaken or are ongoing. However in the absence of the detailed survey results Natural England is not able to provide advice on the likely direct and indirect impacts to designated sites, including Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Wetlands of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention (Ramsar Sites) and Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs).</p>	N	<p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations') and in consultation with the relevant local planning authorities and statutory environmental bodies.</p> <p>Specifically, Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the effects on designations, habitats and species during construction and operation of the Scheme and has</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>been developed in consultation with stakeholders including Natural England. Following the inclusion of mitigation measures (such as the Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3), effects to all designated, habitats of importance and protected and notable species identified within the study areas will not be significant.</p> <p>A number of ecological surveys have been undertaken. These are presented in Appendix 8.1a to 8.1z2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p>
		Consultation	<p>We would refer you to our response to the EIA Scoping Report dated 9th November 2020 for further clarity on the information that should be provided within the Environmental Statement. Natural England will of course be please to provide detailed advice in relation to the likely impacts and mitigation measures in the near future once you are able to share the survey results and draft impact assessment with us.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has considered Natural England’s response to the 2020 Scoping Report in developing the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Applicant’s response to Natural England’s comments on the 2020 Scoping Report can be found in Appendix 4.2 (Scoping Comments and Responses) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with Natural England throughout the pre-application and will continue to engage with Natural England post submission. Natural England has had the opportunity to comment on relevant draft application documents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) • fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) • OLEMP (Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) • Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) which includes summaries of the surveys undertaken and results • Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)).
		Mitigation	<p>We note that the River Itchen SSSI is within the Indicative Application Boundary and the PEIR confirms there will be no direct loss of habitat but acknowledges that there may be potential impacts during construction and operation. Natural England strongly recommends that the scheme is designed to avoid all direct and indirect impacts to designated sites. Where this is not possible, a robust mitigation strategy will need to be implemented.</p>	N	<p>The mitigation hierarchy has been embedded in the Scheme design, and where possible the Scheme has been designed to avoid impacts to designated areas. Where this has not been possible, robust mitigation has been provided and would be secured through the DCO process. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity and the water environment are</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>set in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts on the River Itchen SSSIs as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme. Following the inclusion of mitigation measures set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), potential impacts from construction activities would result in no change or negligible impacts to the River Itchen SSSI. No significant effects on SSSIs within the study area are predicted as a result of the Scheme's operation.</p> <p>Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides an assessment of the potential effects on water resources and concludes that no likely significant effects are expected from the Scheme. The Applicant has also considered the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (Document Reference 7.7), which concludes: <i>"The Scheme does not result in a significant change away from baseline conditions for the overall WFD water bodies, and, as demonstrated, will not result in deterioration of the current WFD potential of the River Itchen, Nun's Walk Stream and Itchen Navigation Canal surface water bodies."</i></p>
		Consultation	The preliminary summary of mitigation measures in section 8.8 and 'assessment of potential effects' in section 8.9 appear appropriate at this high level in the absence of detailed survey information. We will of course be pleased to provide input and guidance over the coming months once you are able to share the detailed survey results with Natural England.	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged with Natural England throughout the pre-application and will continue to engage with Natural England post submission. Natural England has had the opportunity to comment on relevant draft application documents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) • fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) • OLEMP (Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) • Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) which includes summaries of the surveys undertaken and results • Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)).

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Biodiversity	Natural England notes that the PEIR confirms that a Habitats Regulations Assessment will be reported alongside the Environmental Statement. Natural England would be pleased to advise on the details scope of the Appropriate Assessment in due course.	N	A Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) has been submitted as part of the DCO application. As detailed in the assessment, the Applicant has engaged with Natural England throughout the development of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) . Natural England has had the opportunity comment on the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) . The Applicant's responses to Natural England's comments on the Habitats Regulations Assessment Evidence Plan and the draft Habitats Regulations Assessment are provided within Appendix J of the Habitats Regulations Assessment report (Document Reference 7.5).
		Landscape and visual	<p>3. Protected Landscapes</p> <p>The proposed development is for a site within or close to a nationally designated landscape namely South Downs National Park. Natural England advises that the planning authority uses national and local policies, together with local landscape expertise and information to determine the proposal. We note the application boundary for the new preferred options requires more land from within the National Park to construct the new roads and links as well as provide additional land for delivering mitigation measures and for managing excess spoil. Given the above Natural England is concerned there will be negative impacts on the special qualities of the National Park in this area.</p>	Y	<p>The Scheme constitutes major development within the South Downs National Park. The landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) includes an assessment of effects from the Scheme on the landscape (both its character and features) of the South Downs National Park, and on visual amenity within the South Downs National Park and its setting. In so doing, the effects of the Scheme are assessed against the special qualities of the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Scheme design avoids introduction of tall bridge structures or elevated embankments and instead the Scheme is positioned within cutting with structures and associated headwalls set within the landform at as low an elevation as possible. Views of the Scheme from the designated landscape have been considered with the aim where possible to minimise any adverse effects.</p> <p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved since the 2021 statutory consultation to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant decided to remove all three deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. Furthermore, the Applicant reduced the impact of the central construction compound by reducing its footprint within the National Park and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area of the tree line.</p> <p>Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the special qualities of the South Downs National Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
		Legislation and policy	The PEIR does not make reference to the tests for “Major” development, the National Policy Statement for Networks states that “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in nationally designated areas” and development consent should be refused in these areas unless it can meet three tests that must be met to demonstrate exceptional circumstances, It also sets out that where consent is given in these areas, they must be delivered to high environmental standards and include measures to enhance the natural environment.	N	<p>As part of the DCO Application, the Applicant has submitted a National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2). The Accordance Tables provide an assessment of the Scheme conformity with the NPS NN and are set out as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 1: Scheme conformity with NPS NN Chapter 2 – The need for development of the national networks and Government’s policy. • Table 2: Scheme conformity with NPS NN Chapter 3 – Wider

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>Government policy on national networks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 3: Scheme conformity with NPS NN Chapter 4 – Assessment principles. Table 4: Scheme conformity with NPS NN Chapter 5 – Generic impacts. <p>Each relevant NPS NN paragraph is set out with commentary as to the extent of compliance by the Scheme with its terms. This includes NPS NN Paragraphs 5.150 to 5.153 that is referenced by Natural England.</p>
		Legislation and policy	<p>The scheme should also be guided by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 172 which gives the highest status of protection for the ‘landscape and scenic beauty’ of AONBs and National Parks. For major development proposals paragraph 172 sets out criteria to determine whether the development should exceptionally be permitted within the designated landscape. In particular, measures will need to be identified that minimise any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities within the National Park. In addition, in relation to NPPF paragraph 170 and 175 the scheme should seek wherever possible to avoid, minimise, or as a last resort compensate impacts on biodiversity, while seeking to ensure an overall biodiversity net gain.</p>	N	<p>Paragraphs 176 and 177 of the NPPF (previously paragraph 172) are consistent with the policy tests in the NPS NN in relation to development within National Parks. Section 7 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) considers in detail compliance of the Scheme with the NPS NN in relation to its development with the South Downs National Park. Section 8 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) considers in detail the compliance of the Scheme with NPS NN paragraph 5.20-5.36 in relation to biodiversity and ecological conservation.</p>
		Landscape and visual	<p>The statutory purposes of the National Park are to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the park; and to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the park by the public. You should assess the application carefully as to whether the proposed development would have a significant impact on or harm those statutory purposes. Relevant to this is the duty on public bodies to ‘have regard’ for those statutory purposes in carrying out their functions (section 11 A(2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended)). The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that this duty also applies to proposals outside the designated area but impacting on its natural beauty.</p> <p>Natural England acknowledges that the landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) has yet to be finalised and whilst the PEIR does include some potential options for landscape mitigation it does not include a clear landscape strategy. In our view the scheme could be much more ambitious in providing landscape enhancements in line</p>	N	<p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) includes an assessment of effects from the Scheme on the landscape (both its character and features) of the South Downs National Park, and on visual amenity and its setting. In so doing, the effects of the Scheme are assessed against the Special Qualities of the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The design principles for the Scheme are set out within the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9). This has aimed to balance the needs of the Scheme and its landscape context, whilst developing design proposals which respond positively to the environment and looks to respond to</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			with the NPPF and the National Planning Statement for Networks and would advise the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan looks to include some of the options from the joint package of mitigation measures which were agreed in conjunction South Downs National Park Authority, Defra Statutory Agencies and the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust.		recommendations made by the South Downs National Park Authority, Natural England and the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust. The landscape design is in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Technical Figures (Document Reference 6.2) .
		Landscape and visual	The proposals should also be by informed by the South Down National Park Authority's People and Nature Network which identifies priorities for green infrastructure investment in the Winchester and Itchen area.	N	The Applicant has engaged with South Downs National Park Authority and relevant local stakeholder groups throughout the pre-application process. Further details are set out in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) .
		Geology and soils	<p>4. Soil and Agricultural Land Quality</p> <p>Impacts from the development should be considered in light of the Government's policy for the protection of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land as set out in paragraph 170 of the NPPF. We also recommend that soils should be considered in the context of the sustainable use of land and the ecosystem services they provide as a natural resource, as also highlighted in paragraph 170 of the NPPF.</p>	N	<p>An assessment of the impact to Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land resulting from the Scheme, has been undertaken and reported within Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Consideration of impacts to the habitats and species dependent upon the role that soil, as an ecosystem service plays, is reported in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN) is the primary policy document against which the Scheme would be assessed. The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) provides an assessment of the Scheme against government policy, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>
		Air quality	<p>5. Air Quality</p> <p>Within Natural England's advice to the Planning Inspectorate at the Environmental Impact Assessment scoping stage and during recent correspondence with the Project Team on the HRA Evidence plan, Natural England requested that the air quality assessment considered the potential impacts to designated sites from traffic flow. The air quality assessment will also need to consider the in-combination impacts that may occur from other plans and projects, including allocations within Local Plans within the area of influence of the scheme.</p>	N	<p>The Air Quality assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) includes consideration of impacts on designated habitats within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN), as shown Figure 5.2 (Affected Road Network) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The traffic model used to inform the air quality assessment includes other plans and projects to the best of current knowledge, including allocations within Local Plans within the area of influence of the Scheme, developed through consultation with Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council.</p>
		Air quality	We note the PEIR references Air Pollution Information System (www.apis.ac.uk) for assessment of baseline air quality in section 5.4.5.	N	This comment is noted by the Applicant.
		Biodiversity	St Catherine's Hill Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), River Itchen SSSI /Special Area of Conservation (SAC), River Test SSSI, Cheesefoot Head SSSI, River Kennet SSSI, Highclere Park SSSI,	N	Operational effects on designated habitats (including St Catherine's Hill SSSI, River Itchen SSSI/SAC, River Test SSSI, Cheesefoot Head SSSI, Highclere Park SSSI and Burghclere Beacon SSSI)

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			Burghclere Beacon SSSI and Kennet & Lambourn Floodplain SSSI/SAC have been identified as the key designated habitats.		are assessed in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The River Kennett SSSI and Kennet & Lambourn Floodplain SSSI/SAC are now not included within the assessment because of the removal of the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Motorway Upgrade Project interface. These sites are no longer within 200m of the Affected Road Network so have been scoped out.
		Air quality	We also welcome the inclusion of an increase of 1000 AADT/200HDV as a screening threshold, when assessing impacts of increased traffic against the conservation objectives of a European designated site.	N	This is included within the assessment.
		Biodiversity	We recommend you refer to Natural England’s guidance on assessment of road traffic emissions under the Habitats Regulations	N	This is noted and has been considered in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) which forms part of the DCO Application.
		Road drainage and water environment	<p>6. Water Quality</p> <p>Construction impacts</p> <p>The proposals have the potential to impact on the River Itchen SAC and SSSI during the construction and operational phases.</p> <p>It is noted that the PEIR 2.4.54 envisages best practices will be implemented including limiting noise, vibration and dust levels where possible to minimise impacts to sensitive receptors. We advise that the scheme adheres to a ‘Code of Construction Practise’ (CoCP) which follows environmental best practice; includes specific measures for the SSSI and is informed by detailed surveys.</p> <p>Workers should be made aware of the SSSI/SAC and risks to the site and a copy of the CoCP to be available onsite. These details should be included in the Appropriate Assessment to ensure there is no adverse impact from the construction work on the adjacent designated sites.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents the findings of the assessment of the construction and operation of the Scheme on road drainage and the water environment. The assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies outlined within the requirements of DMRB LA 113 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (National Highways, 2020) and discussed with key stakeholders, including the Environment Agency and Hampshire County Council (as Lead Local Flood Authority).</p> <p>A range of measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to avoid and reduce effects on surface water and groundwater bodies. These include installation of systems to trap silty and polluted water, preparation of incident response plans in case of any accidental spillages, locating construction compounds outside areas at risk of flooding where possible. These measures are detailed further in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that there would be no significant effects to water environment receptors from the construction and operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Applicant has also considered the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (Document Reference 7.7), which concludes: “<i>The Scheme does not result in a significant change</i>”</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<i>away from baseline conditions for the overall WFD water bodies, and, as demonstrated, will not result in deterioration of the current WFD potential of the River Itchen, Nun's Walk Stream and Itchen Navigation Canal surface water bodies."</i>
		Road drainage and water environment	<p>Surface water drainage</p> <p>There are also potential impacts from surface water drainage arising from the proposed development may damage features of interest for which the River Itchen SAC and SSSI have been designated via poor water quality. Consideration should be given to the various pollutants that may be present in surface water arising from traffic.</p>	N	<p>The assessment of potential impacts from surface water drainage arising from the Scheme is included within Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Water Framework Directive Assessment (Document Reference 7.7). Both documents include consideration of National Highways' Water Risk Assessment Tool (HEWRAT). The HEWRAT has assessed copper, zinc, PAH, pyrene, fluoranthene, anthracene, phenanthrene, total suspended solids, HGV load spillage, microplastics and the suite of contaminants in HEWRAT v 2.04. The HEWRAT assessment confirm that there will be no adverse impact on surface water and groundwater quality as a result of the drainage strategy.</p>
		Road drainage and water environment	<p>The drainage assessment/strategy should consider the current condition of the site and nearby watercourses, assess the potential impacts upon the protected sites from water pollution and nutrient enrichment, and suggest mitigation measures where impacts are identified. A possible solution may be the incorporation of 'naturalised' sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) that aim to reduce the volume of run-off from the development site, slow the flow of run-off to greenfield rates, and include pollutant controls, prior to discharge into any watercourse.</p> <p>We would draw your attention to the latest best practice guidance in Ciria Manual C753 which under Section 26.7.1 step 3 outlines that the requirement for extra treatment should be considered in relation to discharge into environmentally protected sites.</p>	N	<p>The results of the HEWRAT assessment have informed the drainage strategy for the Scheme. Full details pertaining to surface water drainage are provided within Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The report explains how the proposed design uses pollution prevention methodologies and SuDS features in discharging water to ground primarily (where Hydrogeological Risk Assessments allow) and to existing watercourses.</p> <p>The strategy has been informed by standard industry guidance, including the Ciria Manual C753. All new drainage would convey run-off to a multi-stage treatment system including extended detention basins (EDBs), which would infiltrate to ground where possible. Detailed pollution mitigation measures have been consulted on with relevant statutory bodies, and include catchpits, pollution control devices (PCDs), sediment forebays, swales and an unsaturated zone over a geocell tank.</p> <p>In line with Natural England guidance Advice on Achieving Nutrient Neutrality for New Development in the Solent Region (Version 4, dated March 2020) paragraph 4.12 and Winchester City Council's Position Statement on Nitrate Neutral Development dated February 2020, the applicant considers that due to the absence of overnight stays associated with the Scheme, effects would not be significant</p> <p>Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides further information.</p>
		Road drainage and water environment	We note that figure 2.6 Stage 3B Preliminary Environmental Mitigation Design Plan in Appendix 2.1 includes proposed SuDS and	N	Consideration of poor water quality has been a key consideration, leading to the development of a drainage design which goes

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		water environment	attenuation features including two directly adjacent to the River Itchen SAC, it is advised that further consideration is given to potential impacts on the SAC via poor water quality. Further details and/or clarification should be provided on the specific measures incorporated to remove oils and other pollutants such as heavy metals prior to discharge into the watercourse. It may be deemed that additional measures should be incorporated in line with the precautionary principle when undertaking the Habitat Regulations Assessment. Further features that may be incorporated could include the provision of rainwater harvesting (to reduce run-off volume), oil interceptors and further opportunity for particulate settlement.		beyond industry standard. This drainage design is a key mitigation measure and has been taken into consideration in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) , the Water Framework Directive Assessment (Document Reference 7.7) and the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Biodiversity	7. Habitats of conservation importance Once the results of the detailed ecological studies are available to share with Natural England, we will be pleased to provide further advice in relation to habitats of conservation importance within our remit through our ongoing partnership approach.	N	The Applicant has engaged with Natural England throughout the pre-application and will continue to engage with Natural England post submission. The Applicant has provided Natural England the opportunity to comment on relevant draft application documents, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) • fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) • OLEMP (Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) • Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) which includes summaries of the surveys undertaken and results • Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)).
		Mitigation	Given the scale of the project, Natural England would expect significant mitigation measures to be implemented in order to maintain and enhance habitat connectivity for species and recreational routes for people.	Y	The Applicant is working to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been working collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revised the landscape strategy and Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) to respond to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it has evolved. These measures include the provision of habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>Habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Biodiversity	<p>8. Protected species and species of principal importance</p> <p>When the Project Team are able to share the results of the protected species surveys with Natural England and the more detailed impact assessment, we will be pleased to provide advice on the nature and scale of the mitigation and compensation measures that are likely to be required. We will of course be pleased to work with the Team to ensure that, wherever possible, Natural England are able to provide the Letters of No Impediment (LONIs) for protected species ahead of the Development Consent Order submission. Similarly, we would be pleased to provide advice on species of principal importance within our remit once the detailed information is available. We welcome the Project Team's early engagement with our protected species licensing team on these matters.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged with Natural England throughout the pre-application and will continue to engage with Natural England post submission. The Applicant has given Natural England the opportunity to comment on relevant draft application documents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) OLEMP (Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) which includes summaries of the surveys undertaken and results Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)).

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Climate	<p>9. Climate Change</p> <p>The PEIR proposes climate change mitigation options in terms of GHG emissions during the construction and operation which is welcomed. However the PEIR makes no reference to climate change being likely to affect habitats and species and does not consider opportunities for nature based solutions for climate change adaptation and mitigation. There is potential scope in the Scheme to contribute to landscape scale adaptations responses to climate change such as habitat creation to contribute to the Nature Recovery Network. We recommend referring to Natural England's Climate Change Adaptation Manual's Landscape Scale Climate Change Assessment Tool, so that any enhancements to the ecological network have climate change resilience at their core.</p>	N	<p>Design proposals reflect local design characteristics and use materials commonplace in the local area. New planting will be sourced from UK nurseries and locally available stock where reasonably practicable to help lessen the risk of introducing pests and disease. Indicative species compositions for the proposed landscape elements are provided in the Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). Species selection has been focused on provided species of local provenance and respond positively to the local character whilst providing a diverse mix to which supports resilience to climate change.</p> <p>Climate change effects on biodiversity and landscape have been considered, as well as in respect to in-combination climate change effects, which have been assessed within the relevant topic chapters of this ES. Section 14.17 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) outlines mitigation to climate change vulnerability, including the use of an appropriate planting strategy that considers climate change for the selection of species used, as well as Natural England's Climate Change Adaption Manual (NE751) (Natural England, 2021).</p>
		Consultation	<p>10. Environmental legacy</p> <p>As mentioned previously, Natural England is keen to work with the Project Team and other environmental and landscape bodies to ensure that this project realises the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan aspirations contributing to a significant environmental legacy.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has engaged with Natural England throughout the pre-application and will continue to engage with Natural England post submission.</p>
		Biodiversity	<p>The preliminary environmental mitigation and design plan provides high level detail. Natural England consider the M3 Junction 9 improvement scheme can be far more ambitious in the level of biodiversity net gain, ecological enhancement and green infrastructure measures incorporated into the scheme in order to help deliver in support of the 25 Year Environment Plan but also the biodiversity net gain requirement for NSIPs in the forthcoming Environment Bill. Natural England advises the ES should include a comprehensive landscape, biodiversity and access enhancement plan.</p>	Y	<p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision set out on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of areas of chalk grassland, species rich grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Appendix 8.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) assesses that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Scheme would provide a net increase of approximately 9.6 ha of chalk grassland, which is appropriate to the local area. The protection and enhancement of this habitat is a key theme within the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i> (adopted July 2019) and has been a key theme within consultation responses from stakeholders. However, the use of this habitat type suppresses the overall result of the biodiversity net gain metric, due to risk factors associated with this habitat type. For example, if 'other neutral grassland' was provided in place of chalk grassland then the overall biodiversity net gain score for the Scheme would change from +4.14% to +14.93%. This demonstrates that the Scheme can comfortably deliver over 10% biodiversity net gain. However, whilst a change from chalk grassland to other neutral grassland would be technically feasible, given the wider benefits, chalk grassland has been taken forward as being most appropriate habitat for the Scheme.</p>
		Biodiversity	The key objective of the landscape, access and biodiversity aspects of the scheme should be to ensure that the wider landscape affected by the proposals, the biodiversity it supports and the provision for public access are significantly enhanced by the development. Natural England recommends the scheme considers incorporation of further measures on both land within the applicants control and land outside the applicants control. We recommend inclusion of enhancement options from the joint package of mitigation measures which were agreed in conjunction South Downs National Park Authority, Defra Statutory Agencies and the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust.	Y	<p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>open skies and distant panoramic views focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p> <p>Habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity. Further details are presented in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and not affected by the proposals. This was in response to comments received from stakeholders including Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>Associated with the Scheme, but not taken into account as part of the assessment, is an application that has been made for designated funds that, if successful, will further increase the amount of chalk grassland and the enjoyment by the public of the area. National Highways Designated Funds are focused on making improvements that will make the biggest difference and deliver lasting benefits.</p>
		Mitigation	<p>Enhancements on land within the applicant's control and might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The creation and restoration of areas of priority habitats such as chalk grassland, native woodland, riparian habitat, etc. The aim should be to create attractive, biodiverse habitats with low maintenance requirements along the road corridor. ▪ Provision for enhancing ecological connectivity both along the motorway and habitats along the River Itchen including measures for the safe passage of otter, etc. ▪ Provision for enhancing ecological connectivity across the motorway. For example a green bridge to reconnect Twyford 	Y	<p>The Scheme aims to create new areas of chalk grassland on lower slopes of the South Downs National Park open downland slopes, and adjacent to new woodland and scrub areas on cutting and embankment slopes throughout the Application Boundary. The creation of chalk grassland would provide habitats for a range of species including priority species of invertebrates and birds. As discussed during consultation with Butterfly Conservation, the seed mix used would include dark mullein <i>Verbascum nigrum</i>, the larval foodplant of the striped lychnis moth.</p> <p>In addition to chalk grassland, new areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife. Much of the additional woodland</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>Down and St. Catherine's Hill would help to future proof the scheme allowing species to move.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Addition of living walls to bridges that are to be reconfigured. ▪ The creation of new public access opportunities that link up to the wider footpath network. ▪ The use of chalk embankments, sown with key butterfly food plants to provide biodiverse habitats and enhanced noise attenuation along access tracks. ▪ Habitat creation and enhancements for the Stripe Lychnis moth 		<p>and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for wildlife in a north-south direction. Proposed features are outlined in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Green bridges and living walls are not direct proposed in the Scheme with the aim of linking ecology corridors as there are no instances of new severance.</p> <p>In response to comments made during the 2021 statutory consultation the Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme. The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p>
		Mitigation	<p>Given the scale of the scheme we advise that further enhancements for landscape, biodiversity and access for wider areas of landscape affected by the proposals that are outside the applicants control are provided in order to address wider residual impacts of the scheme. Other measures might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Measures to enhance local landscape e.g. through the restoration of boundary features, removal of eyesores, appropriate tree planting, restoration of the setting of historic features, etc. ▪ Measures to permanently remove landscape features that are out of character such as conifer plantations. ▪ Measures to improve ecological connectivity. ▪ Establishment of new areas of BAP priority habitat, including chalk grassland, farm ponds and broad leaved native woodland. Excess spoil management gives an opportunity to ▪ Provision for the enhancement of existing wildlife sites. ▪ Measures for conserving and enhancing BAP priority species. ▪ Measures for enhancing access opportunities, particularly 	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has developed its mitigation proposals through engagement with stakeholders to ensure appropriate landscapes and biodiversity mitigation is proposed.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1)) providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision set out on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to exiting habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of areas of chalk grassland, species rich grassland, woodland and scrub along the</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>away from the noise and visual intrusion of the M3.</p>		<p>eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Appendix 8.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) assesses that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity. The Scheme would provide a net increase of approximately 9.6 ha of chalk grassland, which is appropriate to the local area. The protection and enhancement of this habitat is a key theme within the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i> (adopted July 2019) and has been a key theme within consultation responses from stakeholders.</p> <p>Connectivity for wildlife is discussed throughout Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1), and the overall landscape design has been developed to improve connectivity for wildlife. Therefore, green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant decided to remove all three deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme. The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Mitigation	The measures identified in the enhancement plan should be used to calculate a reasonable level of offset funding needed to meet the wider objectives of the plan and achieve full moderations of the adverse impacts of the scheme.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. Landscaping design and mitigation is outlined in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Landscape and visual	As will be expected of a scheme of this scale, post-construction monitoring, with reporting and defined performance against targets linked to baseline studies will be essential. This will need to be complemented by detailed management arrangements for any landscape and biodiversity mitigation features to secure their success in the long-term.	N	Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) details a series of objectives, targets and prescriptions for each of the proposed soft landscape elements to ensure their successful establishment. An outline monitoring programme is identified which acknowledges the results of which feed back into defined management regimes throughout the life of the project. An outline management plan for the establishment period is also provided and commitment to undertake further work as part of the subsequent LEMP to provide further detail for the establishment phase and the period beyond (25 years).
		Consultation	Natural England would welcome the opportunity to comment on the landscape, biodiversity and access enhancement plan and agree the funding arrangements in due course.	N	The Applicant continues to engage with Natural England on the proposals of the Scheme during the pre-application process.

K.1K: National Rail

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Assets	Whilst the plans show the changes around the A34, A33 and M3 intersection areas, the works area overall extends to the railway bridge crossing over the A34 at grid reference: SU4828632983. We would be interested in further information about the immediate works planned around the bridge and the embankment supporting the railway at this location.	Y	Following refinements to the Application Boundary after the 2021 statutory consultation, the Scheme will no longer affect the rail network. The Applicant sent a letter to Network Rail informing them of the Application Boundary changes in December 2021.
		Assets	In addition, the works at this location may require an Asset Protection Agreement to be entered to protect the safe operation of the railway and its assets.	Y	Following refinements to the Application Boundary after the 2021 consultation, the Scheme will no longer affect the rail network. The Applicant sent a letter to Network Rail informing them of the Application Boundary changes in December 2021.

K.1.L: Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Principle of development	As was stated during your webinars, Junction 9 can at times bring safety concerns and we therefore welcome the improvements which will also aim to reduce congestion and journey times through this part of the network.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Transport and travel	The improvements are located some distance from our existing sites, in particular the Royal Hampshire County Hospital (RHCH) in Winchester and once operational, are not expected to have a material impact on staff/patient travel to the hospital.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	The potential benefits with regards to walking and cycling improvements included within this scheme are also welcomed. These will improve transport and travel mode choice for those Trust staff and patients living in proximity to Junction 9.	Y	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has developed its walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions further. The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Construction - general	Whilst it is noted that for the Junction 9 improvements, the current phasing of works is not yet known, we understand that during construction of the proposed works, there is a risk that congestion may be increased on local roads which could impact staff/patient travel as well as operational vehicle movements (including blue light movements). We ask that the Trust be kept informed of the anticipated construction sequencing and predicted impacts ensure travel to our sites is not significantly impacted.	N	<p>The indicative phasing of the construction of the Scheme is outlined in Section 3.2 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan (TMP) (Document Reference 7.8). One of the key objectives of the TMP is to maintain adequate access for the emergency services.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that the Emergency Services constitute as key customers and stakeholders. All key stakeholders will be notified of the Traffic Management. Regular advanced stakeholder liaison and consultation will be undertaken by the Applicant with local emergency services to minimise negative impact on services such as response time. The Scheme will maintain access and egress for emergency services at all times.</p>
		In-combination and cumulative	We would also like to bring to your attention the government Health Infrastructure Plan (HIP) which, in September 2019, announced new funding for the NHS. As part of this scheme, Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (HHFT) is receiving seed funding to support the development of one of the 40 listed hospital building projects	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		effects	across the country with a possible construction start date in 2025.		
		In-combination and cumulative effects	The Hampshire Together: Modernising our Hospitals and Health Services (MoHHS) programme has undertaken a comprehensive site selection process to identify potential location options to build a new hospital for the population of North and Mid Hampshire. The programme is due to go to Public Consultation later in the year and included as part of that process is more detail for the public regarding the 2 site options that the MoHHS programme is currently considering. One of these sites is located near to J7 of the M3.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. A cumulative effects assessment has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring and the PINS Advice Note 17 'Cumulative Effects Assessment' and is presented within Chapter 15 (Cumulative Effects) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The cumulative effects assessment considered the effects of the Scheme in conjunction with other developments in line with guidance.
		In-combination and cumulative effects	If following our public consultation process, and further due diligence work, the J7 site is brought forward, a key consideration for HHFT and the MoHHS programme will be regarding the expected impacts during construction of both of these large-scale infrastructure programmes. Please be assured that Highways England will be consulted separately about any future plans to develop adjacent to the strategic highway network.	N	This is noted by the Applicant.

K.1.M: Southern Water

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Utilities	<p>Express some concern about the proposed improvement works (which is great for traffic flow improvement) that will affect our water mains infrastructure.</p> <p>I believe you may have interacted with our developer services team in the past about diverting some water mains that are within the proposed works.</p> <p>As it has been a few years now, we would need to reassess the routes of the main(s) to be diverted based on your latest layout.</p> <p>If you haven't applied for an S185 recently (for water mains diversion application) then it is recommended to do so.</p>	N	<p>Engagement has been undertaken with Southern Water and the Applicant during the preparation of this DCO application.</p> <p>Southern Water is in the process of designing the trunk main diversion proposals following a meeting and site walkover with the Design Team. The Applicant has received Southern Water's budget diversion estimate. Engagement with Southern Water is ongoing relating to this matter.</p>

K.1.N: Hampshire Constabulary

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	In addition to the creation of an improved traffic junction between the M3 and the A34, the proposed plans show a number of new footpaths / cycle ways together with the associated infrastructure. This new connectivity has been designed to increase access to the countryside for walkers and cyclists.	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has amended the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme. The following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>The proposed footpaths have little natural surveillance. Those using these isolated footpaths and cycle ways will be very vulnerable to crime, to reduce their vulnerability to crime I recommend the following, (these recommendations accord with policy CP 13 of the Winchester District Local Plan – Part 1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cycle enabled crime is a threat to those using these routes, two new footways are shown. To reduce the opportunities for cycle enabled crime appropriate barriers should be put in place to prevent cycles, etc. accessing the pedestrian routes. These routes should be as straight as possible, where turnings are unavoidable the area about the turning point should be cleared so as to provide for natural surveillance of the next section of the route Planting along these routes should be such that it does not obscure natural surveillance along the route The footpaths and cycle ways should be wide enough to accommodate both modes of transport without one interfering with other, at least 3m of metaled surface. Isolated structures, such as subways can become crime hotspots. To reduce the opportunities for crime and disorder, some consideration should be given to alternative methods of crossing the carriageways. Any subways through which these routes pass must be wide, well lit, lighting should extend as short distance beyond the subway, open at each end, there should be no places to hide. The construction of features such as retaining walls etc. should be such that they do not provided a feature which might cause people to gather and or loiter The design should minimise the opportunities for graffiti. Any exposed concrete (or similar construction material) should be 	Y	<p>The Applicant provides the following response to the recommendations made by Hampshire Constabulary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cycle routes proposed as part of the Scheme are shared routes with pedestrians. The comment relating to the alignment of cycle routes is noted and can be applied by the Applicant during detailed design of the Scheme. The comment relating to the planting along PRow is noted by the Applicant. The landscaping design will be refined during detailed design. The shared use paths are 3m in width. In the early stages of preliminary design, a non-motorised user optioneering exercise was carried out across by the Applicant to look at the buildability and routing feasibility against the existing site constraints, for example environmental SSSIs and the flood plains. The outcome of this exercise clearly defined the optimum route as illustrated within the consultation, which shows the use of subways. Each subway is 4.0m overall width and will be lit internally. Due regard has been given to South Downs National Park Authority's <i>Dark Skies Technical Advice Note (updated May 2021)</i> when preparing the operational lighting design that has been limited to the illumination of underpasses only. The Applicant notes the comment about retaining features. These elements will be looked at in more detailed during the detailed design phase of the Scheme. The Applicant notes the comment about opportunities for graffiti. This will be looked at in more detailed during the detailed design phase of the Scheme. <p>Please refer to Figure 2.4 (Existing and New Walking, Cycling</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			covered with an anti-graffiti coating so as to facilitate the removal of graffiti.		and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for more information on the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding routes.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>The improvements do offer other opportunities for crime and disorder, the following should also be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appropriate barriers should be put in place to prevent pedestrians attempting to cross the carriageways carrying fast moving traffic ▪ Appropriate barriers should be put in place to prevent persons gaining access to the areas above the vehicle tunnels, so as to prevent items being dropped onto the carriageway 	N	<p>The Applicant provides the following response to the recommendations made by Hampshire Constabulary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Boundary treatments have been applied across the Scheme to prevent wayward pedestrians from crossing other lanes of traffic. ▪ The comment about access to vehicle tunnels is noted by the Applicant and by the structure design during the detail design stage of the Scheme.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>The only comment we have to make regarding this stage of the plans relates to the proposal for pedestrian / cyclist subways, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The subways should be designed as segregated use, for the safety of all users. ▪ Security measures such as CCTV should be installed. We are concerned that the facility should be made as safe as possible. If pedestrians / cyclists do not feel safe using a facility, they will seek out an alternative route; this could lead to them becoming vulnerable to road traffic injury. 	N	<p>The Applicant provides the following response to the recommendations made by Hampshire Constabulary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The subways are proposed to be shared use, the same as overall footway/cycle route from Kings Worthy to Winnall. By segregating at these locations, this would cause more confusion and would be harder to manage in terms of conformity by the public. ▪ The comment about CCTV is noted by the Applicant. Discussion on the future ownership of proposed non-motorised routes is ongoing with Hampshire County Council.

K.1.O: SGN

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Utilities	There are low and medium gas pressure mains within and in the vicinity of the Order boundary. Two sections of the medium pressure gas mains have the benefit of a deed of easement dated 20 October 1971 (HP4231260) and 10 May 1972 (HP14509).	N	The Applicant notes this comment and the information provided by SGN.
		Utilities	<p>There are also two gas governors in close proximity to the Order boundary which are crucial to ensure the gas flows through network at the appropriate pressure.</p> <p>SGN is concerned that works related to the proposed Order may adversely affect the apparatus outlined above. Therefore, it is expected that all reasonable measures are taken to ensure the apparatus is properly protected prior to the implementation of any works associated with the Order at the sole cost of Highways England. Such measures may include, but are not restricted to, entering into Protective Provisions and the relocating of apparatus.</p>	N	<p>The Scheme proposals have been issued and reviewed by an SGN Diversions Team Manager who has provided diversion cost estimates for any apparatus that is affected by the Scheme works. The medium pressure gas mains and gas governors mentioned within SGN's letter dated 16 June 2021 are unaffected.</p> <p>The Applicant understands via the NRSWA C3/C4 process that diversion of some existing low-pressure mains is required. Engagement with SGN is ongoing.</p>

K.1.P: Lumen Technologies

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Utilities	Lumen Technologies do not have any apparatus within the indicated works area.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

K.1.Q: Winchester City Council

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Principle of development	The application site includes land within the South Downs National Park. The National Park Authority are responding to this consultation separately. However, it remains the intention of WCC to work toward and hold Highways England to the highest standards given the potential impact of the scheme on the National Park and its setting.	N	The Applicant has been engaging with the South Downs National Park Authority during the pre-application process. Further details about this engagement are provided in the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) .
		Principle of development	The adopted Winchester Movement Strategy supports the delivery of junction improvement works.	N	The Applicant notes this comment
		Climate	WCC declared a climate emergency in June 2019. The council is committed to becoming a carbon neutral council by 2024 and is aiming for the wider district to be carbon neutral by 2030. The declaration is a common thread through all council decisions and actions, including how we consider and respond to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects. Highways England must take this declaration into account throughout development of the scheme and must be able to demonstrate how the scheme being developed is consistent with the objectives of making this declaration. The declaration and climate impact is discussed in further detail in this report. It is however important to stress this is an interrelated issue and the City Council expect climate impact to be a key consideration throughout.	Y	<p>The Climate Emergency, declared by Winchester City Council, is acknowledged in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Applicant has provided improved walking, cycling and horse-riding provision within the Application Boundary and this has been improved further following the 2021 statutory consultation and review of feedback.</p> <p>Landscape mitigation planting mixes would be selected to ensure resilience to potential climate change effects. Indicative species included within Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) includes a diverse mix including species with specific tolerance to drought and waterlogging, which may be a more common occurrence within the Application Boundary.</p> <p>The Applicant has applied and considered the ten design principles of Highways England’s “The Road to Good Design” document during the design development. This includes the design principle that “Good Road Design is Sustainable”. National Highways’ carbon reduction hierarchy has been applied to the scheme and aims to mitigate emissions by avoiding or preventing, reducing and remediating greenhouse gas emissions. Examples of the steps taken include (but are not limited to) measures to achieve a cut/fill balance, reducing the embodied carbon associated with the production of materials, retaining pavements where possible to reduce the requirement for new or additional materials, reusing excavated materials within the works where possible, construction compounds located close to the area of works to reduce the distance of vehicle trips, using sustainably sourced, recycled and secondary materials, using fuel efficient and electric vehicles during construction, and managing and maintaining plant and equipment to ensure optimal operation and avoidance of unnecessary idling.</p> <p>The drainage design has considered climate change predictions and the second iteration Environmental Management Plan will include mitigation measures for transport, materials, waste and air quality which will help reduce emissions during construction. A Site Waste Management Plan will be implemented to manage waste during</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					construction which will help reduce emissions associated with waste management.
		Air quality	<p>During the construction phase, air quality impacts are one of the main concerns given the need for the diversion of traffic to other routes to allow construction of the scheme.</p> <p>It is appreciated that official diversion routes would be implemented and agreed with the Highways Authority. However, there are historic issues of these routes not being followed particularly by commercial vehicles which have a higher level of impact.</p> <p>Future assessments therefore need to be confident that official diversion routes are possible and actually followed by diverted traffic in reality. Once this confidence is achieved, an assessment of these routes must be undertaken from an air quality perspective to ensure that the impact is accurate. The acknowledgement this issue must be considered in the Environmental Statement (in paragraph 2.5.1 of the PEIR) is welcomed and the City Council will comment on this aspect at this stage.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) assesses the potential air quality impacts of the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>A first iteration Environmental Management Plan (Document Reference 7.3) and an Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) are submitted with the DCO application and provide details of how the environmental effects and traffic movements would be managed during construction.</p> <p>The fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) includes a number of commitments in relation to air quality including undertaking on-site and off-site inspections where receptors are nearby to monitor dust and record results.</p>
		Air quality, Noise	Construction phase assessments must ensure they include impacts (particulate/dust and noise) relating to all depot and soil disposal locations once these have been finalised.	Y	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers potential impacts associated with the construction of the Scheme. In accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 Air Quality standard, the construction dust assessment study area includes a 200m buffer area around anticipated construction works including haul routes, compound areas and soil storage areas.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation and a result of further design development, all three soil deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>
		Air quality	The use of habitat protection measures (to mitigate dust generation and dispersion) is welcomed given the proximity to designated sites and the City Council will comment on the further detail set out in the Environmental Statement at that stage.	N	Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) outlines the design, mitigation and enhancement measures applied to the Scheme. These include dust suppression measures.
		Air quality	It is important that on-going monitoring of mitigation measures takes place and the City Council would wish to see a review process throughout the construction phase to allow mitigation to be modified if necessary.	N	A first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (Document Reference 7.3) has been produced for the Application. It has been produced at an appropriate and proportionate level of detail for the design stage. The fiEMP will be developed into the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (siEMP), a more detailed EMP by the Principal Contractor once the Scheme detailed design has been finalised, subject to the DCO being granted and will be submitted to the Secretary of State (SoS) to discharge

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					Requirement 3 within the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1) . The siEMP will be used on site to manage environmental measures and commitments. If necessary, monitoring parameters and a programme would be established to monitor air quality.
		Air quality	In its operational phase, the assessment shows the greatest traffic increase will be on Easton Lane (>25%). Reviewing the submitted maps (Appendix 2.1, Figure 2.5 of PEIR), this increase is actually spread across Easton Lane, Wales Street and North Walls. There are also sensitive receptors on the latter roads as the amount of residential uses increase. This must be clarified for the Environmental Statement assessments, which must pay detailed attention to the impacts of this particular area and how this relates to the Winchester Air Quality Action Plan.	Y	Easton Lane has been considered in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The operational traffic flows, including through Winchester City centre have been assessed through traffic modelling and reported in Chapter 5 in accordance with DMRB LA 105, (National Highways, 2019). Further receptors have been added to the assessment to clarify impacts in the areas identified by Winchester City Council, see Figure 5.5 (Human Receptors and 2027 Do-Something NO₂ annual average concentration) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) .
		Air quality	The full response of the City Council's Environmental Health Practitioner is provided in Appendix A. Appendix A Overall I have no major objections to the indicated direction of travel of the assessment detailed within the PIER in terms of air quality or noise. However I do "reserve the right" to make more detailed comment when the full information is available within the subsequent Environmental Statement. Below are a few comments that you may choose to include in any overall feedback at this stage:	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Air quality	Construction Phase The main concern is the noise and air quality impacts that could occur to the wider local population from diversions necessary during the construction phase. There have been issues with noise impacts during current diversions regarding works on the A34, particularly relating to commercial vehicles not following official diversion routes. Potential additional hard closures to facilitate a better uptake of official diversion routes may need to be considered and discussed with the Hampshire County Council. Only once we can have confidence that the official diversion will, as far is reasonably practicable, be followed can an assessment of these impacts then be considered acceptable.	N	Figure 2.5 (Temporary Traffic Diversion Routes) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) , and Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provide further information of the temporary traffic diversions anticipated during the construction period. These diversions have been assessed in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . A first iteration Environmental Management Plan (Document Reference 7.3) and an Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) are submitted with the DCO application and provide details of how the environmental effects and traffic movements would be managed during construction.
		Air quality	Construction phase assessments should ensure they include impacts (particulate/dust and noise) relating to all Depot and Soil Disposal locations once these have been finalised.	Y	The Applicant notes this comment and this has been reflected in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Through further design since the 2021 statutory consultation, all three soil deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme design. In accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>105 Air Quality standard, the construction dust assessment study area includes a 200m buffer area around anticipated construction works including haul routes, compound areas and soil storage areas. The assessment of construction phase traffic emissions is focused on areas that have potential to exceed limit values at locations in close proximity to roads that are predicted to experience changes in traffic flows above the LA 105 criteria.</p> <p>The construction noise study area extends 300m in all directions from the land within the Application Boundary.</p>
		Air quality	Depending upon the proposed start date, reference should be made to potential cumulative construction phase impacts that could occur if this development overlapped with the M3 Smart motorway (junction 9 to 14) works.	N	<p>As outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), the all lane running (ALR) scheme is formally paused following the ministerial statement on 12 January 2022. However, National Highways is planning to upgrade the existing central reservation barrier to concrete, to deliver safety benefits. This scheme is known as the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Safety Barrier Improvement Scheme.</p> <p>Given the central reservation work from the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Safety Barrier Improvement Scheme is due to take place prior to the construction of the Scheme, it has been considered as part of the future baseline. This, and other developments which would be operable prior to the commencement of the Scheme's construction, are also considered as part of the future baseline within Chapters 5 – 14 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
		Noise and vibration	<p>Use Phase</p> <p>The current assessment shows the greatest traffic increases, away from the strategic road network, will be on Easton Lane (greater than 25 percent). Although looking at the supporting maps it is suggested this is actually Easton Lane, Wales St and North Walls. It is requested this is clarified going forwards, as there are more sensitive (i.e. domestic) receptors on Wales St than on Easton Lane itself (which is mainly fronted by commercial premises). It is requested that the full Environmental Statement pays specific detailed attention to impacts in this particular area. In particular noise impacts should not just be dismissed if they are less than 3dB based on an LA10 18 hour impact as this can potentially "average out" issues.</p>	N	Operational noise changes are outlined in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . It is found that the majority of dwellings anticipated to experience a noise increase are as an indirect result of the Scheme due to an increase in traffic flow are located along Easton Lane / Wales Street.
		Cultural heritage	It is noted that Appendix 6.1 of PEIR will be used as the key baseline document to support the Cultural Heritage Chapter of the Environmental Statement that will be submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) submission. The information contained in this baseline is considered to adequately cover all relevant designated heritage assets.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Cultural heritage	It is anticipated that the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings will be considered in the Environmental Statement and supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The need for any mitigation above that proposed in the Environmental Mitigation Design Plan to protect heritage assets and their settings would be informed by the forthcoming information.	N	Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) has been prepared and reflects the views of the relevant stakeholders including Winchester City Council. The aim of the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy is to avoid or limit harm and mitigate impacts on above ground heritage assets and known and unknown buried archaeological remains (in line with the National Policy Statements for National Networks (NPS NN, 2014) and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021).
		Cultural heritage	Regarding Archaeology, the assessment methodologies and data sources used are appropriate and adhere to accepted sector methodologies, standard and guidance. The assessment assumptions and limitations (section 2.3, Appendix 6.1), are not considered to have compromised the reliability of the assessment nor the conclusions set out in the PEIR.	N	This comment is noted by the Applicant.
		Cultural heritage	Overall Chapter 6 of the PEIR chapter and the associated appendices are considered to form an appropriate basis for the Cultural Heritage chapter in the forthcoming Environmental Statement, subject to the identified additional assessment requested in the Archaeologist's response being carried out to inform this.	N	Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) is submitted as part of the DCO Application.
		Construction – deposition areas	It is recommended that access to the northern area of search for potential spoil management is pursued (the area has not yet been subject to geophysical survey). Cropmarks within this area suggest a higher archaeological potential than nearby areas already subject to geophysical survey and trial trenching and the results may be useful in determining which areas are taken forward. Informal discussions with the archaeological consultant indicates that access to this area is being pursued.	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, all of the areas previously identified as areas for spare soil have been removed from the Scheme and the Application Boundary has been revised.
		Cultural heritage	Identification and assessment of any important hedgerows as defined in the Historic Hedgerows should also be undertaken as part of the EIA and reported in the ES. It is also suggested that historic Ordnance Survey mapping described in section 4.2 of PEIR Appendix 6.1 should be included within the ES baseline report.	N	An assessment of important hedgerows and historic Ordnance Survey mapping is provided in Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . Figure 6.12 (Important Hedgerows) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) shows important hedgerows within the Application Boundary. The important hedgerows identified are not designated but do constitute non-designated heritage assets as they preserve part of the historic landscape. They are considered to be of medium value. An assessment of the likely impacts and effects upon these is provided in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Cultural heritage	The preservation of listed buildings and their setting (S.66 P (LBCA) Act 1990; Strategic Policy SD12 and Policy SD13 of the South Downs Local Plan (2014-33); Policies CP19 & CP20 Winchester	N	The Applicant notes this comment and has considered these legislative and policy framework documents during design

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			District Joint Core Strategy; NPPF Section 16 The preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of conservation areas (S.72 P(LBCA) Act 1990; Policies DM27 & DM28 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 Adopted 2017; Policy CP19 & CP20 Winchester District Joint Core Strategy; NPPF Section 16).		development.
		Cultural heritage	It is noted that Appendix 6.1 of PEIR will be used as the key baseline document to support the Cultural Heritage Chapter of the Environmental Statement that will be submitted as part of the DCO submission. The information contained in this baseline is considered to adequately cover all relevant designated heritage assets. It is anticipated that the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings will be considered in the Environmental Statement and supported by an LVIA. The need for any mitigation above that proposed in the Environmental Mitigation Design Plan to protect heritage assets and their settings would be informed by the forthcoming information.	N	Please refer to Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) has been prepared and reflects the views of the relevant stakeholders including Winchester City Council. The aim of the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy is to avoid or limit harm and mitigate impacts on above ground heritage assets and known and unknown buried archaeological remains (in line with the National Policy Statements for National Networks (NPS NN, 2014) and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021).
		Cultural heritage	The preservation, conservation, investigation and recording of archaeological interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN) (2014): Historic Environment, para. 5.120 – 5.142; ▪ Ancient Monuments and Areas Act 1979; ▪ Hedgerow Regulations 997 (amended 2003); ▪ National Planning Policy Framework: Section 16; ▪ National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (2019): “Historic Environment” ▪ Policy DM26 Winchester District Local Plan Part 2; Policy CP20 Winchester District Joint Core Strategy; ▪ South Downs Local Plan Policy SD16: Archaeology 	N	The Applicant notes this comment and has considered these legislative and policy framework documents during design development.
		Cultural heritage	Chapter 6 of the PEIR report, the Non-Technical Summary and associated appendices (6.1 – Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline; 6.2 – Geophysical Survey Report; 6.3 – Archaeological Evaluation Report; 6.4 – Geophysical Survey Report), deal with Cultural Heritage (including archaeology) in relation to the proposed scheme. This response has also been compiled cognisant of the results of more recent geophysical survey and trial trenching which have yet to be formally reported / were available for the PEIR.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and the geophysical survey and trial trenching results are reflected in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the accompanying appendices (6.2 to 6.6) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . These have been used to inform the assessment.
		Cultural	Appendix 6.1 of the PEIR comprises a baseline study which outlines current knowledge and understanding of the archaeological potential	N	The study area comprises 1km around the Application Boundary for designated cultural heritage assets and a 300m study area around

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		heritage	(including data from new archaeological surveys and investigations), within a study area around the proposed scheme's red line boundary and identifies their significance and setting. The extent of the study area (300m for non-designated assets and 1km for designated assets), was previously agreed with Stantec, Highways England's archaeological consultant.		the Application Boundary for non-designated cultural heritage assets. Study areas are presented in Figure 6.1 (Site Location and Geology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
		Cultural heritage	The assessment methodologies and data sources utilised for this PEIR are appropriate and adhere to accepted sector methodologies and standards and guidance. The assessment assumptions and limitations (section 2.3, Appendix 6.1), are not considered to have compromised the reliability of the assessment nor the conclusions set out in the PEIR.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Cultural heritage	Section 4 of Appendix 6.1 provides a detailed and comprehensive description of the archaeological and historical baseline within the study area, both designated and non-designated assets, known and currently unknown. Previous impacts within the scheme area have been assessed and information from previous and new ground investigation works have been included.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Cultural heritage	Section 5 of Appendix 6.1 comprises a Statement of Significance for heritage assets within the proposed scheme boundary and ZTC (section 5.3 covers archaeology). The significance and setting of both designated and non-designated assets (known and potential assets) and historic landscapes has been clearly identified and described.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Cultural heritage	Chapter 6 of the PEIR report summaries the archaeological baseline (6.6), previous archaeological investigations, data sources, assessment methodologies and assessment criteria (6.4). Assessment limitations and assumptions are outlined (6.5) together with relevant legislative and policy framework (6.2). Previous and proposed consultations and responses to the Scoping Opinion are provided in section 6.3 of this report. Table 6-5 provides a summary of Receptor Sensitivity which is agreed.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Cultural heritage	Section 6.7 provides a summary of design, mitigation and enhancement measures for the proposed scheme, which are considered appropriate. In addition to the measures set out herein, discussions undertaken to date have identified areas within the scheme area where further trial trenching could be undertaken as part of a staged mitigation programme following the granting of any Development Consent Order. Alternatively, these areas may be subject to strip-map-sample mitigation.	Y	A geophysical survey in Appendix 6.5 (Geophysical Survey Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) and a trial trench evaluation in Appendix 6.6 (Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) were carried out as part of this assessment on suitable areas not covered during previous work. These have been used to formulate an Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy in consultation with the Winchester City Council Archaeologist in Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) .

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Cultural heritage	As outlined in para. 6.7.3, the proposed mitigation measures will result in knowledge gain and a better understanding of the historic environment within the scheme area, in addition to delivering public benefits (knowledge and awareness).	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Cultural heritage	As is specifically noted, the ability to record archaeological remains is not a factor in decision making as to whether loss of remains should be permitted.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Cultural heritage	Further to the mitigation proposals contained in this PEIR, ongoing discussions will be held to formulate an Outline Mitigation Strategy which will form part of the forthcoming ES.	N	An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy in Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) has been prepared and reflects the views of the relevant stakeholders including Winchester City Council. This is submitted with the DCO Application.
		Cultural heritage	Table 6-1 confirms that community outreach and enhancement through the use of public art / exhibitions (including the use of digital technology to engage with areas such as ecology and heritage), will be considered during the design phase of this OMS, further to previous stakeholder discussions. The Preliminary Environmental Mitigation Design Plan (PEIR Appendix 2.1 General Figures, Fig. 2.6) includes areas where public art installations could potentially be installed.	N	Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) has been prepared and reflects the views of the relevant stakeholders including Winchester City Council and includes reference to a holistic landscape approach, opportunities to examine archive material from previous investigations and community outreach. Reference is also made to these commitments in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
		Cultural heritage	Potential effects arising from scheme impacts (both direct and indirect) are detailed in Sections 6.8 of the PEIR, both from the construction and operation phases. Para. 6.8.3 & 6.8.4 outline the identified potential impacts and these are agreed.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Cultural heritage	<p>Para. 6.8.6 details potential impacts to two Scheduled Monuments within the ZTV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Temporary effects may occur to the Magdalen Hill round barrow cemetery (NHLE: 106746), if the southern area is chosen for spoil management (PEIR Appendix 2.1 General Figures, Fig 2.3 Indicative Land Use Plan). However this would form a temporary effect and would not result in any residual effects following reinstatement of the area. Further assessment of this area will be undertaken, however the acceptability of this area for spoil management will require careful consideration and liaison with Historic England. ▪ St Gertrude's Chapel (NHLE: 1005518) may experience some adverse effects arising from increased noise; further assessment work is to be undertaken with regard to this. The PEIR also indicates that there could be some visual impacts arising from the construction phase and although this would be temporary further assessment will be undertaken. Again, the views of Historic England will be important with regard to 	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the deposition areas have been removed from the Application Boundary.</p> <p>St Gertrude's Chapel (NHLE: 1001025) is largely screened from land within the Application Boundary. The trees along the western edge of the A34 which screen views of the carriageway, a small part of water meadow which is within the Application Boundary and higher ground beyond the A34 (which is within the Application Boundary) are visible from the scheduled monument. The noise impact on the site of St Gertrude's Chapel is assessed in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the effects upon the scheduled monument considered within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) in the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			these potential temporary and permanent effects.		
		Cultural heritage	The PEIR report indicates that it has not yet been possible to assess in detail potential scheme impacts to the setting of a third Scheduled Monument (NHLE: 1001825). Further assessment is to be undertaken as part of the EIA and will form part of the forthcoming ES.	Y	Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) notes that the late Iron Age settlement site (NHLE:1001825) has a high sensitivity because it is a scheduled monument. The Iron Age settlement is 40m from the Application Boundary, however, the closest construction works proposed are the installation of new variable message signs (VMS) along the M3 approximately 1km to the south. The main works area is approximately 1.5km to the south of the scheduled monument. Given the long distance from these works it is unlikely that construction activities would be perceptible either visually or audibly from the scheduled monument.
		Cultural heritage	The conclusions set out in para. 6.8.9 of the PEIR with regard to the assessed impacts and effects upon buried heritage assets within the scheme area and Table 6-6 – Potential effects before mitigation upon known archaeological remains, are concurred with.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Cultural heritage	<p>Para. 6.1.2 of the PEIR report indicates that the current baseline document (Appendix 6.1) is an evolving document which will be updated for the ES with the results of additional archaeological surveys and trial trenching undertaken as part of the EIA process and following further consultations and assessment work undertaken in relation to the final scheme.</p> <p>Section 6.9 of the PEIR report details further work anticipated to be undertaken as part of the ongoing EIA and forthcoming ES. Proposed further assessment work and consultation is also set out in Table 6-1 and within para's. 6.33 to 6.3.8 and Section 6.8 of the PEIR. These are agreed.</p>	N	Please refer to Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Cultural heritage	Overall Chapter 6 of the PEIR chapter and the associated appendices are considered to form an appropriate basis for the Cultural Heritage chapter in the forthcoming ES, subject to the identified additional assessment and the matters set out below being carried out to inform this.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. See comments above.
		Cultural heritage	It is recommended that access to the northern area of search for potential spoil management is pursued (the area has not yet subject to geophysical survey). Cropmarks within this area suggest a higher archaeological potential than nearby areas already subject to geophysical survey and trial trenching and the results may be useful in determining which areas are taken forward. Informal discussions with the archaeological consultant indicates that access to this area is being pursued.	Y	Following statutory consultation in 2021, the deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme and therefore this area does not need to be considered.
		Cultural heritage	Identification and assessment of any important hedgerows as defined in the Historic Hedgerows should also be undertaken as part	N	An assessment of important hedgerows and historic Ordnance Survey mapping is provided in Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			of the EIA and reported in the ES.		Heritage Baseline) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). Figure 6.12 (Important Hedgerows) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) shows important hedgerows within the Application Boundary. The important hedgerows identified are not designated but do constitute non-designated heritage assets as they preserve part of the historic landscape. They are considered to be of medium value. An assessment of the likely impacts and effects upon these is provided in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).
		Cultural heritage	It is also suggested that historic Ordnance Survey mapping described in section 4.2 of PEIR Appendix 6.1 should be included within the ES baseline report.	N	
		Cultural heritage	Finally, following recent discussions with the Archaeology and Heritage consultant it is understood that revisions are to be made to the scheme to exclude an area of extant earthworks relating to historic water meadows from an area of proposed ecological enhancement; the area having previously been identified as landfill. This is welcomed.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Landscape and visual	As referenced in the PEIR and by the Planning Inspectorate, the methodology has not used guidance produced by the Landscape Institute: Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3). Highways England guidance has been used instead and this must be clarified.	N	DMRB LA 107 is appropriate for determining the methodology for the landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) for highway schemes. This is a standard which must be followed, and this standard references GLVIA3 which is the industry's best practice guidance throughout. DMRB LA107, has been influenced by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The UK Government's commitment in ratification of the European Landscape Convention ELC 2000, to recognising landscape matters in law, and promoting landscape planning, protection, and management policies; 2. The Convention's ELC 2000 [Ref 10.N] widely adopted definition of landscape which recognises: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. landscape as a resource inclusive of townscape; b. the relationship between people and place; and c. all landscapes are important, irrespective of their location (i.e. natural, rural, urban, and peri-urban areas) or condition (i.e. outstanding or degraded); 3. Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA's) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition (GLVIA3) (2013); and 4. Landscape Institute's Technical Information Notes (i.e. Townscape Character Assessment, LI TN 05/2017, Landscape Character Assessment, (Technical Info Note 08/15) and their visualisation information guidance (Advice on photography and photomontages, and Visual representation of development proposals, TGN 06/19.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Landscape and visual	Gantries and signage will be a visible addition to the area and their locations are not shown on initial plans. An understanding of exact locations, heights and appearance must be supplied alongside a wider assessment of their impact from longer distance viewpoints. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) must include these details.	N	These features have been considered as part of the LVIA. The Scheme description sets out details of these features used to inform the assessment. In addition, ZTVs have been prepared and are shown on Figures 7.6, 7.7 and 7.10 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and included in the LVIA as part Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Landscape and visual	It is noted that 3D models are used for only 7 of the 24 viewpoints which will be subject to LVIA assessment, and this approach should be used for all viewpoints as it is useful in developing an understanding of the scale of the development.	N	Visualisations have been prepared for 7 of the 24 view locations as agreed with stakeholders (Winchester City Council, Hampshire County Council, South Downs National Park Authority). The assessment for all view locations has been informed by 3D modelling available for the Scheme as part of Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Production of visualisations assist in providing a representation of the Scheme within its context and have been prepared for a representative range of locations. The locations and number are considered proportionate to the nature of the Scheme proposals.
		Landscape and visual	The PEIR covers what will be considered in the LVIA. A Landscape Strategy should also be included which provides an overall objective to protect and enhance the nationally designated landscape of the National Park. The application site is the interface between the historic city of Winchester and the National Park which increases the need for this assessment.	Y	<p>A landscape strategy forms part of the documentation prepared for the Application. This has been presented as part of the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p>The Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The Scheme design has been developed to avoid impacts by minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park. The Scheme design also considers the special qualities of the South Downs National Park and aims to promote understanding of them, whilst conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area.</p> <p>The landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance existing key characteristics of the landscape and its setting, with reference to the defined landscape character areas (LCA) of LCA G5: Itchen Valley Sides and LCA A5: East Winchester Downs, and LCA F5: Itchen Floodplain.</p>
		Landscape and visual	Large scale mitigation must be implemented. Any mitigation measures which sit within the National Park are equally as important to the City Council due to the interrelated nature of the landscape and the importance of the National Park's setting. The City Council will also review detailed plans for the spoil management areas which sit within the National Park which are currently causing concern due to the lack of information available. Supporting urban tree planting in neighbouring areas and within the site is important to provide screening and assist with noise reduction.	Y	<p>All three deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme. Mitigation measures have been developed as part of the iterative design process. A sympathetic solution of utilising site gained to aid mitigation has been developed, and as such the need for management of excess spoil and spoil deposition areas has been avoided.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) sets out the embedded and essential mitigation measures being proposed for the Scheme.</p> <p>Figure 2.8 (Scheme Long Sections) of the ES (Document</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					Reference 6.2) have been prepared to support the Application.
		Landscape and visual	The PEIR highlights the existing Landscape Character Assessments being used to help inform the scheme. However the National Park and City Council have previously requested that a bespoke characterisation of the landscape is undertaken as the area is unique with national park character areas being adjacent to a city townscape. No mention is made of this bespoke characterisation in the PEIR.	N	The South Downs National Park Authority has recently completed an update of their characterisation work which was referenced within the PEIR. This and other landscape character studies form the baseline used within the Landscape, and Visual Impact Assessment. This has been supplemented as appropriate, informed by site survey and analysis.
		Landscape and visual	The current information does not indicate contours or topography and it is therefore difficult to assess how features such as Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS) are formed. Understanding topography is key to the assessment of the landscape impact and whilst the areas of cut and fill can be identified there is currently no indication of heights and topography changes. The LVIA and future submissions must clearly demonstrate topography alterations including where cut and fill operations have taken place. This must include a more detailed visual demonstration of existing landform overlaid with the proposed highlighting larger areas of cut and fill. Existing and proposed spot heights should also be indicated, particularly where there are considerable changes to the landform.	N	Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and accompanying Figure 2.8 (Scheme Long Sections) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) provide detail on the existing and proposed topography and how new features sit within the landscape. The sections provide greater detail on how the proposals relate to the surrounding existing landscape and landform profiles.
		Landscape and visual	Reference is made to a draft Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan however this has not been provided. The City Council will review this document as it will form an important part of the scheme.	N	Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) is submitted with the DCO Application.
		Landscape and visual	It is noticed that surveys continue to be conducted on the trees within the site boundary and Arboricultural Impact reports will be submitted as part of the Environmental Statement. The City Council is therefore unable to comment on the suitability of tree removal and protection at this stage but will do so when the information is available.	N	Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) identifies the reasonable worst-case extent of vegetation loss likely to occur as a result of the Scheme.
		Landscape and visual	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment methodology being used is stated as that of Highways England - LA107 Landscape and Visual Effects (Highways England, 2020) rather than the guidance produced by the Landscape Institute: Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3) although this has been referenced in 7.4.1. and we do note that this was also raised by the Inspectorate.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. DMRB LA 107 is appropriate for determining the methodology for the landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) for highway schemes. This is a standard which must be followed, and this standard references GLVIA3 which is the industry's best practice guidance throughout. DMRB LA107, has been influenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The UK Government's commitment in ratification of the European Landscape Convention ELC 2000, to recognising landscape matters in law, and promoting landscape planning, protection, and management

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>policies;</p> <p>b. The Convention's ELC 2000 [Ref 10.N] widely adopted definition of landscape which recognises:</p> <p>a. landscape as a resource inclusive of townscape;</p> <p>b. the relationship between people and place; and</p> <p>c. all landscapes are important, irrespective of their location (i.e. natural, rural, urban, and peri-urban areas) or condition (i.e. outstanding or degraded);</p> <p>c. Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA's) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition (GLVIA3) (2013); and</p> <p>Landscape Institute's Technical Information Notes (i.e. Townscape Character Assessment, LI TN 05/2017, Landscape Character Assessment, (Technical Info Note 08/15) and their visualisation information guidance (Advice on photography and photomontages, and Visual representation of development proposals, TGN 06/19).</p>
		Landscape and visual	<p>Full details of the scheme are still to be designed however an indication of gantry and sign locations and heights within the landscape would be useful to understand better how visible these features may be when assessing the landscape and visual impact. This has been noted to be actioned within section 7 of the PEIR. 24 viewpoints including from elevated positions and the Cathedral as well as PRowS and schools will be assessed although we understand that preliminary draft AVR wirelines based on the 3D model are only for 7 view locations. What is the justification for not preparing all viewpoints in this way? They are very helpful in developing an understanding of the scale/massing/alignment of the proposed highway improvements. We assume these will form part of the LVIA. The webinar indicated that further zone of theoretical visibility work and modelling is required – we look forward to reviewing the outcomes.</p>	N	<p>Visualisations have been prepared for 7 of the 24 view locations as agreed with stakeholders (Winchester City Council, Hampshire County Council, South Downs National Park Authority). The assessment for all view locations has been informed by 3D modelling available for the Scheme as part of Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Production of visualisations assist in providing a representation of the Scheme within its context and have been prepared for a representative range of locations. The locations and number are considered proportionate to the nature of the Scheme.</p>
		Landscape and visual	<p>Section 7 of the PEIR covers in the main what will be considered and assessed in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to be produced as part of the Environmental Statement. The PEIR should include a Landscape Strategy providing an overall objective to protect and enhance the nationally designated landscape of the SDNP and the interface between the historic city of Winchester and the National Park.</p> <p>We have comments on the Preliminary Environmental Mitigation Design (PEMD) in line with the Shared Asks note dated 21 April</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) has evolved through discussions with the South Downs National Park following consultation being cognisant of the need to protect and enhance the National Park.</p> <p>A landscape strategy forms part of the documentation prepared for the Application. This has been presented as part of the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p>The Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			2021 and the Winchester Urban Fringe Proposals restoration Rev 7 plan submitted jointly by WCC and SDNP:		Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The Scheme design has been developed to avoid impacts by minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park. The Scheme design also considers the special qualities of the South Downs National Park and aims to promote understanding of them, whilst conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area. The landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance existing key characteristics of the landscape and its setting, with reference to the defined landscape character areas (LCA) of LCA G5: Itchen Valley Sides and LCA A5: East Winchester Downs, and LCA F5: Itchen Floodplain.
		Landscape and visual	The scheme will never be fully mitigated due to its nature of a being a large scale infrastructure project however large scale mitigation must still be implemented and reference made to the Winchester Urban Fringe Proposals restoration Rev 7 plan submitted previously by SDNP. Although only areas 3 and 8 lie within WCC boundary all areas within SDNP that sit adjacent and are visible from Winchester's boundary are viewed as important to WCC and are highly important to the setting of the SDNP. The preliminary environmental mitigation design does not reflect the suggested mitigation from SDNP and WCC outside of the indicative application boundary. This includes a request for urban tree planting in the Winnall area of Winchester to enhance noise abatement, improve air quality and landscape screening. Within the site boundary we would support increased tree planting over chalk grassland which would provide much needed screening and assist with noise reduction.	N	Mitigation measures have been developed as part of the iterative design process. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) sets out the embedded and essential mitigation measures being proposed for the Scheme and details the proposed planting. Landscape effects on receptors, including Winnall, during construction and operation of the Scheme are detailed in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Figure 2.8 (Scheme Long Sections) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) have been prepared to support the Application.
		Landscape and visual	The PEIR highlights the Landscape Character Assessments being used to help inform the scheme however WCC and SDNP have requested that a bespoke characterisation of the landscape is undertaken – no mention is made of this. The character of the area is unique with the national park character areas adjacent to the city townscape – an urban/rural fringe. The PEIR highlights the Landscape Character Assessments being used to help inform the scheme however WCC and SDNP have requested that a bespoke characterisation of the landscape is undertaken – no mention is made of this. The character of the area is unique with the national park character areas adjacent to the city townscape – an urban/rural fringe. The PEIR highlights the Landscape Character Assessments being used to help inform the scheme however WCC and SDNP have requested that a bespoke characterisation of the landscape is undertaken – no mention is made of this. The character of the area is unique with the national park character areas adjacent to the city townscape – an urban/rural fringe. The PEIR highlights the Landscape Character Assessments being used to help inform the scheme however WCC and SDNP have requested that a bespoke characterisation of the landscape is undertaken – no mention is made of this. The character of the area is unique with the national park character areas adjacent to the city townscape – an urban/rural fringe.	N	The South Downs National Park Authority has recently completed an update of their characterisation work which was referenced within the PEIR. This and other landscape character studies form the baseline used within the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Chapter 7 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1)) . This has been supplemented as appropriate, informed by site survey and analysis.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			townscape – an urban/rural fringe.		
		Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Topography: As the PEMD does not indicate contours/topography it is not easy to assess how the SuDS features in particular will work in receiving surface water run-off and how these outlet into the watercourses/rivers. No SuDS features are indicated south of the junction. Features such as these are ideal for providing some of the mitigation in particular water quality and bio-diversity. Amenity value must also be considered particularly where features are close to the walking/cycling network. Figure 2.4 shows indicative cut and fill and general arrangement however a more detailed visual demonstration of existing landform overlaid with the proposed highlighting larger areas of cut and fill would assist in understanding the proposed topography. Existing and proposed spot heights should also be indicated, particularly where there are considerable changes to the landform and must be shown on the sections in Figures 2.7 & 2.8.</p>	Y	<p>The operational drainage system has been designed to modern highway standards and is likely to provide an improvement of water treatment compared to the existing situation. The drainage design includes a range of features to treat highway runoff including wetlands, attenuation basins, and swales. The drainage strategy is set out in Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p> <p>Figure 2.8 (Scheme Long Sections) and Figure 2.9 (Finished Level Variance from Existing Level) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) have been prepared for submission with the DCO Application. Spot levels have been provided at key feature points.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>Cycling/walking network: New routes for pedestrians are proposed. Cycle access is indicated across the roundabout only to join up with the national network. We would support enhanced provision of a multi-use network for walking, cycling and equestrian on both the proposed and existing routes thereby opening up the area more widely to access for all.</p> <p>The M3 has always been a barrier to the South Downs National Park for residents (physical and perception). Along with the proposed environmental enhancements such as increased biodiversity and additional screening and the creation of new areas of soft landscape WCC would support as many links across the M3 as possible allowing access into and from the National Park – permeability and inter-connectivity. Sub-way links are not considered ideal as they do not promote an attractive/enhanced entrance/exit to the Park and City nor are they perceived by many users as safe. Bridges and open routes are considered preferable even if these are to be located a little removed from the main site.</p>	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals has been improved and increased. As outlined in Figure 2.4 (Existing and New Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) in the ES (Document Reference 6.2) to the east of the Scheme is a proposed bridleway, and to the west of the M3 a shared user path for walkers and cyclists to Kings Worthy. The walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals, amended earthworks and planting provide greater opportunities for walkers, cyclists and horse riders to view the downland to the east (including created chalk grassland as part of the Scheme). This responds positively to creating further opportunities for recreational activities and access to the South Downs National Park. The design solution also maximises tranquillity of these newly accessible areas, minimising audibility of the highway through the sympathetic earthwork solutions which also minimise visibility of the Scheme, which would increase following establishment of proposed planting.</p>
		Construction – deposition areas	<p>Spare soil: Southern area is shown located adjacent to the north of the recreation field at Chilcomb. The pitches here are already prone to waterlogging, we would require greater detail relating to the profile of the surplus soil and the proposed drainage to ensure that the recreation ground does not come under further waterlogging pressures from surface water run-off. To create these spare soil areas hedgerows require removal – the webinar indicated that these may not all be reinstated, what proposals are there for the green infrastructure of the area and biodiversity connectivity? The other two areas indicated appear to be changing the existing landscape profile – greater detail is required to understand these changes fully.</p>	Y	<p>All three deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme. Site material is proposed to be reused within the Application Boundary to create landscape features.</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Construction – compound locations	Construction: During construction phase compound 4 is indicated at Christmas Hill – this is a considerable way from the site. How will construction traffic impact upon the area?	Y	Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) explains that following the 2021 statutory consultation the location of the main construction compound and ancillary compounds have been amended. This includes the removal of the northern construction compound, as shown during the 2021 statutory consultation, due to the distance from the main construction area. It is proposed that the main construction area is directly next to the M3 Junction 9 gyratory. This reduces the amount of traffic disruption to local road users and communities as well as reducing carbon emissions.
		Landscape and visual	Trees: Has an arboricultural impact assessment been undertaken? There appears to be no information on the amount of existing trees and woodland nor a survey showing trees to be retained and those lost due to the proposals.	N	An Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary AIA) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) , has been undertaken and sets out the vegetation loss and tree protection measures required in accordance with BS 5837:2012.
		Landscape and visual	Maintenance/management: Reference has been made to a draft Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP). When is it anticipated that this will be available for review?	N	Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) is submitted as part of the DCO Application.
		Biodiversity	The application site has high biodiversity value and includes works within and in close proximity to designated features such as the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Any works must respect, protect and mitigate impacts on surrounding features.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. An assessment of the potential impacts on the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation is included within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . In addition, a Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) has also been undertaken which also sets out the effects on the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation.
		Biodiversity	Chapter 8 of the PEIR covers this aspect of the scheme and a number of queries are raised below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bat trapping surveys are being undertaken in May and June 2021 and further surveys will be undertaken later in 2021. The survey results were not included as part of the consultation. The accurate results of these surveys must be used to inform the design of the project. ▪ Dormice data is from 2017 and therefore outside of timeframe guidance. Dormice surveys must be updated with acceptable mitigation proposed. ▪ 12 notable species have been identified within the roundabout section and hedgerow removal is proposed, it is important to demonstrate how the surveys undertaken have informed the actions taken in the Environmental Statement. Collaboration with expert bodies such as Butterfly Conservation is also important. ▪ Clarification is required on potential improvements for bat 	Y	Bat trapping surveys are reported in Appendix 8.1q (Bat trapping surveys 2021) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . Dormice presence/absence surveys were undertaken in 2017, and this data has been supplemented with habitat appraisals in 2020 and desk study data. Mitigation for dormice is presented in Sections 8.8 and 8.9 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) sets out the worst case of vegetation loss, however, to ensure the ecological baseline is suitable to inform the detail of required mitigation measures at construction phase, baseline ecological surveys would be updated prior to construction. To compensate for the loss of woodland, scrub and hedgerow within the Application Boundary, the landscape planting has provided compensatory planting to enable a net increase in habitat within the Application Boundary in the long term, and to maintain connectivity across the wider landscape. The landscape design includes provision of habitats located to link

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>foraging and commuting routes (such as the use of bat bridges and green bridges).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A Biodiversity Net Gain assessment must also be undertaken. ▪ Reference is made to a draft Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan however this has not been provided. The City Council will review this document as it will form an important part of the scheme. ▪ The southern spoil management area is adjacent to the recreation field at Chilcomb and hedgerow removal is proposed. Clarification is sought on the impacts of this removal and the impact on biodiversity connectivity. 		<p>to existing areas of high quality bat foraging habitat, such as the mosaic of woodland along the River Itchen corridor, and to provide a strong north south habitat link along the east of the Scheme.</p> <p>A Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment, Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), has been undertaken for the Scheme.</p> <p>Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) is submitted with the DCO Application.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, all three of the soil deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme. Site arisings are proposed to be using in the landscaping proposals through more sympathetic ground reprofiling.</p>
		Biodiversity	The above queries must be addressed prior to the examination stage and not left to be addressed after any Development Consent Order is issued.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Biodiversity	In light of the amendment to the Environment Bill requiring NSIP applications to contain biodiversity net gain, an assessment on this issue is essential.	Y	<p>Relevant biodiversity legislation is covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. It is calculated that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity, refer to the assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.
		Biodiversity	HRA & River Itchen SAC (including consideration of qualifying features including aquatic invertebrates such as southern damselfly and freshwater fish) is still required.	N	A Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) has been prepared to support the Application. The assessment presents the details of the first stage of the HRA process, the Screening assessment, which has been undertaken to determine whether Likely Significant Effects (LSEs) on European Sites may arise as a result of the Project. The assessment also presents the second stage of the HRA process, Appropriate Assessment, where any identified LSEs are assessed in detail.
		Biodiversity	Further bat trapping surveys are being undertaken in May and June 2021 – how will this be reported in / used to inform this project?	N	Bat trapping surveys are reported in Appendix 8.1q (Bat Trapping Surveys 2021) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . The results have been used to inform the assessment of potential impacts to biodiversity receptors presented in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Biodiversity	Further surveys in 2021 are being undertaken to fully establish the status of these roosts - how will this be reported in / used to inform this project? Have Natural England been approached in relation to potential for European Protected Species Licenses (EPSL)?	N	Bat roosts surveys are reported in Appendix 8.1s (Bat Roost Survey Report 2021) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . The results have been used to inform the assessment of potential impacts to biodiversity receptors presented in this chapter. Natural England has been consulted on the approach to protected species licencing using their Discretionary Advice Service.
		Biodiversity	Dormice data is from 2017 and therefore over the three year age that is recommended in guidance. What mitigation is proposed as dormice are considered to be present within all suitable habitat? Have Natural England been approached in relation to potential for European Protected Species Licenses (EPSL)?	N	The dormouse population within the study area has been assessed as being of Local importance. Dormice presence/absence surveys were undertaken in 2017, and this data has been supplemented with habitat appraisals in 2020 and desk study data. Mitigation for dormice is presented in Sections 8.8 and 8.9 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Natural England has been consulted on the approach and the need for European Protected Species Licenses (EPSL) and are broadly in agreement with the outline mitigation strategy.
		Biodiversity	Terrestrial invertebrate surveys during 2020 have identified twelve notable species largely associated with the flower rich grasslands within the motorway roundabout, and to the east of the motorway roundabout - how will this be reported in / used to inform this project?	N	Terrestrial invertebrate surveys are reported in Appendix 8.1o (Terrestrial Invertebrate Survey and Southern Damselfly Habitat Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . The results have been used to inform the assessment of potential impacts to biodiversity receptors presented in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , and the design of mitigation measures proposed.
		Biodiversity	Where hedgerows cannot be retained, either during construction or following landscaping activities these will either be replaced or translocated where practical, along with enhancement of existing hedgerows through gaps filling where necessary. This includes the hedgerows running alongside Easton Lane. – How will hedgerow be assessed in advance to ensure no impact on the habitat and	N	To ensure the ecological baseline is suitable to inform the detail of required mitigation measures at construction phase, baseline ecological surveys will be updated prior to construction. Where hedgerows cannot be retained, either during construction or following landscaping activities, these would be replaced or translocated where possible.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			species utilising hedgerow?		
		Biodiversity	A mosaic of chalk bunds, native scrub and natural regeneration will be created along a stretch of the redundant A34 between the M3J9 gyratory and the River Itchen crossing. The chalk bunds will be planted with larval food plants for priority species of butterfly. – Which butterfly species, and who will be consulted on this (ie. Butterfly Conservation)?	N	Seed mixes used would include dark mullein <i>Verbascum nigrum</i> , the larval foodplant of the striped lychnis moth, as well as foodplants for small blue, Adonis blue and Chalkhill blue butterflies. The Butterfly Conservation has provided advice on key moth species which could benefit from the Scheme.
		Biodiversity	A fiEMP (Environmental Management Plan) is proposed for construction impacts.	N	The first iteration Environmental Management Plan (Document Reference 7.3) provides details of how the environmental effects of the Scheme will be managed during construction and operation.
		Biodiversity	A habitat creation package is included in the appendices (Preliminary Mitigation Design Plan).	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Biodiversity	Table 8.6 states: Direct mortality through collision with traffic is likely to already occur given the presence of bats near to existing major highway corridors. The Proposed Scheme will not significantly alter the existing road layout (in relation to its existing effects on foraging and commuting bats) and is not considered to worsen the existing situation in relation to mortality of bats. – Have improvements been considered at important foraging & commuting routes – ie bat bridges / green bridges?	N	The landscape design includes provision of habitats located to link to existing areas of high quality bat foraging habitat, such as the mosaic of woodland along the River Itchen corridor, and to provide a strong north south habitat link along the east of the Scheme. The increase in semi-natural habitats within the scheme will increase the area of foraging resource for bats. The results of the assessment work demonstrate that further improvements, such as bat bridges, are not necessary to mitigate impacts from the scheme. In addition, research indicates bats do not typically use bat bridges.
		Biodiversity	What Biodiversity Net Gain assessment has been undertaken?	N	Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) presents the results of a biodiversity metric calculation using Defra 3.0 which assesses the predicted habitat losses and gains.
		Biodiversity	What ecological monitoring & maintenance is proposed following completion of the project?	N	Details of ecological monitoring and maintenance are set out in Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . Monitoring for establishment of newly created landscape elements would follow the establishment maintenance specifications produced during detailed design and would take the form of quarterly inspection in the first two years, and annual inspection in the following three years after seeding/planting. During construction monitoring would include that detailed within the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3)
		Geology and soils	Highways England's consultants have received a land search report from the City Council indicating any potential sources of contamination inside the application and within 250m of the boundary.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. The information in the report has been considered within the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Geology and soils	The PEIR mentions the presence of chalk pits and landfills however there is no mention of a former petrol station situated on the A33 section of the application site. It must be determined in future assessments whether any buried tanks will be disturbed and ensured there is no risk to surface water receptors.	N	Historic land use is investigated in Section 9.6 of Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and includes the former petrol station on the A33 within the Assessment. Winchester City Council provided a Historical Land Use Enquiry Report which contained information in relation to two former service stations on the northbound and southbound A33. Further enquires to the Lead Petroleum Officer at Hampshire County Council confirmed that the tanks within the northbound and southbound service station were filled with concrete slurry in November 1987 to the satisfaction of the Petroleum Officer at the time. A further review of Google Earth aerial images shows that the northbound service station was redeveloped by 2005, and therefore it is likely that any tanks in this location would have been remediated and removed (although this is unconfirmed).
		Geology and soils	The waste soil generated must be subject to material management plans to ensure suitability for use and storage. This will also be assessed from a biodiversity protection perspective at this stage.	N	Potential impacts to soil resources would be mitigated through the Soil Management Plan. A draft Soil Management Plan is appended to the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . The REAC includes a commitment to prepare a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) and a Materials Management Plan (MMP) in accordance with the Contaminated Land Application in the Real Environment (CL:AIRE) Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice. Any soils that do not meet chemical acceptability criteria for reuse on site would be treated or disposed of to a suitable licenced facility.
		Geology and soils	Overall I have no major objections to the indicated direction of travel of the assessment detailed within the PIER in terms of contaminated land. However I do “reserve the right” to make more detailed comment when the full information is available within the subsequent Environmental Statement.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Geology and soils	The consultants working on the project have had a land search report from us indicating any potential sources of contamination inside the application area and within 250m of the application boundary. The PIER has stated the presence of chalk pits and landfills situated in the development area, however there is no mention of the former petrol station situated on the A33 section of the application area. The applicant needs to determine in any future assessment if the proposed road scheme will disturb any buried tanks and there is no risk to surface water receptors.	N	Historic land use is investigated in Section 9.6 of Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Winchester City Council provided a Historical Land Use Enquiry Report which contained information in relation to two former service stations on the northbound and southbound A33. Further enquires to the Lead Petroleum Officer at Hampshire County Council confirmed that the tanks within the northbound and southbound service station were filled with concrete slurry in November 1987 to the satisfaction of the Petroleum Officer at the time. A further review of Google Earth aerial images shows that the northbound service station was redeveloped by 2005, and therefore it is likely that any tanks in this location would have been remediated and removed (although this is unconfirmed).

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Geology and soils	It is understood that the proposed highways scheme has the potential to generate significant amounts of waste soil. If this is the case it is requested that we be consulted in relation to any material management plans, to ensure suitability for use.	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, all three deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme, with construction arisings being used for landscaping features.</p> <p>A draft Soil Management Plan is appended to the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which will be submitted as part of the Application. This plan aims to provide details of the methodology, control measures and monitoring programme for the site preparation and reinstatement work phases of the Scheme. The Soil Management Plan would be developed to detail the areas and type of soil to be stripped, haul routes, the methods to be used, and the location, type and management of each soil stockpile to help protect and enhance soil resources on site. This plan would be prepared by the Principal Contractor during the detailed design stage and included within the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (siEMP).</p> <p>The REAC includes a commitment to prepare a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) and a Materials Management Plan (MMP) in accordance with the Contaminated Land Application in the Real Environment (CL:AIRE) Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice.</p>
		Material assets waste	The City Council does not have any comment on the Mineral Safeguarding Area. This is a matter for Hampshire County Council in their capacity as Minerals and Waste Authority.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Material assets waste	As mentioned in section 6, the City Council will review and comment on waste management plans at the appropriate time.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Noise and vibration	Noise and Vibration impacts are a key consideration for the City Council as a number of sensitive receptors, including residential properties, are located in close proximity to the application site.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Noise and vibration	The PEIR sets out the approach which will be taken to assess and consider these impacts and this includes noise vibration control measures which follow best practice. The exact mitigation response will be determined once full details of the construction programme are determined.	N	Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) outlines embedded, and essential mitigation measures proposed. Commitments to noise mitigation are captured in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC), Section 3 of the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
		Noise and vibration	The indicated approaches to respond to noise and vibration issues appear satisfactory however the City Council will comment on the details of the mitigation response within the Environmental Assessment.	N	Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) outlines embedded, and essential mitigation measures proposed for the Scheme.
		Noise and vibration	Diversion routes should also be assessed from a noise and vibration perspective as there is a risk of impact on sensitive receptors on these routes. The same approach applied in paragraph 2.1	N	In accordance with DMRB LA 111 Noise and Vibration (National Highways, 2020), dwellings within 25m of the kerbs of night-time diversion routes have been identified. Based on dwellings having a

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			regarding air quality also applies to noise.		high sensitivity and the noise impact being Moderate or Major along diversion routes at night, the resultant significance could be Moderate, Large or Very Large at receptors within 25m of the diversion routes. However, based on the anticipated timings of the road closures, (i.e. not being over 15 days/nights in any 40 days/nights or 40 days/nights in six consecutive months) these impacts are not anticipated to be significant. This is reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Noise and vibration	It is also important to highlight that cumulative impacts between the M3 Junction 9 and M3 Smart Motorway works, the timescales of which overlap, must be considered.	N	As outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , the all lane running (ALR) scheme is formally paused following the ministerial statement on 12 January 2022. However, National Highways is planning to upgrade the existing central reservation barrier to concrete, to deliver safety benefits. This scheme is known as the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Safety Barrier Improvement Scheme. Given the central reservation work from the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Safety Barrier Improvement Scheme is due to take place prior to the construction of the Scheme, it has been considered as part of the future baseline. This, and other developments which would be operable prior to the commencement of the Scheme's construction, are also considered as part of the future baseline within Chapters 5 – 14 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Noise and vibration	It is important that on-going monitoring of mitigation measures takes place and the City Council would wish to see a review process throughout the construction phase to allow mitigation to be modified if necessary.	N	The exact methodology and location of the monitoring would be agreed with the Local Authority through the submission of a Section 61 application and the Noise and Vibration Management Plan prior to the commencement of any works. This plan will be prepared by the Principal Contractor during the detailed design stage and included within the siEMP. This is secured by the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
		Noise and vibration	In its operational phase, the increase in traffic on alternative routes requires further assessment (as covered under paragraph 2.4 for air quality).	N	As per the PEIR, the operational noise study area includes roads which are anticipated to experience a noise change of 1dBA or more in the opening year. The operational noise study area is provided in Figure 11.1 (Noise Study Areas, Noise Measurement Locations and Receptors) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
		Population and human health	This topic brings together the issues arising from a number of other topics which focus on the impact on human health.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. In accordance with DMRB LA 112 (National Highways, 2020), this chapter presents an assessment of impacts on the following matters during the construction and operation of the Scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • private property and housing – land, buildings and infrastructure for the purpose of residential use

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> community land and assets – land, buildings and infrastructure providing a service/resource to a community, e.g. open spaces, village greens, village halls, healthcare and education facilities etc. development land and businesses – land identified in national or local plans, policies or strategies for development (including intensification of existing uses) and land subject to planning permission, and land and buildings for the purpose of commercial/industrial enterprise. agricultural land holdings – land and associated infrastructure for the purpose of agricultural production, e.g. arable farming, dairy farming etc. walkers, cyclists and horse-riders – routes and paths used by walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. health profiles of affected communities health determinants (e.g. noise or air pollution) likely health outcomes
		Population and human health	The use and assessment of Winchester District and South Downs National Park Local Plan Policy in this section of the PEIR is welcomed as this provides an insight into local requirements for development in this sensitive area.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Population and human health	The PEIR does recognise that the M3/A34 represents a barrier to the movement of people between Winchester, Kings Worthy and the National Park. The principle of enhancing the links between these areas in the form of non-motorised routes is supported. However, it is considered that further work needs to be undertaken on the mechanisms to achieve this.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Regarding the updated footpath/cycle route which crosses the new roundabout (National Cycle Route (NCR) 23), there is little detail shown at this stage. There are concerns that a physical barrier is not shown on the roundabout bridge over the M3 carriageway. The sight lines from the underpasses must also be demonstrated. The Easton Lane to Kings Worthy route is restricted to pedestrians only. This limits the potential for alternative methods of transport to and from the city and is a missed opportunity. The Winchester Movement Strategy is clear that the council seeks improvements to how people travel in and around Winchester and	Y	In response to comments made during the 2021 statutory consultation, amendments have been made. Figure 2.4 (Existing and New Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) identifies these routes and their designations. In total the following new facilities are provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Bridleway (for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders) = approx. 3,151m Shared path for walkers and cyclists = approx. 1,717m Providing for cyclists on the route from Winnall to Kings Worthy will

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>want a future where there is reduced car traffic but more activity in the city centre through improved travel options including cycling. The creation of a cycle route allows sustainable and more inclusive transport routes into the city and can be used to connect to other routes such as national cycle ways and the recently opened district leisure centre which serves the wider community. The route also runs parallel or between major carriageways and mitigation (in the form of screening) will be expected. The Easton Lane to Long Walk route is also pedestrian only which excludes its use by cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>The junction as it stands is a barrier to non-motorised modes of transports and it is vital this opportunity is used to improve the connectivity between the city, outer villages and the wider countryside of the National Park beyond using a wider range of transport options. The City Council will therefore be pursuing revisions to the connections to ensure they are accessible for all modes of non-motorised transport.</p>		<p>encourage cycling to work.</p> <p>The Easton Lane to Long Walk bridleway has been designed to allow for horse riders, with a maximum 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p>
		Population and human health	<p>Regarding economic impacts, a key strand of the Council Plan 2020 – 2025 is a ‘vibrant local economy’. Excellent transport links and connectivity are crucial in maintaining vibrancy, creating high quality employment and inward investment opportunities in the Winchester district.</p> <p>Locally, the enhancements will improve the economic vitality and competitiveness of the Winnall Industrial Estate and the visitor economy of the Winchester district and this key interchange is related to the economic growth of the whole region.</p> <p>Feedback has been provided by the Winchester Business Improvement District and Hampshire Chamber of Commerce in Appendix G.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Construction - general	<p>WCC has adopted a resolution to seek Employment and Skills Plans in connection with major developments. This will secure opportunities to promote apprenticeships, the use of local firms as sub-contractors and to promote wider career opportunities and educational/learning roles from the scheme. It is encouraging to see the use of local labour is mentioned in paragraph 9.4.1 of the PEIR.</p>	N	It is anticipated that the Applicant would appoint a major Tier I contractor for the construction of the Scheme, which is likely to be an international civil engineering firm. It is expected that there would be a degree of sub-contracting, providing the opportunity for local employment.
		General	<p>The economic and tourism team at Winchester City Council would like to support this application in principle.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Traffic and transport	<p>One of the key strands of the Council Plan 2020 to 2025 is a ‘vibrant local economy’.</p> <p>Excellent transport links and connectivity are crucial in maintaining this vibrancy, creating high quality employment and inward investment opportunities in the Winchester District.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Principle of development	<p>The City of Winchester Movement Strategy strongly supports enhancing the strategic road network capacity on the M3 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ sustaining future growth of the national, regional and local economy ▪ improving the resilience of the strategic network and ▪ reducing through traffic in the city leading to improved air quality. 	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Principle of development	<p>The Enterprise M3 and Solent Local Enterprise Partnership’s A STRATEGIC ECONOMIC PLAN FOR THE ENTERPRISE M3 AREA 2018 – 2030 suggests that:</p> <p>“The efficient functioning of this strategic transport network is a priority for businesses, communities and visitors to our area, as well as the UK’s economy. These vital arteries and transport hubs connect markets, help people access jobs, enable businesses to connect with each other and their customers, drive international trade and help unlock planned development. The network plays a crucial role in supporting wider economic prosperity and competitiveness.”</p>	N	The Applicant notes this. Further details are provided in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) .
		Principle of development	<p>The Solent Local Enterprise Partnership: SOLENT STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INVESTMENT PLAN 2016 states that:</p> <p>“The road network is critical for both the national and the local economy.</p> <p>There are currently a number of points of stress on the motorway network which impact on the economic performance including the M3 J9/A34: this is a critical node connecting Solent (especially freight) to production centres and markets in the north and the midlands but a major bottleneck.”</p>	N	The Applicant notes this. Further details are provided in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) .
		Legislation and policy	<p>National Planning Policy Statement for National Networks, applicable to all road and railway Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (Department of Transport, 2014) identifies:</p> <p>“a critical need to improve the national networks to address road congestion...to provide safe, expeditious and resilient networks that better support social and economic activity; and to provide a transport network that is capable of stimulating and supporting economic growth. Improvements may also be required to address the impact of the national networks on quality of life and environmental factors”.</p> <p>“a need for development on the national networks to support national and local economic growth and regeneration, particularly in the most disadvantaged areas. Improved and new transport links can facilitate economic growth by bringing businesses closer to their</p>	N	The Applicant notes this. Further details are provided in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and the National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) .

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			workers, their markets and each other. This can help rebalance the economy”		
		Principle of development	Economic and tourism growth On a local level the enhancements will improve the economic vitality and competitiveness of the adjacent Winnall Industrial Estate.	N	The Applicant notes this comment, and this has also been considered in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) .
		Traffic and transport	Excellent transport links are also crucial to the ongoing vitality of the visitor economy of the Winchester District. The improvements will reduce journey times from many destinations with visitors’ choice of destination strongly influenced by drive time from their homes.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Traffic and transport	It is estimated that around 0.35 million overnight tourism trips were made to Winchester in 2018. £263.4 million was spent on trips to Winchester in 2018 by overnight and day visitors, up by 3% compared to 2017. The total value of tourism activity in Winchester in 2018 is estimated to have been around £339.1 million, up by 2% compared to 2017. (The Economic Value of Tourism on Winchester, 2018).	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Traffic and transport	This key transport interchange, where the A34 meets the M3, links the north with the ports of Southampton and Portsmouth and Southampton Airport, and is crucial to the economic growth of the whole region.	N	This statement is recognised and reflected in Section 3 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) .
		Traffic and transport	Kevin Travers, Head of Infrastructure, Transport & Place, at Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership said: “Improvements to Junction 9 remains a key strategic priority for us. Together with Solent and Dorset LEPs we have all highlighted Junction 9 of the M3 as being a junction of strategic importance to the LEPs as well as the wider national economy. The M3/ A34/ M40 corridor functions as a vital artery for strategic highway flows, providing connectivity between different regions of the UK. The congestion and delay problems at Junction 9 are a key concern for all three LEPs that need to be addressed as a matter of priority. The cities and large towns of Southampton, Portsmouth, Bournemouth, Poole and to some extent Winchester are anticipated to play a role as engines for growth, whereby they will accommodate considerable planned growth in housing and jobs, as we respond to the pandemic. The future economic performance and success of these urban centres is reliant on the continued provision of efficient and reliable strategic transport links by road and rail.”	N	This statement is noted by the Applicant. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) .
		Legislation and policy	It is recommended that a full economic impact appraisal including GVA figures and job creation numbers is carried out before the full planning application is submitted.	N	A full economic appraisal has been undertaken and is described in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) . This includes consideration of wider economic impacts following DfT’s Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) and

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					quantification of Level 2 benefits including productivity and agglomeration. The Level 3 wider economic impacts, such as GVA and job creation, were not quantified at this stage as it was not considered proportionate to carry out a detailed assessment and related land-use and economic modelling.
		Principle of development	Local business community The local business community have lobbied for years for improvements to enable free-flowing links between the M3 and the A34 both northbound and southbound. Leaders from the Winchester Business Improvement District and Hampshire Chamber of Commerce have commented on the proposals below.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Traffic and transport	Paul Spencer, Chief Executive of Winchester Business Improvement District, said: <i>“The proposed scheme at M3 Junction 9 will reduce congestion and improve journey times which will have a positive impact on Winchester City Centre. At busy times Junction 9 struggles and the new proposals will increase capacity at this key transport interchange and remove the need for vehicles to use Winchester as an alternative route.”</i>	N	The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) reflects this comment and references that the Scheme seeks to reduce congestion on the strategic road network.
		Traffic and transport	Mark Mills-Goodlet, Group Managing Director of Winchester Motor Group and Chair of the Winchester Business Strategy Group of Hampshire Chamber of Commerce, added: <i>“Having worked in Winchester for thirty five years I am all too aware of the traffic chaos that occurs in the city during Bank Holidays or at peak periods when the M3 Junction 9 cannot cope with the volume of traffic. Not only does this have a detrimental effect on the businesses in Winchester but has a seriously negative affect on air quality. A free-flowing junction 9 would negate the need for motorists to use Winchester as a short cut.”</i>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Population and human health	Employment and skills The close proximity of the residential area of Winnall gives local people an opportunity to benefit from jobs created. In May 2021 the St Bartholomew ward of Winchester City Council which includes the Winnall area had an unemployment rate of 4.5% compared to a Winchester District average of 3.3%. Local unemployment rates have increased during the COVID-19 pandemic.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. It is anticipated that the Applicant would appoint a major Tier 1 contractor for the construction of the Scheme, which is likely to be an international civil engineering firm. It is expected that there would be a degree of sub-contracting, providing the opportunity for local employment.
		Population and human health	The council follows the Construction Industry Training Board (CITB) client based approach for all large scale planning applications. This means the council will require an employment and skills plan to maximise local employment and training opportunities created through the construction of the M3 improvements.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Population and human health	It is suggested that more detailed work is carried out on the potential longer term impact of the improvements in terms of job creation.	N	One of the Scheme objectives is to support economic growth and ensure the junction can accommodate additional traffic. The Scheme will support the development of housing and the creation of jobs, through the potential to accelerate local development sites by improving marketability and mitigating potential capacity constraints, increasing adjacent commercial and industrial land value and the potential to accelerate ongoing trends towards densification and new development in Winnall. Further details about the traffic and economic benefits of the Scheme are reported in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document 7.10) .
		Climate	<p>Sustainability</p> <p>Winchester City Council has joined local authorities across the country in declaring a climate emergency. The council aims to make itself carbon neutral by 2024 and achieve the same with the wider district by 2030.</p>	N	<p>The Climate Emergency, declared by Winchester City Council, is acknowledged in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Applicant has applied and considered the ten design principles of Highways England's "The Road to Good Design" document during the design development. This includes the design principle that "Good Road Design is Sustainable". National Highways' carbon reduction hierarchy has been applied to the scheme and aims to mitigate emissions by avoiding or preventing, reducing and remediating greenhouse gas emissions. Examples of the steps taken include (but are not limited to) measures to achieve a cut/fill balance, reducing the embodied carbon associated with the production of materials, retaining pavements where possible to reduce the requirement for new or additional materials, reusing excavated materials within the works where possible, construction compounds located close to the area of works to reduce the distance of vehicle trips, using sustainably sourced, recycled and secondary materials, using fuel efficient and electric vehicles during construction, and managing and maintaining plant and equipment to ensure optimal operation and avoidance of unnecessary idling.</p> <p>The drainage design has considered climate change predictions and the second iteration Environmental Management Plan will include mitigation measures for transport, materials, waste and air quality which will help reduce emissions during construction. A Site Waste Management Plan will be implemented to manage waste during construction which will help reduce emissions associated with waste management.</p>
		Climate	We would look to Highways England to provide carbon offsetting funds or solutions to reduce the carbon emissions from the proposed solutions. Activities that provide local employment or active travel opportunities would be encouraged.	Y	<p>Greenhouse gas (GHG) design, mitigation, and enhancement measures are outlined in Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>Active travel is enabled by the additional walking, cycling and horse-riding provision proposed by the Scheme which has been increased since the 2021 statutory consultation.</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Road drainage and the water environment	The condition of surface water when it enters the water environment can have adverse impacts on water quality with consequential impacts on its biodiversity. With the River Itchen carrying both international and national nature conservation designations it is considered important that scheme can demonstrate that adequate steps have been taken to protect the water environment from pollution. Measures to trap pollutants including micro particles and plastics should be incorporated into the gulley/water traps on any new sections of carriageway. Furthermore, the opportunity should be taken to retro fit any existing drains that do not meet this specification.	N	<p>Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) provides details of the pollution control measures.</p> <p>The baseline and assessment are summarised in Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	There are significant concerns regarding the amount of nitrates which enter a group of protected sites collectively known as the 'Solent SPAs'. The watercourses which traverse the site lead to the Solent SPAs and the Environmental Statement will therefore need to cover any nutrient run-off into the system.	N	<p>Consultation has been completed with Natural England to confirm that a Nutrient Neutrality Assessment is not required as there is no increase in foul drainage as a result of the proposals - no overnight stays (meeting 19th Jan 2021). Consideration has been given to nutrients including a Water Framework Directive Assessment (Document Reference 7.7) and HEWRAT assessment, Appendix I of Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The consideration of new pathways during construction and operation has also been considered in Appendix 13.2 (Hydrogeological Risk Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p>
		Construction - deposition areas	The southern area spoil area (within the National Park) is adjacent to the recreation field at Chilcomb. This area is prone to waterlogging and greater detail relating to the profile or surplus soil and proposed drainage would be required to ensure the situation is not worsened.	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, all three of the soil deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme and therefore drainage in this area will not be required. Site arisings are proposed to be used in the landscaping proposals through more sympathetic ground reprofiling.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	Hampshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority will be commenting on the scheme as part of the County Council's response.	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>
		Climate	<p>Winchester City Council declared a climate emergency in June 2019 and committed to the aim of making the council carbon neutral by 2024 and the wider district by 2030.</p> <p>The council's Carbon Neutrality Action Plan (CNAP) sets out a comprehensive list of actions that will help address nearly all the</p>	N	<p>The Climate Emergency, declared by Winchester City Council, is acknowledged in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Applicant has applied and considered the ten design principles of Highways England's "The Road to Good Design" document</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>council's carbon emissions by 2024 and contribute to reducing emissions district wide by 2030. These actions focus around reducing and/or eliminating carbon emissions across the three largest sources of carbon emissions including transport, energy and property/housing, and offsetting the remaining carbon. The CNAP excludes motorway emissions as 'these are national infrastructure and will require a national response'. This scheme is therefore crucial in addressing that element of the City Council's district-wide carbon neutrality targets that is completely beyond its control.</p>		<p>during the design development. This includes the design principle that "Good Road Design is Sustainable". National Highways' carbon reduction hierarchy has been applied to the scheme and aims to mitigate emissions by avoiding or preventing, reducing and remediating greenhouse gas emissions. Examples of the steps taken include (but are not limited to) measures to achieve a cut/fill balance, reducing the embodied carbon associated with the production of materials, retaining pavements where possible to reduce the requirement for new or additional materials, reusing excavated materials within the works where possible, construction compounds located close to the area of works to reduce the distance of vehicle trips, using sustainably sourced, recycled and secondary materials, using fuel efficient and electric vehicles during construction, and managing and maintaining plant and equipment to ensure optimal operation and avoidance of unnecessary idling.</p> <p>The drainage design has considered climate change predictions and the second iteration Environmental Management Plan will include mitigation measures for transport, materials, waste and air quality which will help reduce emissions during construction. A Site Waste Management Plan will be implemented to manage waste during construction which will help reduce emissions associated with waste management.</p>
		Climate	<p>The PEIR document acknowledges that end-user emissions are anticipated to increase with the proposed scheme. Indeed, table 14-6 in the PEIR indicates that the proposed scheme will generate an estimated 3,100 tCO₂e of additional operation end user emissions in the opening year 2026 compared with the current design. Given that the total emissions for the junction are roughly 3.2 million tCO₂e per year, this marks only a marginal increase in carbon emissions of roughly 0.1% of the total emissions.</p> <p>However, the PEIR does not include any calculation or assessment of operation end user emissions beyond the opening year and this is a significant gap in the evidence which makes it difficult to provide an informed response at this stage. Furthermore, there is no calculation and assessment of carbon emissions associated with the 3- year construction phase of the proposed scheme. This is particularly important information for understanding the longer term effects and assessing how this will impact on our district-wide carbon neutrality targets. These matters must be addressed as part of the examination process and the City Council will scrutinise this information at that time.</p>	N	<p>GHG emissions from construction have been calculated using the Defra Emissions Factor Toolkit.</p> <p>National Highways has set its target for net zero maintenance and construction activities by 2040 with an interim target of 10% reduction by 2025 in their 'Net zero highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' (National Highways, 2021). The Scheme would be required to align with the plan by implementing measures such as those listed in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Principal Contractor would be required to address the interim targets within the plan, such as selecting Tier 1 and 2 suppliers that have certified carbon management systems.</p> <p>Operational emissions for modelled opening year (2027), design year (2042) and total over the assumed 60-year operational period (2027 – 2086) have been assessed and this is presented in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), along with the methodology for doing so.</p>
		Climate	<p>A detailed assessment and calculation of the total emissions from construction and operation is noticeably missing from the PEIR,</p>	N	<p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides an assessment in accordance with the Infrastructure</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>however it is accepted that an accurate assessment of carbon emissions is particularly challenging given the current stage of development design.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it is difficult at this stage, with the limited data available in the PEIR, for Winchester City Council to comment on the effect of the proposed scheme on carbon emissions within the Winchester District. The Environmental Statement must expand upon the preliminary calculations within the PEIR with a full detailed assessment of GHG emissions and effects associated with both construction and operation phases.</p>		<p>Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 114 Climate (Highways England, 2021) on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact of the Scheme on climate change (from greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions – ‘carbon’) ▪ Vulnerability of the Scheme to climate change (climate change risk assessment (CCRA)) <p>The assessment and reporting of GHG emissions considers both construction and operation phases of the scheme.</p> <p>The scope of the CCRA covers the operational phase of the Scheme, assuming a 60 year design life.</p>
		Climate	<p>The City Council also expects to see additional direct measures to address the increase in GHG emissions resulting from the construction and operational phases of the scheme. For example, this could take the form of additional planting (on and off site) and direct measures to reduce the number of vehicles on the road. The City Council support the inclusion of section 14.8 ‘Design, mitigation and enhancement measures’ in the PEIR which demonstrates that potential mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions are being considered as part of the design of the Proposed Scheme. The City Council also strongly support the consideration of principles c) and d) of the carbon hierarchy within the ES, as outlined in section 14.8.3 of the PEIR.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the embedded and essential mitigation for the Scheme in relation to GHG emissions.</p> <p>The Applicant has applied and considered the ten design principles of Highways England’s “The Road to Good Design” document during the design development. This includes the design principle that “Good Road Design is Sustainable”. National Highways’ carbon reduction hierarchy has been applied to the scheme and aims to mitigate emissions by avoiding or preventing, reducing and remediating greenhouse gas emissions. Examples of the steps taken include (but are not limited to) measures to achieve a cut/fill balance, reducing the embodied carbon associated with the production of materials, retaining pavements where possible to reduce the requirement for new or additional materials, reusing excavated materials within the works where possible, construction compounds located close to the area of works to reduce the distance of vehicle trips, using sustainably sourced, recycled and secondary materials, using fuel efficient and electric vehicles during construction, and managing and maintaining plant and equipment to ensure optimal operation and avoidance of unnecessary idling.</p> <p>The drainage design has considered climate change predictions and the second iteration Environmental Management Plan will include mitigation measures for transport, materials, waste and air quality which will help reduce emissions during construction. A Site Waste Management Plan will be implemented to manage waste during construction which will help reduce emissions associated with waste management.</p>
		Traffic and transport	<p>As outlined in the Winchester Movement Strategy (WMS), the proposed scheme at M3 Junction 9 will likely reduce the volume of possible traffic through the city and associated carbon emissions. However, we do note that the volume of traffic at Easton Lane is expected to increase by at least 25%. There is added concern,</p>	N	<p>Traffic modelling of the Scheme has been undertaken and is described in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). This incorporates strategic and local operation traffic modelling to assess the Scheme impacts on the highway network including changes in traffic flow loading. This has informed</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>however, that increasing the capacity of the junction will increase the volume through the junction, and generate additional greenhouse gas emissions as a result of an increase in traffic. Any assumption that traffic growth could be offset, emissions-wise, by an increasing proportion of the road fleet becoming electric or having lower emissions with more fuel-efficient engines, would also apply to traffic emissions if the proposed scheme did not take place. At this stage, with the current data provided, it is difficult to determine what the overall change in traffic and emissions throughout Winchester will be as a result of the road improvements. Greater modelling of traffic flows, traffic growth, and emissions is therefore required and must be provided at the examination stage.</p>		<p>the appraisal of Local Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases economic impacts, which is reported in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10).</p> <p>Traffic has been modelled for the 2027 opening year and 2042 design year of the Scheme. The Defra Emissions Factor Toolkit, used to model the estimated GHG emissions from vehicle movements, accounts for likely changes to vehicle fleet composition such as increasing use of electric vehicles (EVs) up to 2050 which is applied to both the 'Do-Minimum' (DM) and 'Do-Something' (DS) scenarios.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>Expanding on the issues raised in section 9, a key priority of the Winchester Movement Strategy is to provide improved active travel options and remove barriers to walking and cycling into and around Winchester. This will help to reduce traffic levels and associated carbon emissions in the city centre, by providing good quality alternatives to having to drive into the centre of Winchester.</p>	Y	<p>In response to comments made during the 2021 statutory consultation, amendments have been made. Figure 2.4 (Existing and New Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) identifies these routes and their designations. In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length ▪ Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>The adaptations to NCR 23 are an improvement and it is imperative the upgrade meets the latest Government standards.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The route has been designed to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges design standards.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>The concerns raised in section 9 are echoed from a Climate perspective. Aside from the NCR 23 improvements, there are no further efforts in the proposals to provide additional infrastructure for cyclists and other non-motorised transport. This is a missed opportunity to improve active travel infrastructure in the area and facilitate the important modality shift away from high-carbon vehicles towards low carbon alternatives.</p> <p>The site has potential to increase the provision of cycling infrastructure. For example, the proposed footpath linking the A33/B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate is a 2-mile route situated close to major roads – it could be argued that this would function better as a properly-surfaced shared cycle/pedestrian path, providing a useful commuter route for cyclists.</p>	Y	<p>In response to comments made during the 2021 statutory consultation process, the new western route from Winnall to Kings Worthy has been expanded to include provision for cyclists as well as walkers, and the eastern route from Easton Lane to Long walk has been expanded to be a bridleway. Figure 2.4 (Existing and New Walking Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) identifies these routes and their designations.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>Another aspect that is not covered in sufficient detail within the proposed scheme is information about closures/diversions of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes during the 3-year construction phase, particularly the existing NCR 23 route. This is</p>	N	<p>Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing public rights of way are provided in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), shown on Figure 2.6 (Temporary Diversion of walking, Cycling and Horse-</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>acknowledged within section 2.4.61 of the PEIR, and further details are to be considered in the ongoing Environmental Impact Assessment work.</p> <p>It is important that this is included within the ES and that efforts are made to ensure that the quality of cycling and walking is not reduced during the 3-year construction phase. A temporary reduction in ease and quality of cycling and walking as part of the construction phase may have a detrimental knock-on effect, shifting current non-motorised users of the junction back towards cars.</p>		<p>riding Routes) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
		Climate	<p>The full response of the City Council's Sustainability Officer is included as Appendix H.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>
		Climate	<p>Appendix H</p> <p>In June 2019, Winchester City Council declared a 'Climate Emergency' and committed to the aim of making the activities of Winchester City Council carbon neutral by 2024, and the district of Winchester carbon neutral by 2030. The council's Carbon Neutrality Action Plan (CNAP) sets out a comprehensive list of actions that will help address nearly all the council's carbon emissions by 2024 and contribute to reducing emissions district wide by 2030. These actions focus around reducing and/or eliminating carbon emissions across the three largest sources of carbon emissions including transport, energy and property/housing, and offsetting the remaining carbon. The CNAP excludes motorway emissions as 'these are national infrastructure and will require a national response'. This scheme is therefore crucial in addressing that element of our district-wide carbon neutrality targets that is completely beyond our control.</p>	N	<p>The Climate Emergency, declared by Winchester City Council, is acknowledged in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Applicant has applied and considered the ten design principles of Highways England's "The Road to Good Design" document during the design development. This includes the design principle that "Good Road Design is Sustainable". National Highways' carbon reduction hierarchy has been applied to the scheme and aims to mitigate emissions by avoiding or preventing, reducing and remediating greenhouse gas emissions. Examples of the steps taken include (but are not limited to) measures to achieve a cut/fill balance, reducing the embodied carbon associated with the production of materials, retaining pavements where possible to reduce the requirement for new or additional materials, reusing excavated materials within the works where possible, construction compounds located close to the area of works to reduce the distance of vehicle trips, using sustainably sourced, recycled and secondary materials, using fuel efficient and electric vehicles during construction, and managing and maintaining plant and equipment to ensure optimal operation and avoidance of unnecessary idling.</p> <p>The drainage design has considered climate change predictions and the second iteration Environmental Management Plan will include mitigation measures for transport, materials, waste and air quality which will help reduce emissions during construction. A Site Waste Management Plan will be implemented to manage waste during construction which will help reduce emissions associated with waste management.</p>
		Climate	<p>The PEIR document acknowledges that end-user emissions are anticipated to increase with the proposed scheme. Indeed, table 14-6 in the PEIR indicates that the proposed scheme will generate an estimated 3,100 tCO2e of additional operation end user emissions in the opening year 2026 compared with the current design. Given</p>	N	<p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides an assessment in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 114 Climate (Highways England, 2021) on:</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>that the total emissions for the junction are roughly 3.2 million tCO₂e per year, this marks only a marginal increase in carbon emissions of roughly 0.1% of the total emissions. However, the PEIR does not include any calculation or assessment of operation end user emissions beyond the opening year and this is a significant gap in the evidence which makes it difficult to provide an informed response. Furthermore, there is no calculation and assessment of carbon emissions associated with the 3-year construction phase of the proposed scheme. This is particularly important information for understanding the longer term effects and assessing how this will impact on our district-wide carbon neutrality targets.</p> <p>A detailed assessment and calculation of the total emissions from construction and operation is noticeably missing from the PEIR, but do we accept that an accurate assessment of carbon emissions is particularly challenging given the current stage of development design. Nevertheless, it is difficult at this stage, with the limited data available in the PEIR, for Winchester City Council to comment on the effect of the proposed scheme on carbon emissions within the Winchester District. We expect that the Environmental Statement (ES) will expand upon the preliminary calculations within the PEIR with a full detailed assessment of GHG emissions and effects associated with both construction and operation phases.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact of the Scheme on climate change (from greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions – ‘carbon’) ▪ Vulnerability of the Scheme to climate change (climate change risk assessment (CCRA)) <p>The assessment and reporting of GHG emissions considers both construction and operation phases of the scheme.</p> <p>The scope of the CCRA covers the operational phase of the Scheme, assuming a 60 year design life.</p>
		Climate	<p>WCC also expects to see additional direct measures to address the increase in GHG emissions resulting from the construction and operational phases of the scheme. For example, this could take the form of additional planting (on and off site) and direct measures to reduce the number of vehicles on the road. We support the inclusion of section 14.8 ‘Design, mitigation and enhancement measures’ in the PEIR which demonstrates that potential mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions are being considered as part of the design of the Proposed Scheme. We also strongly support the consideration of principles c) and d) of the carbon hierarchy within the ES, as outlined in section 14.8.3 of the PEIR.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the embedded and essential mitigation for the Scheme in relation to GHG emissions, including measures for proposed planting, walking, cycling and horse-riding.</p> <p>The Applicant has applied and considered the ten design principles of Highways England’s “The Road to Good Design” document during the design development. This includes the design principle that “Good Road Design is Sustainable”. National Highways’ carbon reduction hierarchy has been applied to the scheme and aims to mitigate emissions by avoiding or preventing, reducing and remediating greenhouse gas emissions. Examples of the steps taken include (but are not limited to) measures to achieve a cut/fill balance, reducing the embodied carbon associated with the production of materials, retaining pavements where possible to reduce the requirement for new or additional materials, reusing excavated materials within the works where possible, construction compounds located close to the area of works to reduce the distance of vehicle trips, using sustainably sourced, recycled and secondary materials, using fuel efficient and electric vehicles during construction, and managing and maintaining plant and equipment to ensure optimal operation and avoidance of unnecessary idling.</p> <p>The drainage design has considered climate change predictions and</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					the second iteration Environmental Management Plan will include mitigation measures for transport, materials, waste and air quality which will help reduce emissions during construction. A Site Waste Management Plan will be implemented to manage waste during construction which will help reduce emissions associated with waste management.
		Climate	As outlined in the Winchester Movement Strategy (WMS), the proposed scheme at M3 Junction 9 will likely reduce the volume of possible traffic through the city and associated carbon emissions. However, we do note that the volume of traffic at Easton Lane is expected to increase by at least 25%. There is added concern, however, that increasing the capacity of the junction will increase the volume through the junction, and generate additional greenhouse gas emissions as a result of an increase in traffic. Any assumption that traffic growth could be offset, emissions-wise, by an increasing proportion of the road fleet becoming electric or having lower emissions with more fuel-efficient engines, would also apply to traffic emissions if the proposed scheme did not take place. At this stage, with the current data provided, it is difficult to determine what the overall change in traffic and emissions throughout Winchester will be as a result of the road improvements. Greater modelling of traffic flows, traffic growth, and emissions is therefore required.	N	Traffic has been modelled for the 2027 opening year and 2042 design year of the Scheme. The Defra Emissions Factor Toolkit used to model the estimated GHG emissions from vehicle movements, accounts for likely changes to vehicle fleet composition such as increasing use of electric vehicles (EVs) up to 2050 which is applied to both the 'Do-Minimum' (DM or baseline scenario) and 'Do-Something' (DS) scenarios for each assessment year. The limitations and assumptions of using the EFT to calculate vehicle emissions are noted within Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>Cycling and walking infrastructure</p> <p>A key priority of the WMS is to provide improved active travel options and remove barriers to walking and cycling into and around Winchester. This will help to reduce traffic levels and associated carbon emissions in the city centre, by providing good quality alternatives to having to drive into the centre of Winchester. We have noted that efforts have been made in the proposed scheme to improve the current cycling and walking provision at the junction. Firstly, the scheme proposes to upgrade the substandard National Cycle Route 23 that already exists across the junction, and reconnect the two ends of Easton Lane where were truncated when the M3 was built – a noticeable improvement for cycling and walking. It is imperative that the upgrade to the National Cycle Route (NCR) 23 meets the latest Government standards for cycling infrastructure set out in LTN 1/20. Secondly, two new footpaths will improve the accessibility of the area for walking. The new footway for the western side of the scheme will link the A33/B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. The footpath proposed on the eastern side will link Easton Lane with Long Walk.</p>	Y	The Applicant notes this comment. Refer to comments above regarding modifications to walking, cycling and horse-riding provision. The level of provision has increased following the 2021 statutory consultation.
		Walkers, cyclists, and	We do, however, share concerns with non-motorised user groups, such as Cycle Winchester, regarding the cycling infrastructure provision included in the Proposed Scheme. Rather than taking the	Y	Since the statutory consultation in 2021, the walking route to the west of the M3 (Winnall to Kings Worthy) has been revised to include a cycling route with the proposed use of redundant

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		horse-riders	opportunity to maximise opportunities for active travel in and around Winchester and curb carbon emissions from transport, the scheme proposes only an upgrade to the pre-existing NCR 23 route. Currently, aside from this, there are no further efforts in the proposals to provide additional infrastructure for cyclists. We feel this presents a missed opportunity to improve active travel infrastructure in the area and facilitate the important modality shift away from high-carbon vehicles towards low carbon alternatives. There is scope in the scheme to increase the provision of cycling infrastructure. For example, the proposed footpath linking the A33/B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate is a 2-mile route situated close to major roads – it could be argued that this would function better as a properly-surfaced shared cycle/pedestrian path, providing a useful commuter route for cyclists.		carriageway, please refer to Figure 2.4 (Existing and New Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	Another aspect that is not covered in sufficient detail within the proposed scheme is information about closures/diversions of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes during the 3-year construction phase, particularly the existing NCR 23 route. This is acknowledged within section 2.4.61 of the PEIR, and further details are to be considered in the ongoing Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) work. It is important that this is included within the ES and that efforts are made to ensure that the quality of cycling and walking is not reduced during the 3-year construction phase. A temporary reduction in ease and quality of cycling and walking as part of the construction phase may have a detrimental knock-on effect, shifting current non-motorised users of the junction back towards cars.	N	Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing public rights of way are provided in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , shown on Figure 2.6 (Temporary Diversion of Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		In-combination and cumulative effects	It is noted there will be an overlap in timeframe for Junction 9 and Smart Motorway works. It is vital the two projects are coordinated together and any cumulative impacts (such as noise and air quality concerns for nearby residents) are responded to in combination.	N	As outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Motorway Upgrade Project is formally paused following the ministerial statement on 12 January 2022. However, National Highways is planning to upgrade the existing central reservation barrier to concrete, to deliver safety benefits. This scheme is known as the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Safety Barrier Improvement Scheme. Given the central reservation work from the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Safety Barrier Improvement Scheme is due to take place prior to the construction of the Scheme, it has been considered as part of the future baseline. This, and other developments which would be operable prior to the commencement of the Scheme's construction, are also considered as part of the future baseline within Chapters 5 – 14 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		In-combination and	There are a number of approved developments in the area which are likely to be constructing alongside the Junction 9 scheme. The contact made to local house builders and major projects as part of	N	Chapter 15 (Cumulative Effects) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) outlines the assessment methodology. The Applicant has considered comments from stakeholders in developing its 'long list'

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		cumulative effects	this consultation is welcomed. Please note that a number of site allocations and planning consents have been missed from the search area for cumulative effects. These are listed in Appendix I.		and 'short list' of other developments which could potentially have a cumulative effect. The Applicant's long list of cumulative developments can be found in Appendix 15.1 (Long List of Cumulative Developments) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) and Appendix 15.2 (Short List of Cumulative Developments) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) ,
		Climate	As indicated at the start of this response, Climate is an issue which relates to all aspects of the project and should be a common thread through every consideration.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Legislation and policy	The proposed M3 Junction 9 improvements are a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project and will be dealt with by a Development Consent Order (DCO) application. This will be assessed by the Planning inspectorate, when submitted, who will make a recommendation to the Secretary of State.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Environment - general	An Environmental Impact assessment (EIA) is required to be developed in two stages: the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) which is subject to public consultation before an Environmental Statement is prepared to accompany the DCO application. The Council has been consulted on the PEIR along with other stakeholders and the public.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Environment - general	The PEIR is an initial statement of the main environmental information available, along with descriptions of the likely environmental effects and mitigation measures envisaged. The PEIR has been updated following a previous assessment in 2019, to reflect modifications to the scheme and additional assessment information/material. The information is preliminary as there is an iterative process of scheme development and EIA, with the final EIA work reported within the Environmental Statement that will accompany the DCO application. The PEIR covers 10 key topic areas, including air quality, noise, biodiversity and water environment, as well as 'in combination' and cumulative effects.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		In-combination and cumulative effects	The list of topic areas appears comprehensive and covers all the areas in which impacts may be expected. The majority of topic areas will be subject to comments from specialist consultees either within or outside the City Council. The Strategic planning issues relate mainly to the Local Plan policies relevant to each topic (listed in section 2 under each topic in the PEIRS) and the 'Cumulative Effects' topic area, particularly the list of 'other developments' which may need to be assessed for cumulative impact.	N	The cumulative effects and combined effects of the Scheme are assessed in Chapter 15 (Cumulative Effects) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Cumulative effects are effects that occur as a result of changes caused by other developments acting cumulatively with the effects of the Scheme. Combined effects are effects from the combined effect of several different impacts acting together on a single receptor, such that the combined effect would be more significant than the individual effects.
		In-combination and cumulative	In responding to the previous (2019) consultation, comments were made about the relevant policies and concerns were raised about the narrow (2km) radius used to identify other developments and the absence of some substantial schemes. These concerns seem to	N	A Zone of Influence (ZoI) for environmental disciplines is stated in Chapter 15 (Cumulative Effects) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The ZoI has been used to identify a long list of 'other developments', outlined in Appendix 15.1 (Long List of

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		effects	have been largely taken into account and a much longer list of 'other developments' is now used.		Cumulative Developments of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . This has been prepared in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 17 (Planning Inspectorate, 2019).
		Legislation and policy	The Development Plan currently consists of: Winchester District Local Plan Part 1: Joint Core Strategy – Adopted March 2013; Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations - Adopted April 2017; Winchester District Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Development Plan Document – Adopted February 2019; Hampshire Waste & Minerals Plan – Adopted October 2013; South Downs National Park Local Plan – Adopted July 2019.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. Relevant policy compliance is considered in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) .
		Legislation and policy	The Local Plan policies relevant to each topic are listed in section 2 under each topic in the PEIRS. These generally appear to highlight the key policies, with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Topic 8 Biodiversity – Local Plan Parts 1 and 2 are not listed but include relevant policies, particularly LPP1 policies DS1, CP15, CP16 and CP17 and LPP2 policies DM23 and DM24; ▪ Topic 13 Drainage and Water Environment – policies from Local Plan Part 1 are wrongly listed under the 'emerging local plan' heading; ▪ No Supplementary Planning Documents appear to be listed. Those which may be most relevant within the City Council's area (outside the SDNP) are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ High Quality Places SPD 2015 ○ Air Quality SPD 2021 ○ Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy Village Design Statement 2007 ○ Littleton Village Design Statement 2010 ○ St Giles Hill Neighbourhood Design Statement 2020 	N	The Applicant notes this comment. Policy compliance is considered in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) including the Supplementary Planning Documents. Within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) the Local Plans Parts 1 and 2 are listed. Within Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) references the Local Plans Parts 1 and 2.
		In-combination and cumulative effects	The expanded search area and list of 'other developments' is welcomed. This appears to cover the key developments within the City Council's area, with the exception of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The following site allocations/planning consents appear to be missed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WIN8, land at Stanmore, Winchester (planning consents 17/00641/FUL and 18/01792/REM) ○ CC1, Sandyfields Nursery, Colden Common (planning 	N	Please refer to Appendix 15.1 (Long List of Cumulative Developments) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . The three site allocations/planning consents highlighted are included within the cumulative assessment matrix as follows: WIN8 is ID68, CC1 is ID29 and NA2 is ID70 (17/02306/FUL) and ID69 (16/01854/FUL). Sir John Moore Barracks has been considered but this scheme has not been included in the long list as it is not allocated nor subject to a planning application, so it therefore falls outside of our search criteria for cumulative developments.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>consent 17/00641/FUL under construction)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NA2, The Dean, Alresford (various planning consents); ○ Sir John Moore Barracks, Littleton – to be vacated and sold for development by MOD (although not part of a Local Plan allocation or planning application currently); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a risk of overlap and double counting of schemes in the Station Approach, Winchester area. Local Plan Part 2 policy WIN5 sets out development principles for the Station Approach area as a whole, which is sub-divided into the 'Carfax' site and 'Cattlemarket' sites, with policies WIN6 and WIN7 setting out the respective requirements. Planning application ref 19/00601/OUT (ID1) also relates to the Carfax/WIN6 part of the area. 		<p>The possibility of double counting was picked up during the cumulative assessment exercise where it was decided which schemes should be progressed to Stage 2 (the short list, refer to Appendix 15.2 (Short List of Cumulative Developments) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p>
		Traffic and transport	<p>Detailed highways assessments will be made by the County Council as Highway Authority. However, the exclusion of any improvements to the junction between the A33 'Winchester Bypass' and London Road (locally called the 'Cart and Horses junction') in Kings Worthy is a concern.</p> <p>Figure 2.5 of Appendix 2.1 shows a 1 to 25% increase in traffic movements from this junction onto the A33 and the additional M3 north-bound entrance from this direction may increase the attractiveness of this route. It is not understood why this junction has been excluded from improvement works when it sits as part of the wider scheme and forms parts of the red line boundary and this must be revisited by Highways England. The City Council will work alongside the Highways Authority in this regard.</p>	N	<p>Since statutory consultation, the Application Boundary has been amended and reduced in area.</p> <p>The Cart and Horses junction is outside of the Application boundary and no work is proposed to this junction as part of the Scheme. The Applicant has engaged with Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council about this area of the Scheme.</p>
		Traffic and transport	<p>The exclusion of the Cart and Horses junction is also related to the Kings Worthy – Winnall footway which starts at this location. As discussed previously, this route is currently restricted to pedestrians and should be revised to ensure it can be used by other modes of non-motorised transport. The scheme is a major development for the area and it is important this local junction is included and improved by connecting an inclusive non-motorised route to the city from this location.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Cart and Horses Junction lies outside of the Application Boundary.</p>
		Traffic and transport	<p>It is currently unknown whether the traffic flows shown in figure 2.5 of Appendix 2.1 are from the first year of operation or whether they have modelled predicted future road use. Clarification is requested on this point.</p>	N	<p>Traffic flows are outlined in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) and the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10). This includes presentation of forecast traffic flows from the strategic traffic model for the Do Minimum (without Scheme) and Do Something (with Scheme) scenarios in 2027 (opening year), 2042 (design year), and 2047 (horizon year).</p>
		Principle of	<p>At this point in the NSIP process the City Council is not expressing a</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		development	view regarding the merits of the project and, by extension, whether it is able to support the proposed scheme.		
		Consultation	As indicated in a number of sections throughout this response, more information is required to address a range of issues to allow a fully informed and balanced view to be reached.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Consultation	Winchester City Council is ready to engage with meaningful and proactive discussions with Highways England alongside colleagues at Hampshire County Council and the South Downs National Park Authority.	N	During the pre-application process, the Applicant has engaged with Winchester City Council.

K.1.R: Hampshire County Council

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Principle of development	Overall, the County Council is supportive of the improvement scheme which will seek to address the existing issues of congestion, noise and air quality impacts associated with Junction 9. However, there are some detailed points which will need addressing as the Development Consent Order (DCO) application is progressed, and the County Council would welcome continued joint working with Highways England to address these.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Legislation and policy	Additionally, it should be noted that the County Council would expect to maintain its current legislative powers as they relate to the local road network, traffic management, temporary diversion of rights of way and stopping up, and in relation to the Land Drainage Act 1991 as part of any future DCO.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has engaged with Hampshire County Council regarding this comment. Further details about this position are provided in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement (Document Reference 3.3) .
		General	The County Council has been working closely with its partners at Winchester City Council and South Down National Park in relation to this project and notes the comments raised by both parties in relation to this consultation.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Principle of development	The Winchester Movement Strategy, which was recently developed and adopted by the County Council and City Council, provides a vision and plan to substantially reduce city centre traffic, improve air quality and increase the use of active transport modes. The general arrangements indicate that traffic on the strategic network is able to continue more efficiently, removing volume from the local roads into and around the city centre, and improving access to existing park and ride sites, albeit detailed traffic modelling is required to confirm this. The objectives and design of the Junction 9 improvement scheme should closely relate to the strategies key priorities: 1. To reduce city centre traffic; 2. To support healthier lifestyle choices; and 3. To invest in infrastructure to support sustainable growth.	N	Chapter 3 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) outlines the strategic objectives of the Scheme. These include reducing delays at the Winchester junction, as well as the M3, A33 and A44, supporting economic growth and improve walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. This aligns with the Winchester Movement Strategy's key priorities.
		Principle of development	The scheme is considered to be essential to the success of the strategy and therefore the County Council as Local Highway Authority supports the principle of the scheme. Congestion on the strategic road network at and around Junction 9 of the M3 has significant negative impacts to the local road network in terms of congestion, noise and air quality, particularly in relation to the City of Winchester.	N	One way that the Scheme will deliver benefits is by reducing motorway congestion. Other benefits are listed in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) .

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Traffic and transport	Whilst the scheme is supported in principle there remain a host of parameters and issues which need to be addressed before the Local Highway Authority will be in a position to fully support the scheme, including the implications of any temporary or permanent impacts which materialise on the local highway network as a result of the scheme proposals. Significant levels of further details and assessment are required in this regard, which are summarised in sections below.	N	The implications of any temporary or permanent impacts on the local road network are provided in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) and the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) .
		Traffic and transport	The application boundary includes the Cart and Horses junction at the B3047, although no detail has been given as to the proposals for this.	N	Since the 2021 statutory consultation the Application Boundary has been updated. The Cart and Horses junction sits outside of the Application Boundary and no work is proposed to the junction as part of the Scheme.
		Traffic and transport	It is disappointing that details for this junction have not been included within the PEIR as early discussions emphasised that this is a particularly sensitive junction and needs to be given serious consideration in relation to any projected increase in traffic flows and modification to its layout. Thorough analysis of capacity, safety, queues and active travel movements to enable development of additional traffic calming measures to protect the junction will need to be carried out prior to submission of any DCO application. It is likely that a modification to the layout to include a roundabout configuration would be necessary to mitigate the impacts of the scheme, and Highways England needs to work closely with the County Council on the detailed design.	N	The Applicant has engaged with Hampshire County Council about this junction, sharing proposed layout drawings and modelling information with the Council. As outlined in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) and the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) , the conclusions of the modelling exercise show that strategic traffic model forecasts broadly indicate an increase in traffic flow along A33, a decrease in traffic flow along B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches.
		Traffic and transport	M3 / A34 / A272 / Easton Lane Junction The proposed design at the existing M3 / A34 / A272 / Easton Lane gyratory reduces the scale of the junction and proposes that the roundabout be uncontrolled. Traffic modelling will be needed to support the proposal to have the roundabout without signals. The PEIR did not include a detailed traffic assessment, something that will be necessary to enable the proposal to be properly assessed prior to submission of a DCO application.	N	Traffic modelling of the proposed layout has been undertaken to assess operational impacts and this is described in Section 7 of the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) .
		Traffic and transport	From a traffic capacity perspective traffic signals may no longer be required however with any reduction in traffic volumes (including HGV traffic) it could be expected that circulatory speeds will increase which, coupled with removing the traffic signals, could lead to a highway safety issues. An investigation into the safety risks of not having signal control combined with increased vehicle speeds will be needed. Discussion will be required regarding the responsibilities for the roundabout post construction, as if this section of the network becomes part of the local highway network then any ongoing safety	N	Safety assessments are being undertaken and these are described in Section 8 the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) . This highlights that based on the 5-year accident data and accident assessment undertaken using COBALT (Cost and Benefit to Accidents – Light Touch) to predict the change in accidents with the Scheme, a reduction was shown.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			issues associated with it would also become the responsibility of the Local Highway Authority, and any reintroduction of traffic calming measures would require further funding and the approval of Highways England at a later date.		
		Traffic and transport	<p>Traffic Modelling</p> <p>In order to support a DCO application a full traffic modelling assessment will need to be undertaken for the proposed scheme and the wider network so that relevant mitigation schemes can be identified, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Winchester rural area and key routes and junctions within it to understand the traffic flow loading as a result of the improvement scheme; ▪ The Cart and Horses junction; ▪ Three Maids roundabout; ▪ Andover Road; ▪ Junction of Andover Road and Worthy Lane; ▪ Easton Lane; and ▪ Stanmore Lane. 	N	Traffic modelling of the Scheme has been undertaken and is described in Section 7 of the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) . This incorporates strategic and local operation traffic modelling to assess the Scheme impacts on the highway network, including changes in traffic flow loading.
		Traffic and transport	The scope an appropriate technical assessment of the wider area will need to be agreed, and steps must be taken to ensure that intervention measures are identified to alleviate any negative effects of any potential traffic increase on local roads as a result of the proposed scheme.	N	Traffic modelling of the wider area is presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) , which has not identified any notable negative effects associated with changes in traffic flow loading.
		Traffic and transport	There are locations with higher rates of accidents within the indicative scheme boundary, and it is of great importance that these are assessed fully and mitigation put in place to protect them from the impacts of reassigned traffic.	N	Accident analysis has been undertaken in line with best practice and is described in Section 8 the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) . This indicates a reduction in accidents and casualties with the Scheme in place.
		Consultation	It is disappointing that the technical information has not been provided within the PEIR, as this would have allowed a greater level of detail to be included in the consultation exercise.	N	This is noted by the Applicant, however, the technical information provided in the PEIR was a preliminary assessment using information available at the time.
		Traffic and transport	<p>Asset management and maintenance</p> <p>Discussions will be needed at the earliest opportunity with regards to asset boundaries between the local highway network and the strategic network post construction. There is no detail in the consultation material to determine maintenance responsibilities and so no determination can be made on whether the design standard of the project areas that will become part of the local highway network</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment. This matter has been raised in meetings with Hampshire County Council to ensure that the Scheme design satisfies either DMRB or local authority standards, dependant on ownership.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			is satisfactory. The scheme's detailed design must be produced to satisfy the current national design standards and guidelines (DMRB) and the Local Highway Authority's own local design standards and construction detail for the works to be adopted.		
		Traffic and transport	<p>Traffic Management</p> <p>Any works taking place on the strategic network will inevitably require closures and diversion of traffic onto the local highway network. Additional measures will need to be undertaken to mitigate the traffic disruption and damage to the local network as a result of displaced traffic from the strategic road network.</p>	N	A detailed description of the Traffic Management Plan is described in Section 3 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) .
		Traffic and transport	Work on the Highways England and Local Highway network must be co-ordinated to minimise clashes and traffic disruption. Coordination will require Highways England to collaborate and cooperate with the Local Highway Authority on the following matters.	N	The Applicant has engaged with Hampshire County Council on the proposed Traffic Management Plan for the Scheme.
		Traffic and transport	It may be necessary to make changes to the current agreed diversion routes and Highways England is expected to supply additional signage and traffic management to advise motorists and reinforce the appropriate agreed diversion routes. It would be essential that extensive stakeholder engagement is carried out by Highways England, including (but not limited to) residents affected by the works and displaced traffic.	N	The communication plan to notify stakeholders of the traffic management is explained in Section 3 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) . This includes, and is not limited to, announcements on local and regional radio, notices in newspapers, advance warning signs at the roadside of affected routes, and letter drops, emails and on-going liaison with key stakeholders in the vicinity of the Scheme.
		Traffic and transport	Highways England is expected to undertake full assessment of the impact of construction traffic on the network, particularly during peak hours. Night and weekend working whilst on the local highway network will be expected in order to expedite the works, restricting working hours of 0700-1900 and occasional weekend working is not acceptable on the local highway network unless both the impact on traffic and residents has been considered. It should be noted that it is the Local Highway Authority's view that all closures of the Highways England strategic network should always happen at night, however long periods of consecutive night closures and use of the local highway network for displaced traffic should be avoided in order to give residents some respite.		<p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. Information on the CTM traffic modelling assessment can be found in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10).</p> <p>Construction working hours are shown in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
		Traffic and transport	It is important that wider network improvements are also delivered alongside the new junction to minimise the impact on the local highway. Use of these routes by strategic traffic 'reassigning to the local highway should be prohibited as much as possible in order to limit the adverse impacts on local communities. This may entail additional measures to calm or reduce the speed of displaced traffic and potential additional closures of roads on the local road network.	N	Traffic modelling of the Scheme has been undertaken and is described in Section 7 of the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) . This incorporates strategic and local operation traffic modelling to assess the scheme impacts on the highway network including changes in traffic flow loading. This indicates an increase in traffic on some local roads near Junction 9, including Easton Lane, and a reduction on traffic on several local

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>Additional maintenance to the local highway network, both before and after displaced traffic had used the network, should be carried out to reduce noise and repair damage by displaced vehicles. Consideration should also be given to the impact that the construction period will have on Hampshire's local roads by both construction vehicles and by traffic using unsuitable local roads to avoid the construction work. Traffic movements to and from Highways England compounds must avoid heavily congested times of the day on the local highway network. Liaison with the local Environmental Health Team is encouraged to mitigate the impacts of noise from both the construction works and from the displaced traffic on residents.</p>		<p>roads within Winchester City where 'rat-running' reduced with the Scheme in place.</p> <p>A Construction Traffic Management Assessment has been undertaken and is described in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) with associated economic impacts reported as well. This indicated an increase in journey times and congestion during the construction period, however, this was generally not significant.</p>
		Traffic and transport	<p>Meetings will need to be held between the Highway Authority and suitable representatives from Highways England to coordinate the works. The County Council would encourage coordination with other Highways England schemes in the area, including strategic coordination outside of Hampshire, and for these to be represented at these meetings.</p>	N	<p>Necessary engagement during construction and management of the traffic impacts is outlined in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8).</p>
		Traffic and transport	<p>Finally, it should be noted that work scheduling needs to take account of localised traffic sensitivity, other major works and events and the fluctuations of traffic demand and that there needs to be flexibility between the County Council and Highways England to change any mitigation measures that are not working.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. Significant events that affect traffic on the road network are considered in Section 3 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8).</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>Active Travel Provisions</p> <p>Whilst the Local Highway Authority is supportive of the principle of the scheme, it is imperative that a project of this size does not disbenefit the efforts of the County Council to improve air quality and achieve net-zero carbon. Highways England is encouraged to maximise opportunities from this scheme, essentially being to provide the infrastructure that is sustainable for walking, cycling and public transport provision.</p>	Y	<p>Post statutory consultation in 2021, changes have been made to the Scheme to improve the walking, cycling and horse-riding provision. In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the impacts from the Scheme in relation to air quality during both the construction and operational phases.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides an assessment in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 114 Climate (Highways England, 2021) on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of the Scheme on climate change (from greenhouse

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>gas (GHG) emissions – ‘carbon’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vulnerability of the Scheme to climate change (climate change risk assessment (CCRA)) <p>The assessment and reporting of GHG emissions considers both construction and operation phases of the scheme.</p> <p>The scope of the CCRA covers the operational phase of the Scheme, assuming a 60 year design life.</p> <p>The Applicant has applied and considered the ten design principles of Highways England’s “The Road to Good Design” document during the design development. This includes the design principle that “Good Road Design is Sustainable”. National Highways’ carbon reduction hierarchy has been applied to the scheme and aims to mitigate emissions by avoiding or preventing, reducing and remediating greenhouse gas emissions. Examples of the steps taken include (but are not limited to) measures to achieve a cut/fill balance, reducing the embodied carbon associated with the production of materials, retaining pavements where possible to reduce the requirement for new or additional materials, reusing excavated materials within the works where possible, construction compounds located close to the area of works to reduce the distance of vehicle trips, using sustainably sourced, recycled and secondary materials, using fuel efficient and electric vehicles during construction, and managing and maintaining plant and equipment to ensure optimal operation and avoidance of unnecessary idling.</p> <p>The drainage design has considered climate change predictions and the second iteration Environmental Management Plan will include mitigation measures for transport, materials, waste and air quality which will help reduce emissions during construction. A Site Waste Management Plan will be implemented to manage waste during construction which will help reduce emissions associated with waste management.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	Although it is recognised that the current proposed design does include some new and upgraded provision for active travel users, largely where they are needed to maintain existing public rights of way, the proposed facilities are fairly limited in scope and do not integrate the scheme fully into the wider network of active travel facilities. The scheme is required to deliver an active travel strategy as part of the project which fully complies with LTN 1/20.	N	Whilst it is noted that LTN 1/20 provides guidance for cycle infrastructure, DMRB is to be applied on the National Highways network.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	There are opportunities to maximise the scheme’s potential by providing new infrastructure that is suitable for use by as many modes of transport as possible and upgrading the status of all public	Y	Footway, cycleway and horse-riding routes are provided as part of the Scheme. Please refer to the General Arrangement Plans (Document Reference 2.5)

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>footpaths to full cycle and pedestrian facilities to provide a coherent network of routes for both pedestrians and cyclists.</p>		<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length <p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the provision of National Cycle Network Route 23. On both sides of the gyratory (east and west), the existing walking and cycling route which links both parts of Easton Lane, would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. The existing provision for horse-riders is being retained, and as part of the Scheme would be improved with a widened 3m route (with 4m wide underpasses), which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway to enable rider dismounting for leading horses through to continue the route to the existing bridleway extent (which currently ceases within the existing roundabout).</p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway, footpath and cycle track for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Tesco's situated on Easton Lane. The route runs parallel to the west of the A33 with the route to be constructed within the existing verge. A signalised (unlit) Toucan crossing is proposed adjacent to the proposed National Highways depot roundabout, to provide a link to this route through the north-western side of the gyratory roundabout. The route then transitions to utilise the existing A34 northbound and A33 carriageways which are to be abandoned as part of the Scheme. The existing informal link to the existing</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>PRoW would also be upgraded from its connection to the A33. For the first River Itchen crossing (i.e. most northern), the route follows the existing A33 and is accommodated on the existing bridge deck abandoned carriageway.</p> <p>For the second river crossing (i.e. most southern), the Scheme includes a new cycle/footbridge to be constructed across the River Itchen, with the route extending south along the east of the new A34 alignment, crossing under the A34 in a new 4m wide subway which would then traverse around new attenuation basins, then progressing to the existing depot junction and towards NCN 23 via a new subway under the northern arm of the gyratory roundabout.</p> <p>An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	The proposed walking link between Winnall and Kings Worthy is a key route within the scheme boundary and should be designed with full cycle and pedestrian facilities which comply with LTN 1/20. Highways England is encouraged to work closely with the County Council in the detailed design of this provision to ensure that the benefits of the scheme are successfully maximised. The Local Highway Authority will expect to see this included in any DCO application that is submitted. This will help to improve safety for both public rights of way users and road users, and lead to improved health, leisure and community benefits, as well as facilitating access to employment and services.	N	The link between Winnall and Kings Worthy is proposed as a shared, unsegregated footpath/cycleway route. The adjacent roads (A33 and A34) throughout the route's extent form part of the trunk road network and, as such, are designed to DMRB CD 143.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	Therefore, at this stage in the development of the scheme, the limited range of active travel measures currently identified in the scheme are unlikely to meet the government's ambition for the provision of sustainable transport measures into and around Winchester, as set out in the priorities of the Winchester Movement Strategy.	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>Local Highway Authority in respect of Public Rights of Way</p> <p>As Local Highway Authority in respect of Public Rights of Way (PRoW), the County Council's responsibilities include the protection of the Rights of Way network and the interests of PRoW users, Temporary Closure Orders (including the provision of alternative routes), creation of new Rights of Way or dedication of additional user rights, Highway Works Agreements to approve changes to the surface of PRoW and working with Highways England and local planning authorities and the National Park to maximize opportunities to improve and enhance access to the countryside.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has engaged with Hampshire County Council and walking, cycling and horse-riding groups throughout the pre-application (see Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1)). Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>The M3 junction 9 improvement proposals affect the following PRoW within the redline of the application and in the close vicinity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Winchester Bridleway 502; Winchester Bridleway 520; Footpath 9; Itchen Valley Restricted Byway; Footpath 20; Footpath 21; Footpath 22; Footpath 27; 	N	<p>There are 22 PRoWs that interact, with or are in close proximity to, the Scheme, as shown on Figure 12.6 (Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Receptors) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The assessment of the PRoWs is contained within Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Appendix 12.1 Schedule of Population and Human Health Effects of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) also sets out the magnitude and nature of effects (with mitigation in place) during both the construction and operational phases.</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Headbourne Worthy Footpath 6; ▪ Footpath 749; and ▪ Kings Worthy Footpath 8. 		
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>The key elements of the scheme that have the potential to most impact on PRow and provide opportunities for enhancement of access to the countryside and active travel improvements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rearranging the main junction 9 roundabout; ▪ Three new bridges and a number of other structures including new underpasses; ▪ Revised walking and cycling routes ▪ PRow diversions and stopping up; ▪ Haul roads and temporary closures of PRow; and ▪ New connecting roads from the revised roundabout. 	N	<p>Details of temporary closures and diversions to existing Public Rights of Way are shown in Figure 2.6 (Temporary Diversion of Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The effects on existing PRow during construction are outlined in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The impacts of the construction of the Scheme on these routes are considered.</p> <p>Appendix 12.1 Schedule of Population and Human Health Effects of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) also sets out the magnitude and nature of effects (with mitigation in place) during both the construction and operational phases.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>The proposed provision of Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding (WCHR) improvements are noted, and there is an opportunity to provide a new multiuser Bridleway on the eastern side of the proposed scheme linking Easton Lane with Long Walk rather than a Footpath that is only available to pedestrians as currently proposed by the scheme.</p>	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the PRow provision to the east of the M3 has been modified to a bridleway.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>It is a missed opportunity if it is only to be a pedestrian circular leisure path (as proposed) linking the South Downs National Park to the other cycle and equestrian PRow and quiet Highways around Long Walk that connects to local villages.</p>	Y	<p>Improvements have been made to the Scheme. The walking route to the west of the M3 (Winnall to Kings Worthy) has been revised to include a cycling route with the proposed use of redundant carriageway.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>As a general point, currently the consultation plans do not include full details of the status of the PRow affected and some plans (including Figure 2.9) label all PRow as Footpaths. Any plans submitted with a DCO application will need to provide full details of all rights of way in the red line boundary, and adjacent to that boundary, for routes that will be affected by the development during construction and operational phases. The application will also need to provide clarity on the terminology used for WCHR to ensure the correct designation is referenced (i.e. Bridleway, Restricted Byway and so on).</p>	N	<p>Figure 2.4 (Existing and New Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) identifies these routes and their designations.</p>
		Legislation and policy	<p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</p> <p>The County Council recommends the inclusion of the Countryside Access Plan for the South Downs (Hampshire) 2008-2013 and Hampshire Countryside Access Plan 2015 – 2025 in the review of</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has undertaken a review of relevant planning policy in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1).</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			policy in the PEIR section 5.		
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	The County Council is generally satisfied that the Landscape and Visual, Air Quality, and Population and Health chapters of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will consider the direct and indirect impact of the development on Rights of Way or Rights of Way users in combination with other environmental impacts considered in other section of the Environment Statement.	N	Please refer to Chapters 5 (Air Quality), 7 (Landscape and Visual) and 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) for information on PRowWs and their users.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	However, the County Council is concerned that the following sections of the PEIR do not adequately address the need to retain, protect and improve Rights of Way for equestrians including existing Bridleway and Restricted Byway. The County Council will require the DCO to include provisions for applications to be made to Hampshire Countryside Service (as Local Highway Authority in respect of Rights of Way) and provide alternative routes for PRowW users where it is considered necessary to protect their amenity.	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length <p>Discussions with Hampshire County Council in relation to the drafting of the DCO are ongoing.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>Temporary Diversion of Rights of Way</p> <p>The County Council notes that the PIER refers to temporary diversion of Rights of Way being further considered in the EIA. Where the construction process may affect a right of way, it is requested that these are not diverted without the agreement of Hampshire County Council. The County Council requires that the Temporary Closure Order powers specified in the Highways Act 1980 be retained as protective provisions as part of any future DCO.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has submitted an outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) as part of its DCO application. The Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) provides details of how the construction works will be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measure, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase.</p> <p>Temporary diversion routes for PRowW during construction are also outlined in Figure 2.6 (Temporary Diversion of Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) will be</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					refined at various stages of the Scheme development. The final version will be developed in consultation with key stakeholders such as Hampshire County Council and Hampshire Police. Discussions with Hampshire County Council in relation to the drafting of the DCO are ongoing.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	Details of temporary Stopping Up should be included in the application and the County Council requests that the process for any Temporary Closure Orders is discussed with the Countryside Service as Local Highway Authority at the earliest opportunity. As part of any future DCO, the County Council will require that Temporary Closure Orders applications should be made to Hampshire Countryside Service at least 6 weeks prior to the commencement of works.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. Areas subject to temporary stopping up (as a result of the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme) are identified within the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1) and shown on the accompanying Rights of Way and Access Plans (Document Reference 2.4) .
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	As the Local Highway Authority for public rights of way, Hampshire County Council has a duty to protect and assert the rights of the public to use the rights of way network. The County Council therefore request that no surface alterations to any rights of way or works which could affect their surface are proposed or undertaken without first seeking the permission of Hampshire Countryside Service. This will need to be reflected in any future DCO.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. Existing PRoW to be stopped up and proposed PRoW (as a result of the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme) are identified within the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1) and shown on the accompanying Rights of Way and Access Plans (Document Reference 2.4) .
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	The EIA and a future DCO should include details of the process of stopping up and diversion of Bridleway 502 and 520 and creation of alternative routes. It should be noted that, where the PEIR refers to future provision for horse-riders and space for future mounting blocks, there are existing legal rights, bridleway and highway rights which must be accommodated.	N	See above.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	All of these legislative powers relating to temporary diversion of rights of way and stopping up should stay with the County Council as part of any future DCO.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. Areas subject to temporary stopping up (as a result of the M3 Junction 9 Improvement scheme) are identified within the DCO and shown on Rights of Way and Access Plans (Document Reference 2.4) . Discussions with Hampshire County Council over their legislative powers under the DCO are ongoing. The Applicant will continue to engage with Hampshire County Council on this matter.
		Design	Bridges and crossings Details of the design and any changes to bridges and water course or highway crossings that could potentially impact on PRoW Highway user will be needed in any DCO application. The County Council will require Highways England to work closely with the local highway authority on the specific designs of bridges and crossings.	N	Details on existing and proposed structures can be found in the Structures Plans and Sections (Document Reference 2.7) . These plans provide detail on the existing structures that are to be retained, existing structures that are to be removed, and proposed structures.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>Lack of Bridleway Multiuser routes</p> <p>The County Council is concerned that the horse riding provision appears to be limited to retaining NCN Route 23 and segregating users from vehicles on the gyratory. It is proposed only to provide a pedestrian footpath on the eastern edge of the M3 corridor linking Easton Lane and Long Walk, and a new footpath along the north side of Easton Lane next to the Homebase site and northward along the western edge of the A34, rather than a Bridleway multiuser route as outlined in previous versions of the M3 Junction 9 improvement scheme consultations.</p>	Y	<p>Changes have been made to the Scheme since the 2021 statutory consultation. These include providing horse-riding provision between Long Walk and Easton Lane to the east of the M3, and cycleway provision between Winnall and Kings Worthy. Refer to Figure 2.4 (Existing and New Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>The County Council is concerned that providing a pedestrian only footpath linking to Easton fails to maximise the opportunity to provide enhancement and create a viable non-motorised user link for all users in that location.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, please refer to Figure 2.4 (Existing and New Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) which identifies these routes and their designations.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>Prior to a DCO application being submitted the County Council advises that further consideration will need to be given to the provision of a multiuser bridleway between Easton Lane and Long Walk and extending the off-road route to Restricted Byway Itchen Valley 19 in order to comply with policy, minimize impacts of the</p>	Y	<p>A bridleway has been proposed between Easton Lane and Long Walk to the east of the Scheme since the 2021 statutory consultation.</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			motorway junction improvement scheme on WCHR users and provide improvements as previously recommended.		
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	A 3 meter wide subway is not sufficiently wide to accommodate a horse and rider and to allow users to pass and the detail of the alternative to Bridleway 502 and 520 should be developed in consultation with the Hampshire County Council Countryside Service and / or statutory consultees and relevant user groups such as British Horse Society, and in line with up-to-date best practice to ensure the diversion of the Bridleway provides an improvement for all WCHR users and improvement to non-motorised user safety.	N	3m wide subways were proposed as part of a Value Engineering exercise due to possible Scheme funding. However, the proposed subways have now been revised and are all proposed to be 4m in width. The design of subways has been discussed with local walking, cycling and horse-riding groups. The Applicant will continue to engage with Hampshire County Council about Bridleways 502 and 520 during detailed design.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>Construction Phase - Mitigation</p> <p>The proposal will include haul roads which may directly affect the PRow network and specifically Itchen Valley Footpath 20 and 21 and other public footpaths in the vicinity.</p>	N	<p>Whilst all efforts will be made to retain the existing routes, there will be a need for minor diversions to enable construction activities to progress safely during the works. Any required diversions will be agreed in advance with the Local Authority. Controlled Crossing points will be put in place where interaction with haul roads cannot be avoided to ensure safe access is maintained.</p> <p>The effects on existing PRowS during construction are outlined in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The impacts of the construction of the Scheme on these routes are considered.</p> <p>Appendix 12.1 Schedule of Population and Human Health Effects of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) also sets out the magnitude and nature of effects (with mitigation in place) during both the construction and operational phases.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	Hampshire County Council as PRow Authority would like the opportunity to review the impacts of the construction phase works, from the highway construction, site compounds or storage areas, and in particular haul roads and temporary roads which will need to be addressed in a DCO application.	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. Further details are provided in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) and the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The effects on existing PRowS during construction are outlined in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The impacts of the construction of the Scheme on these routes are considered.</p> <p>Appendix 12.1 Schedule of Population and Human Health Effects of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) also sets out the magnitude and nature of effects (with mitigation in place) during both the construction and operational phases.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	<p>Asset management and maintenance</p> <p>The Countryside Service would expect Highways England to begin</p>	N	The Applicant is in discussions with Hampshire County Council regarding asset management and handover.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		horse-riders	discussions at the earliest opportunity with regards to boundaries between the redline PRow network and the strategic network post construction, as there is no clear detail in the consultation materials to clarify which routes would be dedicated as PRow or adopted by the County Council to become part of the local highway network. Hampshire Countryside Service would encourage discussions in relation to responsibilities of the roundabout and WCHR underpass post-construction if this section of the network becomes part of the local highway network, where ongoing liabilities associated with it would also become or remain the responsibility of the County Council.		
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	Clarification on whether the proposed path linking to Long Lane will be dedicated as Local Highway, PRow or retained by Highways England is needed. The detailed design of any WCHR route which is transferred to Hampshire County Council must satisfy either Hampshire Countryside Service Design Guidelines or Hampshire County Council Highways local design standards and construction detail for the works to be adopted by the relevant Highway Authority. For details of PRow dedication please see the following guidance: https://documents.hants.gov.uk/rightsofway/dedicationguidance.pdf	N	The Applicant is in discussions with Hampshire County Council regarding asset management and handover.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	Opportunities for mitigation and enhancement of the existing PRow network In order to mitigate for the impact of the M3 Junction 9 improvement proposals the County Council as the PRow Authority request the inclusion of the details of proposals to improve the surfacing of existing public footpaths (marked between points A – B on the Hampshire Countryside Service map in Appendix 1) which falls within the within the red line boundary of the proposed scheme.	N	Surfacing works to public footways have not been included within the preliminary design of the Scheme. Separate designated funding will need to be agreed in order for the works to be included in the detailed design.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	The improvement of this footpath would help to provide wider enhancements to the circular routes which will link to the new routes proposed by Highways England enhancing the PRow network within the boundary of the scheme to offset impacts on user amenity and encourage active travel.	Y	As part of the pre-application process, the Applicant has engaged with stakeholders to ensure that the Scheme delivers improvements to the existing PRow network.
		Road drainage and the water environment	Lead Local Flood Authority The County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has been engaged in discussions with Highways England and its consultants to review the drainage proposals in relation to flood risk management, and a statement of common ground is currently being prepared.	N	The Applicant has engaged with Hampshire County Council on the preliminary drainage design for the Scheme. Refer to Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) .

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Road drainage and the water environment	The County Council considers that the general principles of the scheme are considered appropriate in relation to surface water management. The County Council can also confirm that additional meetings have been held which are not currently documented in the PIER.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Road drainage and the water environment	Hampshire County Council as LLFA normally has two key responsibilities in relation to a proposal of this nature: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory consultee on surface water drainage for major developments (with the LPA being the determining body); and Determining body for ordinary watercourse consents. 	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Road drainage and the water environment	In relation to the first point, the general principles set out in relation to the drainage are considered appropriate with infiltration drainage used where possible and connection to ordinary watercourses and the Main River used in other areas. Drainage will be designed to the 1:100 + 40% with any discharge rates limited to 2l/s/ha.	N	Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) has been designed to limit discharge rates to 2l/s/ha and to provide attenuation up to the 1 in 100 year + 40% climate change storm event, as per LLFA requirements. This is detailed in Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The LLFA has been consulted with regarding the drainage design.
		Road drainage and the water environment	It is understood that further work is in progress and will be submitted including (but not limited to) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Impact Assessment Flood Risk Assessment Site Investigation (to confirm infiltration rates and groundwater levels) Hydrogeological Information Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) 	N	The following documents are submitted with the DCO Application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ES (Document Reference 6.1) Flood Risk Assessment (Document Reference 7.4) Ground Investigation Report (Document Reference 7.11) Appendix 13.2 (Hydrogeological Risk Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). First iteration Environmental Management Plan (Document Reference 7.3)
		Road drainage and the water environment	Although as LLFA the County Council would not usually review temporary works, given the likely duration of the construction process, the management of construction runoff from the works and site compounds should be addressed in the CEMP and the County Council would therefore request to be consulted in relation to this element of the proposed scheme as it is finalised prior to a DCO application being submitted in the future.	N	Appendix J (Temporary (Construction) Drainage Strategy) of the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (Document Reference 7.3) has been prepared which outlines the management of the risk of silt-pollution through mitigation measures.
		Road	The content of the technical evidence base documents that will need	N	The Applicant has considered this in the work that has formed part of

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		drainage and the water environment	to be finalised will need to address the key points included in the County Council's guidance documents available on the County Council's website: Flood and water management Hampshire County Council (hants.gov.uk) for surface water assessment and the LLFA can confirm that this has already been provided to Highways England.		the application. Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) provides the design information and is considered to address the key points provided by Hampshire County Council LLFA. Formal Application for Hampshire County Council LLFA consent is under discussion between the Applicant and Hampshire County Council.
		Road drainage and the water environment	At this stage, the LLFA does not consider that there are any key issues that need to be raised with Highways England, but future discussions and subsequent agreement will need to be secured dependent on the technical details provided within the list of documents (or similar) previously referred to by the LLFA. The details in these documents should be agreed prior to the submission of a DCO application.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Road drainage and the water environment	Whilst acknowledging that this scheme is not yet at the DCO submission stage, the County Council as LLFA is keen to ensure that our statutory powers are maintained through that process in relation to the Land Drainage Act (LDA) 1991.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Road drainage and the water environment	In relation to ordinary watercourse consents, these will be required in a number of areas to implement the proposed scheme. Again, the County Council's requirements are included on the County Council's website, and it is expected that the requirements specified in the Land Drainage Act 1991 are retained but if it is sought to be disavowed, the key elements will need to be included in a specific requirement for discharge by the LLFA under section 23 of the LDA.	N	Discussions relating to Land Drainage Consent are ongoing. The Applicant will continue to engage with Hampshire County Council LLFA on this matter. The Consents and Agreements Position Statement (Document Reference 3.3) sets out the consents and agreements expected to be needed to implement the Scheme, and how these will be obtained. This includes Ordinary Watercourse Land Drainage Consent under section 23 of The Land Drainage Act 1991.
		Road drainage and the water environment	In respect of timescales which are set in future to review documentation within the DCO process in relation to LDA consents, the County Council would suggest that if there are a large number of consents required then it may not be possible to complete a bespoke assessment in the usual timelines. However, the County Council consider that there is scope to agree a 'grouping' of consents that can be undertaken using a standardised set of information / drawings to speed up that process. Given the drainage system will have been reviewed in some detail, the County Council would request that a 21 day turnaround period for this information as part of that process would be sufficient but is open to discussions around this prior to an application being submitted.	N	The Applicant notes the timescales required for the LLFA.
		Road drainage and	The fees associated with Land Drainage Consent applies a £50 per structure charge. If the LDA is disavowed as part of a Development	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		the water environment	Consent Order the County Council would need to consider what is an appropriate fee to review the likely level of information as part of the DCO.		
		Population and human health	Public Health Hampshire County Council has statutory duties for Public Health, and as such has responsibility for promoting and protecting the public's health. The comments refer to the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme, Preliminary Environmental Information Report Non-Technical Summary (Part 1 of 2) (May 2021) and are provided in relation to key public health issues and outcomes.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Population and human health	As has been made clear in the Local Highway Authority's comments, the County Council welcomes the overall ambition to reduce congestion and increase the reliability of people's journey times, as well as improve safety by reducing delays and making traffic queues shorter. The way in which people travel has an impact on their wellbeing, both physically and mentally and hence development of more effective, less congested travel networks is vital for improving and promoting population health.	N	One of the key objectives of the Scheme is to improve the safety for all road users and reduce the annual collision frequency and severity ratio on the M3 Junction 9. The Scheme objectives are listed in Section 2.2 of the Introduction to the Application (Document Reference 1.3) .
		Population and human health	Population and Health The County Council encourage any measures taken to protect the health of residents, visitors and workers in the proposed red line of the site during construction as well as during future operation of the junction.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. The first iteration Environmental Management Plan (Document Reference 7.3) sets out a number of commitments to mitigate impacts to human health from construction and operation of the Scheme. This includes but is not limited to dust management, noise management, pollution control measures and monitoring, and general best practice construction practices.
		Population and human health	The County Council also welcomes the ambition that the development will be health promoting as it improves access for pedestrians and cyclists and improves the highways environment for drivers and passengers through the reduction of traffic and congestion.	N	Two key objectives of the Scheme are to provide improvements for walkers, cyclists including connecting the National Cycle Network Route 23 which is severed by the current junction layout and to reduce delays at M3 Junction 9 on all links M3, A33 and A34
		Population and human health	The strategic objectives of the proposed scheme indeed all link to health – reducing congestion hence the reduction of stress as well as exposure to air and noise pollution; improving road safety to avoid injuries and fatalities; improving the natural environment which has a synergistic effect on population health; improving access for walkers and cyclists which promotes active travel and supports mental wellbeing; as well as supporting economic growth as we know stable, prosperous employment is essential to wellbeing. A health-first	N	The Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) concludes that the Scheme is expected to improve journey time reliability where it provides more capacity which reduces congestion and journey time delays. In addition, accidents are forecast to show a reduction with the Scheme. The Scheme includes elements that either help ensure continued access for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders or bring improvements in terms of current accessibility / severance.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			approach to the proposed development that aligns with and underpins the strategic ambitions of the proposed scheme is welcomed.		
		Population and human health	However, the County Council would like to see a full Health Impact Assessment produced in support of any DCO application. This should clearly outline any potential health impacts and how these will be directly mitigated.	N	Health is considered as part of Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document 6.1) and considers the following aspects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • health profiles of affected communities • health determinants (e.g. noise or air pollution) • likely health outcomes
		Air quality	Air Quality, Traffic and Congestion It is recognised that no level of air pollution is a safe level of air pollution, and the County Council welcome stringent prevention and management measures. Winchester City Council has ambitions to significantly reduce air pollutant emissions, and recently consulted on an emerging air quality policy in the form of a Supplementary Planning Document. Hampshire Public Health therefore support the principle of any highways development which supports a reduction in air pollution in and around Junction 9 as a public health outcome.	N	The effects of changes to traffic flows on air quality have been assessed within Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) in accordance with DMRB LA 105. Consideration of impacts to human health are reported in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Climate	Climate The County Council welcome and encourage any measures taken to mitigate the impacts of climate change, and to support the reduction of the sizeable impact of transport through the proposed scheme. While Hampshire Public Health encourages the overall reduction of road vehicles that produce emissions contributing to climate change and, in turn impacting on population health, it supports measures proposed in this consultation that aim to reduce traffic and congestion, making roads more effective for those who use them.	Y	The Scheme seeks to provide improved walking, cycling and horse-riding provision. The level of provision has increased following the 2021 statutory consultation. Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) outlines the embedded and essential mitigation that would reduce GHG emissions from the Scheme. The Applicant has applied and considered the ten design principles of Highways England’s “The Road to Good Design” document during the design development. This includes the design principle that “Good Road Design is Sustainable”. National Highways’ carbon reduction hierarchy has been applied to the scheme and aims to mitigate emissions by avoiding or preventing, reducing and remediating greenhouse gas emissions. Examples of the steps taken include (but are not limited to) measures to achieve a cut/fill balance, reducing the embodied carbon associated with the production of materials, retaining pavements where possible to reduce the requirement for new or additional materials, reusing excavated materials within the works where possible, construction compounds located close to the area of works to reduce the distance of vehicle trips, using sustainably sourced, recycled and secondary materials, using fuel efficient and electric vehicles during construction, and

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>managing and maintaining plant and equipment to ensure optimal operation and avoidance of unnecessary idling.</p> <p>The drainage design has considered climate change predictions and the second iteration Environmental Management Plan will include mitigation measures for transport, materials, waste and air quality which will help reduce emissions during construction. A Site Waste Management Plan will be implemented to manage waste during construction which will help reduce emissions associated with waste management.</p>
		Climate	<p>A body of evidence now shows active travel is a vital step in reducing air pollution and subsequent climate impacts, whilst also supporting population health through encouraging citizens to walk, cycle and use public transport. Active travel is linked to positive impacts on mental and physical wellbeing through the reduction of risk of illness such as anxiety, overweight and obesity, cardiovascular disease and Type II diabetes. Encouraging children and families to be active from a young age supports good health throughout the life course.</p>	Y	<p>The improved walking and cycling provision contribute to the active travel agenda.</p> <p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Noise and vibration	<p>Noise and Vibration</p> <p>Whilst Hampshire Public Health welcomes that the noise and vibration control measures during construction will be implemented to avoid impact on nearby receptors, it encourages Highways England to mitigate this and the operational noise of the completed scheme as far as is possible due to the effects on nearby residents, schools, places of worship as well as healthcare and other facilities.</p>	N	<p>Mitigation is incorporated in the design of the scheme, where necessary, to mitigate significant effects based on guidance provided within DMRB LA 111 (DMRB LA 111, Highways England, 2020).</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides an assessment of the impacts in relation to noise and vibration due to both the construction and operational phases of the Scheme. The chapter also identifies the embedded and essential mitigation required as a result of the assessment and these include the use of low noise road surfacing, installation of close board fencing around the main works compound, selection of suitably quiet plant and appropriate working hours for excessive noise generating</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					activities, restricting the number of plant items in use at any one time, frequent maintenance of plant and equipment, and closing compressor, generator and engine compartment doors when in use.
		Noise and vibration	The impacts of prolonged exposure to noise have been evidenced by the World Health Organisation and the local environmental health team will need to be satisfied that the impacts of the scheme during construction and in its operational phase are at an acceptable level based on the evidence and modelling that Highways England will need to provide prior to a DCO application being submitted.	N	The assessment of significance has been judged based on relevant guidance (DMRB LA 104 and DMRB LA 111, Highways England, 2020). This is current guidance and an appropriate approach. More information is in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Consultation	<p>Future Engagement</p> <p>The input of Hampshire County Council as Local Highway Authority, along with its other statutory functions, will be critical in the application process for the M3 Junction 9 improvement scheme. Whilst the County Council is supportive of the principles of the scheme and what it aims to achieve, there is a lot of detail which is yet to be agreed and it is in the interest of both Highways England and the public purse that any issues relating to the scheme are resolved before formal submission of the application.</p>	N	This is noted by the Applicant and engagement has occurred with Hampshire County Council during the preparation of the application.
		Consultation	Given the scale of this improvement scheme and the nature of the DCO application process, the County Council is seeking a Planning Performance Agreement with Highways England in order to ensure its statutory functions are in a position to engage proactively in the process and help to overcome any issues which may lead to an objection at the examination.	N	This is noted by the Applicant and engagement has occurred with Hampshire County Council during the preparation of the application.
		Consultation	Having a PPA with Highways England at this stage would enable the County Council to ensure those resources are in place for the duration of the application process and enable the County Council to participate in a proactive way.	N	This is noted by the Applicant and engagement has occurred with Hampshire County Council during the preparation of the application.
		Consultation	<p>The County Council would be pleased to discuss the comments raised in this response, and assist Highways England in progressing the scheme, once agreement on the Planning Performance Agreement has been reached.</p> <p>If you wish to discuss any of the comments raised, please do not hesitate to contact my colleague Neil Massie on 0370 779 2113 who is providing a coordinating role for the County Council on this project.</p>	N	This is noted by the Applicant and engagement has occurred with Hampshire County Council during the preparation of the application.

K.1.S: South Downs National Park Authority

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Principle of development	In summary, on the basis of the information available, the SDNPA OBJECTS to this proposal. Disappointingly given discussions and evidence we have provided, this repeats some of the same concerns raised during the previous consultation in 2019. I hope following the consultation more can be done thereafter to respond to the issues raised.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. A number of monthly update meetings have been held with the South Down National Park Authority (SDNPA) during the pre-application process. This includes a site visit on 22 October 2021. The Applicant has sought to share information with the SDNPA to develop mitigation proposals collaboratively.
		Principle of development	The SDNPA recognises the need for improvements to this strategically important junction. It is also noted that the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) acknowledges the proposed scheme will have adverse effects on the South Downs National Park (both during the construction and operational phases). Yet the information provided does not adequately assess the impacts on the National Park. This, together with inadequate mitigation measures leaves the SDNPA unable to come to a definitive view on the level of impacts of, or mitigation provided by the Scheme, hence the objection.	Y	The PEIR was a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. Subsequently, since the 2021 statutory consultation the design has been amended, particularly to the eastern side of the Scheme where the Application Boundary has been amended and deposition areas have been removed.
		Legislation and policy	As you are aware this proposal represents ' major development ' within a National Park. The National Policy Statement for National Networks (2014) paragraph 5.150 sets out the high level of protection afforded to National Parks and paragraph 5.151 the assessments necessary to determine the 'exceptional circumstances' in which the public interest may be served by the proposed development. It is required, as part of this test, that any detrimental effects on the environment, landscape and recreational opportunities are assessed as well as the extent to which they could be moderated.	Y	The Applicant recognises that this Scheme constitutes major development within the South Downs National Park. The Applicant has been working with the SDNPA and has subsequently made changes to the design to take into account the Special Qualities of the National Park. Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) assesses the impacts on the National Park and its Special Qualities. Mitigation measures have been proposed to minimise any adverse impact on the character and qualities of the National Park. These measures include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modifications to the topography and landform by using cuttings and false cuttings. This will aim to minimise the visibility of the Scheme and, where possible, reduce the visibility of the existing highway arrangement. Overall, the long-term visibility of Scheme will be minimised by using site gained material. ▪ Re-profiling the existing landform to create sympathetic features and reinforce existing characteristics whilst balancing visual screening requirements. ▪ By creating chalk grassland (LE1.3) within the permanent land-take boundary and beyond the permanent land-take boundary, by reversing to arable agriculture. ▪ Improvements to existing PRoWs with culverted and bridge crossings under and over the highways. Improvements to the

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>reconfigured gyratory roundabout, including the creation of a new walking, cycling and horse-riding (WCH) link between Easton Lane on the west side of M3 and NCN Route 23 on the east side of M3. This aims to address issues identified in published landscape character assessments relating to severance and separation between Winchester and the South Downs National Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Creation of a new bridleway link between Easton Lane and Long Walk on east side of M3 to improve connectivity within the local PRow network at the western end of the South Downs National Park. ▪ Retention of existing vegetation where possible, particularly established and mature woodland habitats, as detailed in Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary AIA) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). A reasonable worst case position has been presented and this could be improved during later design stages of the Scheme. ▪ New woodland (LE2.1 and LE2.4) and scrub/shrub planting (LE2.8) alongside new road alignments and within internal islands (planted towards the end of construction programme). Planting mixes are to be selected to ensure resilience to potential climate change effects and future pest and disease threats. ▪ Early planting (advanced planting) of new woodland (LE2.1 and LE2.4) and scrub/shrub planting (LE2.8), as indicated on the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2). ▪ Creation of new areas of chalk grassland (LE1.3) on lower slopes of the South Downs National Park open downland slopes, and adjacent to new woodland and scrub areas on cutting and embankment slopes throughout the Application Boundary. Creation of areas of species-rich grassland (LE1.3) in locations on the west side of the alignment of the M3. ▪ Drainage features are to be typically seeded with marginal aquatic grass mix (LE6.1). The infiltration feature on the Eastern slopes to be seeded with a chalk grassland (LE1.3) mix. <p>Design proposals reflect local design characteristics and use materials commonplace in the local area. New planting will be sourced from UK nurseries and locally available stock, where reasonably practicable, to help lessen the risk of introducing pests and disease. Indicative species compositions for the proposed landscape elements are</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					provided in the Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) .
		Legislation and policy	The SDNPA does not find it acceptable that the published consultation material fails to acknowledge the ‘major development’ test (other than listing out our own Local Plan policy SD3) or how the proposed scheme meets the tests laid down in the National Policy Statement.	N	The South Downs National Park Local Plan, along with Core Policy SD3, are assessed in Appendix A of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) . Chapter 7 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) assesses the Scheme against the tests laid out in the National Policy Statement for National Networks in relation to development in nationally designated areas.
		Legislation and policy	We are also objecting as the overall objectives for this Scheme do not specifically include addressing the impacts on the protected landscape (i.e., the South Downs National Park), as referred to in our 2019 consultation response and nor do they provide for the conservation and enhancement of the National Park. This is directly at odds with the ‘Memorandum of Understanding’ signed between Highways England and National Parks England in October 2019 (2019 MoU) which states that where a scheme impacts on a National Park there will be an inherent presumption to net enhancement of the wider environment and setting of the National Park rather than just mitigation of the impacts. This is also part of the Local Plan policy regarding ‘major’ development in a National Park.	Y	Chapter 7 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) assesses the case for developing the Scheme within the South Downs National Park and sets out the measures that the Applicant has designed into the Scheme to enhance other aspects of the environment. The landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The Applicant has undertaken a biodiversity assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity. The South Downs National Park Local Plan policy is assessed in Appendix A of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) .
		Mitigation	The current Scheme (and accompanying information) fails to clearly demonstrate the mitigation hierarchy through the evolution of the proposals to show that Highways England have sought to minimise the impact on the National Park (as required under the 2019 MoU) and their statutory duty to have regard to the National Park Purposes and duty.	Y	The Applicant has applied the mitigation hierarchy to the Scheme. This is outlined in Chapter 4 (EIA Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Through engagement with the South Downs National Park Authority there have been changes made to the design to reduce the impact of the Scheme on the South Downs National Park. These include removing three deposition areas and siting the construction compound adjacent to the Scheme to reduce the impact on the wider environment, the local community, and the users of the South Downs National Park. Further details are included in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Mitigation	Overall, the Scheme is a missed opportunity to demonstrate how Highways England can help contribute to the Government’s commitment to nature recovery (as set out in the Government’s 25 year Environment Plan) and the SDNPA’s ‘People and Nature Network1’ which specifically identifies the Winchester and Itchen	Y	The Applicant is working to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been working collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revised the landscape strategy and Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>area as a 'natural capital investment area'. Again the published material fails to acknowledge the 2019 MoU which states a key objective is to deliver long term benefits to the environment within the National Park.</p>		<p>of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) to respond to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it has evolved. These measures include the provision of habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) presents the results of a biodiversity metric calculation which assesses the predicted habitat losses and gains from the Scheme.</p>
		Biodiversity	<p>In addition and following the recent announcement by the Government that the Environment Bill will be amended to legislate for biodiversity net gain for new Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, it is the SDNPA's view that Highways England should be including within this Scheme proposals to achieve biodiversity net gain.</p>	Y	<p>Relevant biodiversity legislation is covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. It is calculated that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity, refer to the assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity
		Consultation	Therefore, and as set out in our 2019 consultation response, although the SDNPA recognises the basic principles of the possible mitigation as set out in the PEIR and accompanying Preliminary Environmental Mitigation Design Plan (Figure 2.6), the published consultation material has limited detail on what the ‘embedded mitigation’ and ‘essential mitigation’ actually includes. This effectively makes it impossible to accurately assess the impact of the Scheme and assess the proposal against the National Policy Statement which states high quality environmental standards are required within National Parks (as set out in paragraph 5.153). Therefore, the Authority is issuing an objection.	N	<p>The Applicant has applied the mitigation hierarchy to the Scheme. This is outlined in Chapter 4 (EIA Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>During the pre-application process, the Applicant has engaged with the South Downs National Park Authority sharing and asking for comments on the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary AIA) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) ▪ Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) ▪ Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) ▪ General Arrangement Plans (Document Reference 2.5) ▪ Figure 2.9 (Variance from Existing Level) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) ▪ Figure 2.8 (Scheme Long Sections) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) ▪ Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).
		Landscape and visual	<p>The SDNPA has also reconfirmed four key priorities (each carrying equal weight), in terms of mitigating and compensating the direct impacts of this Scheme on the special qualities of the National Park. It continues to be our view that these should be used as the guiding framework for any Scheme proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The landscape setting, this includes issues such as land re-profiling, lighting and trees / woodland screening (the landscape setting of this particular area featured prominently in the public inquiry into the designation of the National Park); ▪ Water (particularly the enjoyment of, quality and quantity impacts on the River Itchen SAC and SSSI and Winnall Moors Nature Reserve); ▪ Chalk grassland (mitigation or compensation for areas directly 	Y	<p>Since the statutory consultation in 2021, the Applicant has undertaken alterations to the landscaping design and walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals. The Applicant has upgraded the footway to a proposed bridleway, and reinforced landscape planting to the west of the route on the Scheme’s embankments / cutting slopes and on the side slopes of the land raising associated with the reprofiling. This has been done to give greater consideration to views of the South Downs National Park and visual screening of the Scheme. They provide greater opportunities for walkers, cyclists and horse riders to view the downland to the east (including created chalk grassland as part of the Scheme). This responds positively to creating further opportunities for recreational activities and access to the South Downs National Park. The design solution also maximises tranquillity of these newly accessible areas, minimising audibility of the highway through the</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>impacted by the scheme), and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to the National Park from Winchester for walkers, cyclists and other users (preventing any further severance and improving where possible). <p>As you are aware, these key priority areas were used to create a joint package of mitigation measures in conjunction with the DEFRA Statutory Agencies and the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust.</p>		<p>sympathetic earthwork solutions which also minimise visibility of the Scheme, which would increase following establishment of proposed planting.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals. The Applicant has considered the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p>
		Mitigation	<p>These measures were produced at the request of HE to be clear on types of mitigation that would be required and have been shared a number of times (most recently as part of a 'joint asks' paper signed off by both the SDNPA and Winchester City Council). Therefore, it is again disappointing that no reference has been made to that joint package of measures or how the Scheme specifically addresses them, including the delivery of a green bridge to enhance the connection between the town (city) and the Downs to which it is intrinsically linked over centuries. A copy has been attached again at Appendix 2.</p>	N	<p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design following consultation and some reflect the aspirations of this plan. However, provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme. Other bridges in the Scheme and the walking, cycling and horse-riding provision do provide for greater levels of connectivity that reflect local aspirations.</p>
		Mitigation	<p>Notwithstanding an overall lack of information with regards to mitigation, Appendix 1 contains details of where the SDNPA considers the mitigation to be inadequate, examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-profiling earthworks – Sections A-A and B-B (on Figures 2.7 and 2.8) show a 'zone of reprofiling earthworks with undulating chalk grass land creating screening of works'. This element appears to be completely artificial on the high flank of the Downland, would interrupt and truncate views to the higher ground to the east, and would not appear to be beneficial as a screening function given their proposed position; The location of some of the proposed Chalk Grassland and woodland – the site is located within and on the sides of a river valley. Typically, the valley floor is wooded pastoral mosaic floodplain with valley sides more open. This would seem to suggest that the Scheme would be best located within woodland as a strategic approach with refinements and 	Y	<p>The earthworks design has been redesigned since the 2021 statutory consultation. The Applicant has engaged with South Downs National Park Authority about the new design.</p> <p>The Applicant has shared a draft revision of the Preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) prior to the submission of the DCO application to inform about proposed loss of trees and woodland. This document forms part of the application; Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary AIA) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p> <p>The design has been developed to include creation of chalk grassland on the rolling chalk downlands and a combination of chalk grassland, woodland and scrubland within the Itchen Valley and Valley Sides to positively reinforce the identity of the landscape character and enhances habitat connectivity within the landscape.</p> <p>Revised proposals from the footway and earthworks / planting provided at consultation to include a bridleway / cycleway and amended planting proposals to provide greater opportunities for walkers, cyclists and horse riders to view the downland to the east</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>Chalk Grassland reversion to create a second tier of mitigation within the outer / higher elevation areas of the Scheme. However, Section B-B (Figure 2.8) shows that the proposed M3 south slip road and the A34 southbound will be in open Chalk Grassland;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Loss of trees and woodland – there is no information on the amount of existing trees and woodland which would be lost by the Scheme and no tree survey nor a detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessment; ▪ Adverse impacts on the perceptual qualities of the National Park, such as tranquillity. It is unclear what mitigation is proposed to address these impacts and likely timescales for any proposed mitigation planting. The SDNPA needs to see a substantial and detailed planting plan and specification and confirmation of the locations where advanced planting is proposed to help mitigate the significant impacts caused by the construction phase; ▪ Proposed attenuation ponds – some of the proposed locations for attenuation ponds appear to be uncharacteristic of the chalk geology and landscape and may require substantial engineering works in their own right; ▪ Lighting – there is no light assessment, however, the Scheme should demonstrate that there will be no net increase in light spill in the National Park and that any new lighting proposed will comply with the guidance in the Authority’s Dark Skies Technical Advice Note (updated May 2021); ▪ Excess spoil management - the current proposals for use of excess spoil material is a missed opportunity to deliver mitigation and enhancement measures, for example to support St Catherine’s Hill and Magdalen Hill Down; ▪ New Footpaths – it is proposed that the two largest footway improvements (to both the east and west of the Scheme, as highlighted yellow and blue on Figure 2.9) would be for pedestrians only. This is in direct conflict with the HE’s stated strategic objectives for the Scheme to create a ‘more accessible and integrated network’, the second statutory purpose of a National Park and other national guidance, including from the Department of Transport, which promote opportunities for active travel modes. 		<p>(including created chalk grassland as part of the Scheme). This responds positively to creating further opportunities for recreational activities and access to the South Downs National Park. The design solution also maximises tranquillity of these newly accessible areas, minimising audibility of the highway through the sympathetic earthwork solutions which also minimise visibility of the Scheme, which would increase following establishment of proposed planting.</p> <p>The design of the proposed attenuation basins has balanced spatial constraints with design requirements with due regard to their location, and maximising biodiversity value. Some of the attenuation features will be of typical dry nature reflecting the surrounding landscape features, whilst others will contain permanent water allowing for further biodiversity options to be explored.</p> <p>The Scheme includes lighting of the underpasses and two gantries. A lighting assessment for the proposed gantry mounted illuminated signage has been undertaken in accordance with South Downs National Park Authority’s <i>Dark Skies: Technical Advice Note</i> as reported in Appendix 7.7 (Technical Note: Lighting Assessment of Gantry Signage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). A lighting assessment has not been undertaken for the underpasses as lighting features are limited to the underpasses and not visible from the wider landscape.</p> <p>The three deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Walkers, cyclists, and	In addition, it would also contradict HE’s assurance to the SDNPA in August 2019 (following the previous consultation and concerns raised about the then proposed new route on the eastern side of the	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the PRow provision to the east of the M3 has been altered to incorporate horse riders. This route is

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		horse-riders	M3) that ‘a new walking, cycling and horse riding route is proposed on the eastern side of the M3, between Easton Lane and Long Walk’.		approximately 1,717m in length.
		Mitigation	We would also like to repeat, the Environmental Statement and other information which will accompany the Development Consent Order application needs to set out in detail how the specific mitigation measures will be delivered and secured. If these specific measures are not secured through any Development Consent Order then they cannot be taken into account when assessing the likely significant effects of the proposed Scheme.	N	<p>The Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme and the measures to avoid or reduce such effects. The ES forms part of Volume 6 Environmental Information of the application and has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)) Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the EIA Regulations).</p> <p>Specific mitigation measures identified within the ES are set out and secured within the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 7.3) and this will be developed refined into a second iteration EMP prior to construction and then into a third iteration EMP once construction is complete. The fiEMP is secured through Requirement 3 of the draft Development Consent Order (Document Reference 3.1).</p> <p>Details of other consents and licences required for the Scheme are set out in the Consents and Agreements Position Statement (Document Reference 3.3).</p>
		Construction – compound locations	We are further concerned that the proposed location for construction compounds and in particular the central construction compound and potential temporary soil treatment area have been moved back inside the National Park, with little information on what consideration, if any, has been given to sites outside of the National Park. Therefore, we re-instate our objection as these construction compounds would be harmful for the appearance and landscape character of the National Park and could be sited outside of it.	Y	The Applicant notes this response. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme and the land take has been minimised. In addition, the construction compound footprint has been reduced in size. Refer to Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) for information on the construction compound options that have been considered and discounted.
		Principle of development	The SDNPA objects to the Scheme as currently presented. We would welcome however the opportunity to work with HE with a real commitment on both sides to address matters properly, to try and resolve these issues prior to a Development Consent Order application being submitted in early 2022.	N	The Applicant has worked with the South Downs National Park Authority by engaging in monthly update meetings, including a site visit to discuss the proposed landscaping plans and changes to the landform.
		Consultation	The following detailed comments are structured around the SDNPA’s four key priorities (as identified in the covering letter) and where relevant cross references the published consultation material. The SDNPA expects the issues set out below to be addressed and the SDNPA afforded the opportunity to comment before the Development Consent Order (DCO) application is submitted.	N	This comment is noted by the Applicant.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Landscape and visual	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA117 Landscape Design Standards for Highways (2019), sets out in Point 2.4 (Section 2 Principles and Purpose) 'A project's design strategy shall establish a landscape strategy (design vision) and/or a set of defined landscape objectives for the project early on in the development of motorway and all-purpose trunk road projects as an essential part of the design process' (our emphasis).	N	<p>This comment is noted by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant has applied and considered the ten design principles of Highways England's "The Road to Good Design" document (as referenced in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)).</p>
		Landscape and visual	A landscape strategy has not been included in the PEIR and although a range of measures have been referred to, there is no overall project objective which refers to protecting and enhancing a nationally designated landscape (which benefits from the highest levels of protection) and it is unclear what mitigation measures are proposed.	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the updated design has been shared with the South Downs National Park Authority. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) has been updated to refine proposals, taking on board feedback.</p> <p>The proposed planting and topography have been designed to reinforce the local characteristics of the area. Adjacent to the carriageway, woodland planting is proposed to restrict views of the roads and mimic the characteristic features present within the Itchen Valley whereas chalk grassland creation is proposed on the surrounding elevated landforms, this reinforcing the openness characteristics of this landscape. Views to and from the South Downs National Park have informed the design response.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. Overall, the Scheme design has been developed to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined LCAs (LCA G5: Itchen Valley Sides and LCA A5: East Winchester Downs, and LCA F5: Itchen Floodplain).</p> <p>Given the wooded context of the highway (within the Itchen Valley), the Scheme has aimed to retain existing vegetation where reasonably practicable and minimising permanent land take by reducing the Scheme footprint and returning land to agriculture following temporary use. The Itchen Valley is wooded in character and the Scheme has sought to replicate and reinforce this characteristic. Within the surrounding elevated landscape of the Winchester Downs, the creation of chalk grassland has sought to provide a design solution which is responsive to the more open characteristics, and a priority habitat of the local environment. Overall, the landscape strategy provides a solution which is responsive to the place whilst meeting the requirement of the Scheme.</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Landscape and visual	The SDNPA welcomes the recognition at 7.7.9 of the PEIR that the National Park will be treated as having very high sensitivity and that as set out in Table 7-2, landscape receptors will be considered of high value depending upon location relative to the National Park. However, this approach appears to be inconsistent with other landscape receptors which are generally components of the National Park and have been given a high (not very high) level of sensitivity, for example topography.	N	<p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) highlights the landscape receptors and the application of sensitivity for each, which considers the relationship to the South Downs National Park. Rationale is provided for landscape receptor.</p> <p>Appendix 7.3 (Schedule of Landscape Effects) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) sets out the assessment on landscape receptors and provides details on the baseline, receptor sensitivity, the magnitude and nature of the changes, and the nature and significance of the effect of those changes.</p>
		Landscape and visual	The Authority requests that a consistent approach is taken and ‘very high’ sensitivity is the norm where landscape components are part of the National Park. This would correctly represent the worst case scenario and provide a consistent approach towards the National Park within the assessment.	N	<p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) highlights the landscape receptors and the application of sensitivity for each, which considers the relationship to the South Downs National Park. Rationale is provided for landscape receptor.</p> <p>Appendix 7.3 Schedule of Landscape Effects of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) sets out the assessment on landscape receptors and provides details on the baseline, receptor sensitivity, the magnitude and nature of the changes, and the nature and significance of the effect of those changes.</p>
		Landscape and visual	As highlighted in the concerns above about landscape sensitivity, it is considered that the topography baseline is poorly described and this failing has implications for the design and mitigation sections of the Landscape Chapter in the PEIR and future Environmental Statement to support the DCO. In addition, this issue emphasises the objection raised (in the covering letter) about the major development test and the lack of a project objective to protect and enhance a nationally designated landscape.	Y	<p>The design of the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk has been revisited and redesigned to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. This design has progressed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority who confirmed they were generally content with the progress the design was showing to respond to some of the concerns, specifically changes to landform and topography. The proposals to the change in topography are referenced in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase was sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, has prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition.</p> <p>The re-profiled landform is acknowledged to affect a larger area in the immediate vicinity of the M3 corridor, however on balance this is still considered to result in more environmental benefits as identified above and fewer negative environmental impacts as a result of the removal of deposition areas. It would also require spoil to be transported over a shorter distance, resulting in lower carbon emissions and less vegetation affected by fewer entry points through vegetated field boundaries.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Scheme constitutes ‘Major Development’</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) where it is considered in detail the compliance of the Scheme with the NPS NN in relation to development within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>Appendix 7.3 Schedule of Landscape Effects of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) sets out the assessment on landscape receptors and provides details on the baseline, receptor sensitivity, the magnitude and nature of the changes, and the nature and significance of the effect of those changes.</p>
		Landscape and visual	The existing topography of the site and the study area is bold and dramatic and there are significant geophysical features. The topography then has a marked effect on land use patterns, circulation and transport routes, settlement patterns, biodiversity, heritage and hydrology and visibility.	N	<p>This has been considered as part of the baseline to inform the sensitivity of the landscape receptor and how this contributes to the special qualities of the national designation.</p> <p>In addition, relevant landscape receptors including topography are considered, and potential effects set out within this chapter Section 7.10 of Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Appendix 7.3 (Schedule of Landscape Effects) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p>
		Landscape and visual	For example, the topography is formed by chalk which is a distinctive geology and presents particular issues for cuttings and embankments. The chalk Downland, cut through by the River Itchen (which has formed its floodplain along the valley floor), Winchester City rising up the western valley side with largely arable Downland to the east (rising to 100m within the study area) and with the existing M3 passing along the lower part of the eastern valley side. The valley context coupled with rising Downland to east and west together with the nature of the proposals makes topography a very highly sensitive receptor.	N	The Landscape Character Areas LCA A5: East Winchester Open Downs, LCA F5 Itchen Floodplain, LCA G5: Itchen Valley Sides within the South Downs National Park and LCA 8G: East Winchester Open Downs within Hampshire County have been considered as highly sensitive landscape receptors in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Landscape and visual	The Authority considers that whilst the PEIR acknowledges the National Park as a high sensitive receptor, the topography has not been understood or used to help shape the Scheme and the proposed mitigation measures. Examples of this lack of understanding are set out below.	Y	Additional work has been undertaken since the PEIR to review and update the design proposals in relation to topography on the Open Downland landscape. Further details can be found in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternative) and Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Landscape and visual	The site is within and on the side of a river valley, the valley floor is typically a wooded pastoral mosaic floodplain, with the valley sides more open and intensively arable farmed, some pasture and woodland further east. This would suggest that the Scheme would be best located within woodland as a strategic approach with refinements and Chalk Grassland reversion to create a second tier of mitigation within the outer / higher elevation areas of the Scheme. However, Section B-B (Figure 2.8) shows that the proposed M3 south slip road and the A34 southbound will in fact be in open Chalk	Y	<p>Woodland has been prioritised within the valley floor and sides with chalk grassland creation prioritised on the open downland landscape. In accordance with National Highways policy, areas of grassland within the valley floor required for visibility splays, maintained and utility easements will be low nutrient grassland with chalk grassland the most suitable grassland type. Further details can be found within the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p>The landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance existing</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			Grassland.		<p>defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas (LCA) (LCA G5: Itchen Valley Sides and LCA A5: East Winchester Downs, and LCA F5: Itchen Floodplain).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthworks which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland.</p> <p>The requirement for chalk spoil deposition, generated during construction of the Scheme, on agricultural land within wider areas of the South Downs National Park has been minimised. This is a landscape scale enhancement measure which responds to the objectives of the National Park and positively reinforces and enhances a key characteristic of the South Downs National Park through creation of priority chalk grassland habitat. The Scheme design also minimises agricultural severance to existing land parcels.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape and away from the highway network.</p>
		Landscape and visual	The use of Chalk Grassland within the lower embankments and inter-structural parts of the Scheme is questioned. These areas will be difficult to maintain properly as Chalk Grassland (for example due to the sloped angles and issues with access for long term maintenance) and it is considered that these elements will not provide any screening or noise reduction benefits and will not mitigate for the loss of the existing highway vegetation.	Y	The maintenance of chalk grassland has been set out in the Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) noting its potential challenges. This will be finalised in the LEMP which is secured by a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1) .
		Landscape and visual	Sections A-A and B-B (on figures 2.7 and 2.8) show an area called 'zone of reprofiling earthworks with undulating chalk grass land creating screening of works'. This element appears to be completely artificial on the high flank of the Downland and would interrupt and truncate views to the higher ground to the east. The SDNPA would question whether this is actually a suitable location for surplus spoil and the proposed screening function of these works would not appear to be beneficial to receptors to the east (in the short or long term) due to their elevation and distance.	Y	Additional work has been undertaken since the PEIR to review and update the design proposals in relation to topography on the Open Downland landscape. A solution which maximises visual screening whilst responding to the profiles of the landforms has been taken forward. Further details can be found in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternative) and Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Landscape and visual	<p>The SDNPA welcomes the clarification set out in Table 7-1. However, and as set out in previous correspondence to HE in February 2021, the Authority would like further clarification on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In relation to our suggested viewpoints C, D, F, G and K, it would be very helpful if HE could overlay the viewpoints on the ZTV image as it would appear that viewpoints C, D, F and K would be visible, and; ▪ The position of Viewpoint 10 has not moved since the Scoping Opinion Report (albeit it is acknowledged that at the Scoping Opinion Report stage there were two locations marked '10' on the plan and now there is only one). As highlighted in the Authority response to the Scoping Opinion Report, Whiteshute Lane is also an area of Open Access Land and there are open elevated views from this publicly accessible location. Therefore, the Authority requests that the viewpoint be moved to the open Downland to ensure it reflected an appropriate worst case scenario. 	Y	<p>Appendix 7.1 (Landscape and Visual Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) provides rationale for inclusion and exclusion of View Locations (View Locations both those proposed by the Project and suggested by the stakeholders). Consultation on View Locations is detailed below.</p> <p>View Locations, C, D, F, G, and K are shown on Figure 7.7 (ZTV of the Scheme (Traffic, No Traffic and Gantries) with View Locations of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) to show the location in relation the visibility of the Scheme.</p> <p>The location of View Location 10 has been discussed and agreed during workshops with South Downs National Park Authority (Sept 2021). A review of VL 10 has been undertaken to ensure the final location represents the worst-case scenario within the open access land. View Locations not included in the visual assessment have been overlaid on Figure 7.7 (ZTV of the Scheme (Traffic, No Traffic and Gantries) with View Locations) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)</p>
		Landscape and visual	We welcome the intention that a UK Forestry Standard (UKFS) compliant woodland management plan will be integrated as part of any Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.	N	An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan has been prepared as Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . The design and management has considered the UKFS principles on guidelines of Forest and Landscape as part of sustainable forest management. This document has been shared with the South Downs National Park Authority prior to submission of the DCO.
		Landscape and visual	However, the published information does not adequately disclose the amount of existing trees and woodland which will be impacted by the Scheme. There are various references through the document to 'retained where reasonably practical', that a tree survey has been undertaken, that the Scheme could potentially include advanced planting and that opportunities for landscape enhancement or improvement through the management of any retained areas will also be explored.	N	Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary AIA) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) identifies the reasonable worst case extent of vegetation loss likely to occur as a result of the Scheme. This has principally looked to avoid loss wherever possible and where this is not practicable appropriate mitigation for replacement features has been proposed considering the constraints that the Scheme poses (i.e., visibility splays, utility diversion easements etc). Advance planting is proposed as part of the Scheme and details are provided within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
		Landscape and visual	As per our 2019 consultation response, the SDNPA has not seen a tree survey nor a detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessment. Without this information, the SDNPA is unable to provide comprehensive comments on all the likely significant impacts and mitigation and compensation measures which will be required, and has no option to conclude other than that the impact on trees would be substantial and harmful.	N	Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary AIA) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) sets out the vegetation loss assuming the reasonable worst- case position. <p>Potential effects on existing vegetation as a landscape feature have been considered within Appendix 7.3 (Schedule of Landscape Effects) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). This has been informed by Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary Arboricultural Impact</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p> <p>Mitigation identified within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) includes new woodland and scrub/shrub planting alongside new road alignments and within internal islands (planted towards the end of construction programme). Planting mixes will be selected to ensure resilience to potential climate change effects and future pest and disease threats. Early planting (advanced planting) of new woodland and scrub/shrub planting as indicated on the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p>
		Mitigation	The SDNPA would expect advanced mitigation in the form of planting to screen views of the construction works and that any advanced mitigation also be designed to improve habitat connectivity.	Y	<p>Early planting (advanced planting) of new woodland and scrub/shrub planting as indicated on the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>The design draws on the character of the existing landscape including the South Downs National Park and its setting, as well as its ecology and heritage. The design aims to retain existing vegetation with proposed areas of woodland, scrub, and linear planting within the internal islands and periphery of the highway corridor, to replace lost features, strengthen the green infrastructure network and habitat connectivity, and provide visual screening of the infrastructure.</p>
		Landscape and visual	Although no ancient woodland has been identified within the application boundary, and as acknowledged in the PEIR, woodland under 2 ha may not appear on the Ancient Woodland Inventory but may still have ancient woodland characteristics. The SDNPA would like to see any surveys have been undertaken. Consideration also needs to be given to increasing and enhancing the connectivity of woodlands and hedgerows and these should be clearly stated as part of any mitigation and enhancement measures.	N	<p>Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary AIA) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) sets out the vegetation loss assuming the reasonable worst-case position. Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary AIA) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) has considered for the presence of ancient woodland and trees and veteran trees to inform the iterative design process and baseline constraints. No ancient woodland and trees or veteran trees have been identified within the Application Boundary.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) also considers the presence of ancient woodland. No parcels of ancient woodland, ancient trees, or veteran trees have been identified within the Application Boundary. A number of parcels of ancient woodland have been identified on the ancient woodland inventory within 2km, the closest being 475m north-west of the Scheme, as presented on Figure 8.4 (Non-Statutory Designated Areas) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2). Further parcels of ancient woodland are present beyond the 2km study area, but within 200m of the ARN. Further details of these can be found in Appendix 8.3 (Assessment of Air Quality Impacts on Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					Reference 6.2) identifies areas for new woodland and scrubland planting which will contribute to enhancing connectivity of these resources as part of the Scheme’s mitigation package.
		Mitigation	We note the acknowledgement within the PEIR, that the Scheme will have adverse effects on the perceptual qualities of the National Park, such as tranquillity. However, it is unclear what mitigation measures are proposed to address this issue and we are concerned about the likely timescales before the proposed planting referred to the PEIR has matured to provide sufficient mitigation. Therefore, the SDNPA would expect to see the DCO application accompanied with a substantial planting plan and in certain locations advanced planting to help mitigate the significant impacts caused by the construction phase.	Y	Proposed modifications to landform have been included to mitigate impacts on tranquillity within the South Down National Park. Visual analysis and noise modelling has identified limited visibility and perceptible noise increase from the baseline situation. The analysis has also identified improvements through reduced visibility and noise within the South Down National Park when accessing the new bridleway between Easton Lane and Long Walk. In addition, extensive woodland, scrub and linear belts of planting have been included with a number of areas identified for advanced planting where there is potential for this accounting for construction programme and benefits to provide increased screening at an earlier time in the Scheme lifecycle. Opportunities for advanced planting as part of an early stage of the construction programme have been identified on the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . Advanced planting would be undertaken at the start of construction works to provide opportunity for establishment during the construction period to provide improved mitigation at the opening of the Scheme.
		Landscape and visual	As set out in our 2019 consultation response, any assessment of the Scheme also needs to acknowledge and consider the multiple benefits provided by the current landscape characteristics and how the Scheme impacts upon those multiple benefits.	N	The Applicant notes the Scheme’s impacts on the landscape in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and sets out the sensitivity of the landscape resource (both its character and its individual features) considering the importance, quality /condition, rarity, value and scale of contribution to the landscape character, and assess the impacts from the Scheme to these elements.
		Construction – deposition areas	The SDNPA welcomes the expansion of the ‘Indicative Application Boundary’ (IAB) since 2019 to include land for potential mitigation and enhancement measures. However, we are concerned with the extent of the IAB in relation to areas for potential excess spoil management. This is because in these areas, spoil will need to be graded to tie in with existing contours and will require sufficient room to achieve this effectively. Currently the red line of the IAB has straight edges which cut across contours and this may not be conducive to achieving this aim.	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Application Boundary has been amended and the deposition areas have been removed.
		Construction – deposition	In addition, the lack detailed information on the proposed landforms (for example, references are made to the spoil being a height of up	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Application Boundary has been amended and the deposition areas have been removed

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		areas	to 4m) it is not possible to comment, therefore an objection is raised.		
		Construction – deposition areas	Please also see our additional comment on the proposed excess spoil areas in the Chalk Grassland section below.	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Application Boundary has been amended and the deposition areas have been removed
		Construction – compound locations	As highlighted in the covering letter, the SDNPA objects to the proposed locations of the site compounds within the National Park.	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the proposals for the main central construction compound have been revised. The Applicant reduced the impact of the central construction compound by reducing its footprint and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area of the tree line.</p> <p>By locating the compound close to construction activities associated with the junction improvement, the Applicant is minimising impacts on tranquillity from a wider area within South Downs National Park and reducing the need for additional vehicle travel. Concentrating activity also minimises the potential for impacts of the diverse views from within and towards the South Downs National Park. Collectively these help retain enjoyment of the special qualities of the South Downs National Park.</p>
		Construction – compound locations	Of significant concern, is the proposed location for the central compound and soil treatment area (as shown as Number 1 on Figure 2). It is unclear what process has been gone through to establish why this is the preferred location (when it was removed from the previous proposal) and whether it has been included in the initial landscape impact assessment work (for example it is unclear if it has been included in the ZTV in Figure 7.8).	Y	<p>The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the location of the construction compounds during the refinement of the current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been studied by the Applicant and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the proposals for the main central construction compound have been revised. The Applicant reduced the impact of the central construction compound by reducing its footprint and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area of the tree line.</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					By locating the compound close to construction activities associated with the junction improvement, the Applicant is minimising impacts on tranquillity from a wider area within South Downs National Park and reducing the need for additional vehicle travel. Concentrating activity also minimises the potential for impacts of the diverse views from within and towards the South Downs National Park. Collectively these help retain enjoyment of the special qualities of the South Downs National Park.
		Construction – compound locations	The proposed location for the central compound is high on the valley side and whilst screened from the ‘Spitfire Link’ and to the west by the existing highway woodland belt, it would be highly visible from the National Park in closer views.	Y	The central construction compound has been reduced in size and located to the north of the woodland belt (now largely retained) within a slight depression within the landscape. Its reduced size and location maximise the benefit of natural screening features from the surrounding landscape.
		Construction – compound locations	The SDNPA considers that a compound in this location would be an unacceptable incursion beyond the existing highway into open landscape of the National Park beyond the valley side and it would have detrimental effects on Easton Lane (the main NMU connection from Winnall). In addition, it is considered that there may be conflict with the existing site entrance and entrance to the existing Highway Depot which could result in the entrance to the proposed compound being relocated for safety reasons, resulting in further tree and hedgerow loss.	Y	The compound had been sited at this location having considered many factors including visual impact, access to and from the highway and availability of service connections. The selected vehicular access from the A272 is the only viable point to safely access the eastern extent of the scheme. The Applicant anticipates that this would be restricted for no right turn entrance and exit to aid traffic flow and avoid congestion build up. A swept path analysis for vehicle turning will be undertaken to ensure safe exit of vehicles. The entrance and exit is likely to be enhanced. The area in question is utilised within the scheme environmental mitigation and there will be a significant increase in hedgerow and tree planting in this location as a result of the scheme. There will also be provision of close board fencing around the compound.
		Road drainage and the water environment	As highlighted in our 2019 response, whilst the principle of SuDs and attenuation ponds is supported (and can provide multiple benefits) the SDNPA has significant concerns if they are to be located in sensitive areas (for example due to topography or habitat sensitivities) and if the form and locations are uncharacteristic of chalk geology and landscape. For example, the location of the proposed attenuation basin close to the River Itchen SAC / SSSI and the basins shown on the eastern side of the Scheme (shaded blue on Figure 2).	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation the Applicant has carried out further work to understand the visual impact of the balancing ponds. The site is very constrained, and the topographic form of the land is high on the east side to low on the west where the River Itchen is located. The principal of the design is that it is gravity fed, discharging at a controlled rate into the river. To reduce the extent of cut into the hill side the design incorporates filling on the downward side of the basins to create increased storage volume. Screening in the form of planting will be provided to the south and east of the ponds to ensure that the views to the balancing ponds are limited.
		Biodiversity	As set out in the covering letter, following the recent announced by Government that the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, this Scheme should clearly demonstrate how it could achieve that requirement. Other specific	N	The Applicant has undertaken a biodiversity assessment, please refer to Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . This report concludes that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			comments relating to biodiversity are set out below.		
		Biodiversity	In Table 8.5 of the PEIR the SDNPA would question the rationale for determining the importance of some species given their legal status. For example, the table refers to the fact that 'Dormouse are present within suitable woodland scrub and hedgerow habitat within the IAB and adjacent habitats. Whilst dormouse are distributed across southern England, they live at low densities and are becoming increasingly scarce due to habitat fragmentation. They are listed as common in Hampshire (PTES, 2013) and so would not meet the threshold for 'county' importance, but their general scarcity makes them of importance at the local level'. Dormice are a European protected species and protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. The SDNPA considers that the fact that they are a species in decline means that the presence of a healthy population is of far greater than local importance. Another example is that Badgers are listed as only locally important.	N	<p>Most legally protected species are classified as 'important ecological features' and are therefore carried forward through the assessment, with mitigation provided where necessary. Where protected species are present within or adjacent to the Scheme, which are not considered 'important ecological features', measures have been included in the mitigation package to enable legal compliance, and where possible to provide an enhancement.</p> <p>For dormice and badgers, protected species licences will be obtained to allow construction to progress lawfully, with any required mitigation agreed with Natural England and secured within the licences. An importance level has been attributed to each ecological feature in accordance with CIEEM's geographic framework (CIEEM, 2018). The geographical framework has used the following levels of nature conservation importance: International, National (England), County (Hampshire), Local (The Scheme and its local environments, including Winchester), Less than local.</p> <p>Determining the importance level attributed to a species is guided by the overall distribution and status within the geographical area. Legal protection is a consideration, but this needs to be carefully interpreted. For instance, badger are legally protected due to historical persecution, however the species is widespread and abundant across much of lowland Britain.</p>
		Biodiversity	On the issue of habitat connectivity, whilst chalk grassland verges and species poor hedgerows may have low value they often contribute to connectivity. Habitat corridors and connectivity is an area that is not covered within the PEIR, where cumulative impacts rather than individual habitat impacts should be given more weight.	N	Chalk grassland and hedgerows are both Habitats of Principal Importance and are valued at local level importance within the Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) . The Scheme will result in a significant net increase in both of these habitat types. Connectivity for wildlife is discussed throughout Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) , and the overall landscape design has been developed to improve connectivity for wildlife.
		Biodiversity	In addition, the current Scheme is a missed opportunity to provide habitat connectivity / enhancements (and biodiversity net gain) through the design and materials proposed for the many bridges and other structures within the scheme. For example, it is noted that the Kingsworthy Bridge will need to be 'reconfigured', there is an opportunity to use green wall cladding, as demonstrated by the Millbrook Roundabout in Southampton (referred to as the Living Wall at Millbrook), to demonstrate mitigation and improvements for biodiversity and provide as many opportunities as possible to connect up habitats across the whole Scheme.	N	<p>Delivering for biodiversity has been a key principle within the design from the outset. Chalk liberated during the construction phase will be used to provide landscape and biodiversity enhancements including the provision of significant areas of chalk grassland to the east of the Scheme.</p> <p>The preferred structure solution for roads crossing under one another are buried boxes, with one key benefit being to reduce the visual impact of the new structures on the South Downs National Park. The structural form enables their decks/roofs to be buried with habitat potential alongside the new road corridors. The adjoining retaining</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					walls have options to potential partially adopt vegetated wall systems which will be developed during detailed design. From a landscape perspective, all of the bridges, apart from the main junction structure, lie in existing valleys and are therefore not prominent structures.
		Cultural heritage	We welcome the amendments / clarifications provided in the PEIR following on-going discussions with SDNPA (such as those set out in 6.3.7).	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Cultural heritage	With regards to the statement at 6.6.15, we would like see some acknowledgement that waterlogged archaeological remains includes the potential for levels of preservation specific to materials that comprise rare findings in the archaeological record (such as textiles).	N	This has been acknowledged within Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) and in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Cultural heritage	For the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures (set out in section 6.7 of the PEIR) the SDNPA stress that appropriate time must be allocated to proposed archaeological mitigation activities.	N	Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) notes that sufficient time should be provided to allow pre-construction archaeological work to be carried out. Suitable time has been allocated within the proposed programme for construction of the Scheme.
		Cultural heritage	In terms of the paleoenvironmental remains (referred to in 6.7.2 of the PEIR), the SDNPA would expect to see the mitigation measures to include the use of a recognised paleoenvironmental specialist (i.e. someone with recognised experience of the paleoenvironmental potential within the South Downs).	N	Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) notes that geoarchaeological and paleoenvironmental work should be carried out by a relevant specialist.
		Cultural heritage	With regards to 6.7.3 - 6.7.4 of the PEIR, any assessment also needs to acknowledge that mitigation is effectively preservation by record, which is in itself a destructive process and mitigation through design includes preservation in situ.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. This is acknowledged in the text in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Cultural heritage	The SDNPA would also like to repeat that any archaeological mitigation both identifies enhancement opportunities in relation to archaeological sites, interpretation and research, and in turn revisits the archaeological findings from the original road construction and subsequent development of the M3 to ensure advancement of knowledge and understanding draws on previous research, finds and archives.	N	These issues are addressed in Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) which reflects the views of the Key Heritage Stakeholders. Enhancement measures are also set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
		Lighting	We welcome the acknowledgment within the PEIR of the South Downs International Dark Skies Reserve and references to no lighting on the junction and slip roads. However, in the absence of a Lighting Assessment the SDNPA cannot comment in detail on the lighting impacts of the proposal.	N	The Scheme includes lighting of the subways, underpasses and two gantries. A lighting assessment for the proposed gantry mounted illuminated signage has been undertaken in accordance with South Downs National Park Authority's <i>Dark Skies: Technical Advice Note</i> as reported in Appendix 7.7 (Technical Note: Lighting Assessment of

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>Gantry Signage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). A lighting assessment has not been undertaken for the underpasses as lighting features are limited to the underpasses and not visible from the wider landscape.</p> <p>No other permanent lighting is included. The effects of lighting have been considered within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
		Lighting	As set out in our 2019 consultation response, the Authority would look for this proposal to take the opportunity to enhance dark night skies in the National Park by reducing light spill and, at the very least, to result in no net increase in light spill in the National Park.	N	<p>The lighting proposed to illuminate the PRow underpasses would be designed to minimise light split. The landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) has included an assessment of effects of proposed lighting on night-time views and the mitigation measures proposed to mitigate for such effects.</p>
		Lighting	The SDNPA would also expect to see any new lighting comply with the lighting guidance in the Authority's Dark Skies Technical Advice Note (updated May 2021). Such a requirement has been secured on other NSIPs in the National Park.	N	<p>Due regard has been given to South Downs National Park Authority's <i>Dark Skies Technical Advice Note (updated May 2021)</i> when preparing the operational lighting..</p> <p>The fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) includes the following commitment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The gantry-mounted signage will be lit. This lighting is required for safety in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, CD 365 Portal and cantilever signs/signals gantries. The gantries are located outside of the South Downs National Park; however, lighting should be within the parameters for requirements of Environmental Light Zone in which the gantries are located (E2 / E1b) as set out in the <i>South Downs National Park (TLL-10), Technical Advice Note</i>. <p>The Environmental Management Plan (Document Reference 7.3) will be secured through a DCO requirement.</p>
		Climate	As per our 2019 consultation response, whilst the focus on climate change mitigation in terms of impacts from CHG emissions is welcomed, it is the SDNPA's view that there is scope for the Scheme to make a positive contribution to landscape scale adaptation responses to climate change and it is disappointing that even at this stage, the PEIR makes no reference to this and how the Scheme could provide mitigation and enhancement measures to help tackle climate change (for example selecting plant species for water capture or to help with air quality).	N	<p>Design proposals reflect local design characteristics and use materials commonplace in the local area. New planting would be sourced from UK nurseries and locally available stock where reasonably practicable to help lessen the risk of introducing pests and disease. Indicative species compositions for the proposed landscape elements are provided in the Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). These have focused on provided species of local provenance and respond positively to the local character whilst providing a diverse mix to which supports resilience to climate change.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides an assessment in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>Regulations) and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 114 Climate (Highways England, 2021) on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of the Scheme on climate change (from greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions – ‘carbon’) • Vulnerability of the Scheme to climate change (climate change risk assessment (CCRA)) <p>The assessment and reporting of GHG emissions considers both construction and operation phases of the scheme.</p> <p>The scope of the CCRA covers the operational phase of the Scheme, assuming a 60 year design life.</p> <p>Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) outlines the embedded and essential mitigation that would reduce GHG emissions from the Scheme.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	In terms of impacts to water, the SDNPA’s concerns relate to the protection of groundwater and the potential for increased pollutants and the proposed mitigation measures in the form of SuDs and attenuation ponds. The concerns about the form of the mitigation measures are set out in the Landscape Setting section above. The comments below relate to water quality issues.	N	<p>The fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) includes measures considered standard good practice that would be implemented by the construction contractor to ensure no detrimental impacts on water quality.</p> <p>Construction methods such as appropriate piling techniques (if required) to minimise the risk of mixing of aquifer bodies through the creation of new pathways would form part of the essential mitigation. The temporary drainage strategy for construction compounds and the wider Scheme would ensure minimal impacts on groundwater quality due to pollution control measures.</p> <p>The drainage strategy is designed so that surface water runoff is stored in extended detention basins (EDB) before being discharged to the watercourses/groundwater.</p> <p>A National Highways Water Risk Assessment Tool (HEWRAT) screening assessment and Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) has been undertaken in Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) to confirm the impact of the proposed EDBs on groundwater quality.</p> <p>EDBs that are located in solid chalk geology have been sized assuming an impermeable liner, so that no infiltration is possible (Extended Detention Basins 1, 3A and 4). Where basins overlie granular, drift geology, infiltration has been assumed within the design of basin volumes.</p> <p>The results of the HEWRAT assessment demonstrate that none of the EDBs are likely to result in an impact in groundwater from soluble contaminants within the sediment lining the base of EDBs (chronic risk).</p> <p>The DQRA undertaken to further assess the risk from the un-lined</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>EDBs confirms that the acute risk from soluble contaminants has been assessed as low. The contaminant concentrations in the EDBs as derived from the HEWRAT assessment are below the UK Drinking Water Standards and thus pose no significant risk to groundwater.</p> <p>The lowest return for a spillage incident is 1 in 253 years which meets the minimum 1 in 200 year return period expected for spillage probability in the context of River Itchen SAC.</p> <p>The proposed drainage discharges runoff via a far greater area of infiltration over granular soils, which provides a betterment in risk to groundwater from the existing M3 Junction 9 drainage configuration.</p> <p>Soil and water testing on samples as part of the Controlled Waters risk assessment confirmed that risk to groundwater was low based on soil samples from soil disposal and fill areas.</p> <p>No measurable impact upon the aquifer/chalk groundwater WFD body has been identified by HEWRAT/DQRA (both acute soluble and chronic sediment related pollutants) and risk of pollution from spillages has been assessed as less than 0.5%.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	Of principal concern is the siting of the works on Source Protection Zone 1 for groundwater and the potential for operational discharges to soakaways. Ideally, future drainage schemes should not be direct to a soakaway without additional interventions.	N	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) and Appendix 13.2 (Hydrogeological Risk Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) have been prepared, addressing these concerns. Amendments to the Application Boundary and Scheme have occurred such that the northern compound (located in Source Protection Zone) is no longer required. The proposed drainage strategy measures all lie outside of the Source Protection Zones.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	Also of concern is the protection and enhancement of the ecological balance and species within the River Itchen and surrounding areas (including biodiversity net gain). The River Itchen has a number of specific designations and is one of our best examples of a lowland chalk river.	N	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a biodiversity assessment, please refer to Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p> <p>A Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) has also been undertaken in relation to the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation (SAC). This concluded that with implementation of the mitigation measures set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3), the pollution prevention measures in Appendix 13.1 Drainage Strategy Report of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) and the habitat management measures set out within Appendix 7.6 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), there would be no adverse effects to the River Itchen SAC as a result of the Scheme alone, or in combination with other projects or plans.</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Road drainage and the water environment	There are major risks of contamination of the River Itchen during construction and operation of the scheme, as the only river in the National Park that has good 'Water Framework Directive' (WFD) status, all necessary measures, should be put in place to avoid any pollution incidents or impact on the chemical composition of the river water.	N	<p>The fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) outlines good practice recommendations for the prevention of contamination which include measures to comply with relevant legislation, guidance and best practice measures. This document will be submitted with the DCO Application. After DCO consent, the siEMP will be prepared for pre-construction and construction phases of the Scheme.</p> <p>Please refer to the Water Framework Directive Assessment (Document Reference 7.7) which details the potential impact that the Scheme and associated works could have on the watercourses' ability to meet WFD requirements, and any mitigation measures that would be implemented.</p> <p>The River Itchen, Nun's Walk Stream, and Itchen Navigation Canal WFD surface water bodies, and the WFD Itchen River Chalk groundwater body, have all been assessed within the WFD Assessment (Document Reference 7.7). The assessment concludes that the proposed widening of the M3 Junction 9 carriageway and implementation of the new footway/cycleway bridge crossing will not have any significant long-term impacts on the ecology or water quality within the water bodies. The creation of potential new pollutant pathways through piling and the temporary impacts during the construction phase will be avoided and minimised through the adoption of best practice techniques and the implementation of a robust fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and siEMP, and Environmental Control Plans (detailed in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and siEMP) which will be completed prior to construction commences.</p> <p>The works will not affect the ability for the key actions identified in the RBMP to be implemented for the catchment, and as such, the works are compliant with the WFD and will not prevent the water bodies from achieving Good status in the future.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	Whilst we acknowledge that the PEIR recognises these important issues, and we welcome the references to SuDs and their design being developed in consultation with the project ecologist, without the detailed information which is referred to being contained in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy (and other information) the SDNPA cannot assess whether the overall effects (including mitigation) on water quality will be 'neutral' as asserted in the PEIR.	N	<p>During pre-application the Applicant has shared Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) with the South Downs National Park. In addition, there have been extensive discussions with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Hampshire County Council) on this report and its contents, with updates as required.</p> <p>A number of other assessments have also been undertaken to support the assessment of water quality with Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). These assessments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (Document Reference 7.7)

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HEWRAT assessment within Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) • Appendix 13.2 (Hydrogeological Risk Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) • Flood Risk Assessment (Document Reference 7.4)
		Road drainage and the water environment	We also welcome the acknowledgement within the PEIR that the River Itchen discharges directly to further, coastal European sites (the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA and Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar site) and the issue of 'Nitrate Neutrality' has not been scoped out of the assessments.	N	<p>A Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (Document Reference 7.7) and HEWRAT assessment within Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) and Appendix 13.2 (Hydrogeological Risk Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) has been completed which considered nutrients and nutrient pathways and is reported in Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment).</p> <p>Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) also considers pathway-receptors in relation to geology and groundwater.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	However, we are disappointed that Scheme does not propose mitigation or enhancement measures to address this issue. For example, during the operational phase, the Scheme could have a significant positive benefit taking land out of agricultural use and converting it to a use (for mitigation) that does not artificially increase the nitrogen load of the land and / or creating wetland environments that act as a nitrogen sink and remove nitrogen from the river (a catchment management solution).	N	The Applicant notes the comment made by South Downs National Park Authority promoting the removal of agricultural land (which would include Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land) from use in the local area. The removal of BMV land would result in an impact to the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) as a resource, which is assessed in Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Landscape and visual	The SDNPA welcomes the principle of proposed Chalk Grassland as a form of mitigation for the Scheme, and we would welcome Chalk Grassland creation on current scrub land (such as parts of St Catherine's Hill) and the arable land (east of the M3).	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The design does include creation of new areas of chalk grassland (east of the M3 corridor) on lower slopes of the South Downs adjacent to the highway corridor in areas undergoing land reprofiling, and areas of chalk grassland creation on the lower open downland slopes within the South Downs National Park.</p>
		Landscape and visual	However, and as highlighted in comments earlier, the SDNPA would question the proposed the location of some of the Chalk Grassland and is seeking assurances that the long term management of the Chalk Grassland has been 'designed in' from the start as this type of habitat is 'man made' and will quickly scrub over unless it is cut or grazed regularly.	N	<p>The proposed location of Chalk Grassland is shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Management commitments are outlined within the fiEMP (Documents Reference 7.3) such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of species-rich grassland (LE1.3) (including those with chalk grassland characteristics) are proposed in locations on

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					the east side of the M3 alignment including in areas where conversion from arable farmland is required. Management to become species-rich grassland will vary due to the underlying soil and subsoil type as indicated on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and detailed within Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . This includes commitments to undertake soil sampling to determine conditions of the soil and measures required to prepare the soil for successful species rich grassland establishment.
		Landscape and visual	The proposed areas of Chalk Grassland need to be designed with good management in mind, in terms of access, degree of slope, and if grazing is proposed, water supply and fencing into suitable grazing cells. The SDNPA is concerned that failure to address these issues now will affect the viability of the mitigation proposals.	N	The South Downs National Park Authority have been consulted on the proposed location of chalk grassland as the design has evolved. The management of this habitat has been fully considered and is set out in Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) .
		Geology and soils	As set out in our 2019 consultation response, whilst it is noted that the PEIR makes reference to a search for designated 'Regionally Important Geological Sites' (RIGS) and none being found within the area, in the SDNPA's experience this does not mean that there are no features of significance in that area. At the present time, the SDNPA would advise that there is a shortfall in the identification and designation of significant Geological and Geomorphological sites and features, which means there is risk they could be missed entirely.	N	Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of impacts upon geology, soils, contamination (human heath, surface water, groundwater) and the built environment during both the construction and operation of the Scheme in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 109 Geology and Soils amongst others. LA 109 considers both designated and undesignated sites such as: a) Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); b) Areas of Special Scientific Interest (ASSI); c) Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS); d) Local Geological / Geodiversity Sites (LGS); e) Geological Conservation Review (GCR) sites; and f) Earth Science Conservation Review sites (ESCR).
		Geology and Soils	The SDNPA would suggest that a scheme of investigation be established alongside the site works, similar to the approach taken for archaeological investigations. This would be especially desirable in relation to any work on cutting or the exposure of new chalk faces. This scheme of investigation could include arranging a walk-over by a geologist to ensure that adequate opportunity is given to research and document existing stratigraphy or any important features that may exist before they are lost. As with the archaeological strategy, if agreed, this could be added to a future Statement of Common Ground.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Deposition	The SDNPA is concerned that the current proposals for use of	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation the Applicant has removed all

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		areas and landscape and visual	excess spoil material is a missed opportunity to deliver mitigation and enhancement measures. There is a real opportunity to provide multiple benefits by using the chalk deposition to create species rich grassland rather than just returning it to agricultural use (as stated in Figure 2.6).		three deposition areas which were included as options at statutory consultation. The material has been integrated into the landscaping proposals through more sympathetic ground reprofiling, with shallower land raising across a wider area which provides functional as mitigation for the Scheme (earthwork bunds) and the opportunity for chalk grassland creation. Please refer to Figure 2.8 (Scheme Long Sections) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) . This conserves the land within the National Park that would have been affected by the deposition areas. Areas of proposed Chalk Grassland (LE1.3) are shown on the long sections issued as part of the DCO Application. These drawings have been shared with the South Downs National Park Authority during the pre-application process.
		Construction – deposition areas	For example, the southern area proposed for excess soil management (shown on Figure 2), is just downhill of Magdalen Hill Down, the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Butterfly Conservation’s flagship site in Hampshire (which fulfils the National Park’s first Purpose) as well as being directly adjacent to the South Downs Way (which fulfils the National Park’s second Purpose). Creating rich grassland in this area could deliver multiple benefits, including helping to provide habitat connectivity, possible biodiversity net gain and could help to address the issue of ‘Nitrate Neutrality’ (by taking agricultural land out of use).	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the decided to remove all three deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
		Construction – deposition areas	In addition, and as already set out in the information provided to HE to date, excess spoil could also be used at St Catherine’s Hill (identified as areas 6 and 9 in the joint package of mitigation measures in conjunction with the DEFRA Statutory Agencies and the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust) to deliver the restoration of Chalk Grassland in this important area.	Y	The Applicant notes this comment and has made changes to the design and the Applicant Boundary to minimise permanent land take.
		Construction – deposition areas	The SDNPA would again strongly encourage the HE to hold discussions with the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust about exploring this option further.	N	During the pre-application process, the Applicant has engaged with the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	Paragraph 2.4.27 of the PEIR refers to <i>‘existing provision for horse-riders will be improved with a widened 3m route, which includes mounting block...and.....future provision for horse-riders is allowed for (beyond the existing cessation point within the roundabout) by providing a wider bridge over the M3 for a 3m width route’</i> . The SDNPA considers that a 3m wide route is insufficient to accommodate a horse and rider side by side particularly where there will be vertical infrastructure adjacent such as subway walls or bridge parapets.	Y	The Applicant has engaged with the British Horse Society to ensure the improvements to the existing bridleway at the M3 Junction 9 gyratory are acceptable to horse riders. On both sides of the gyratory (east and west), the existing walking and cycling route which links both parts of Easton Lane, would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. The existing provision for horse-riders is being retained, and as part of the Scheme would be improved with a widened 3m route (with 4m wide underpasses), which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway to enable rider dismounting for leading horses

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>through to continue the route to the existing bridleway extent (which currently ceases within the existing roundabout).</p> <p>An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	The SDNPA expects a 5 metre wide route as this would be in line with current standards for bridleway provision (in accordance with guidance from DMRB, Interim Advice Note 195/16 – Cycle, Traffic and the Strategic Road Network and the British Horse Society).	N	<p>CD 195 is not applicable as this bridleway is not on the trunk road and motorway network. LTN 1/20 is more appropriate and covers cycle infrastructure design including those on other rights of way such as bridleways and routes within public open space. However, this document does not specify minimum or recommended widths for bridleways. The 5m requirement stated may be in relation to Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT) rather than a bridleway.</p> <p>Hampshire County Council's Design Standards Path Widths clarifies that the desirable path width and heights for vegetation clearances are to be a minimum width of 2.5m and height of 3.5m for bridleways (or paths which are also open to cyclists and/or horse-riders).</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	As highlighted in the covering letter, the SDNPA does not consider it acceptable that the proposed footway improvements are intended for walkers only (as referred to 2.4.28 – 2.4.31 in the PEIR).	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	Earlier iterations of the Scheme indicated that the route on the western side would be a walking and cycling route and Highways England gave assurances to the SDNPA in 2019, that 'a new	Y	This route to the east of the M3 has been amended the proposals to ensure provision for horse riders by ensuring a maximum gradient of 1:20.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<i>walking, cycling and horse riding route is proposed on the eastern side of the M3, between Easton Lane and Long Walk’.</i>		An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	Given that the intention on the western side is to utilise the abandoned carriageways and the route on the eastern is a new route to be constructed, the SDNPA can see no reason why the routes could not be for all users as there would be sufficient width to provide path fit for all to use.	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation the walking route to the west of the M3 (Winnall to Kings Worthy) has been revised to include a cycling route with the proposed use of redundant carriageway. During the pre-application process, this provision has been discussed with Hampshire County Council.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	In addition, a shared use path (particularly on the western side) is more likely to generate greater uptake of sustainable modes of travel by people currently using vehicles for short utility journeys. The increased uptake of E-bikes, for example, means that more shorter journeys could become car free if the infrastructure was provided.	Y	The majority of the walking, cycling and horse-riding provision is within the South Downs National Park and which enables better access to the National Park for the public, especially from the urban area of Winchester which is acknowledged as currently having poor connectivity.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	Therefore, the SDNPA objects to the Scheme (and does not agree with the statement set out in 12.9.36 of the PEIR) due to its currently inadequate provision for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders and its inconsistency with current national policy which seeks to ensure transport schemes support increased uptake of active travel modes (for example the Department of Transport publication ‘Gear Change: A bold vision for Cycling and Walking and LTN1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design).	Y	<p>In response to comments made during the 2021 statutory consultation, amendments have been made.</p> <p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the provision of National Cycle Network Route 23. On both sides of the gyratory (east and west), the existing walking and cycling route which links both parts of Easton Lane, would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. The existing provision for horse-riders is being retained, and as part of the Scheme would be improved with a widened 3m route (with 4m wide underpasses), which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway to enable rider dismounting for leading horses through to continue the route to the existing bridleway extent (which currently ceases within the existing roundabout).</p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway, footpath and cycle track for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Tesco’s situated on Easton Lane. The route runs parallel to the west of the A33 with the route to be constructed within the existing verge. A signalised (unlit) Toucan crossing is proposed adjacent to the proposed National Highways depot roundabout, to provide a link to this route through the north-western side of the gyratory roundabout. The route then transitions to utilise the existing A34 northbound and A33 carriageways which are to be abandoned as part of the Scheme. The existing informal link to the existing PRoW would also be upgraded from its connection to the A33. For the first River Itchen</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>crossing (i.e. most northern), the route follows the existing A33 and is accommodated on the existing bridge deck abandoned carriageway.</p> <p>For the second river crossing (i.e. most southern), the Scheme includes a new cycle/footbridge to be constructed across the River Itchen, with the route extending south along the east of the new A34 alignment, crossing under the A34 in a new 4m wide subway which would then traverse around new attenuation basins, then progressing to the existing depot junction and towards NCN 23 via a new subway under the northern arm of the gyratory roundabout.</p> <p>An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	As the Scheme design progresses, the SDNPA will also expect that views from any proposed new path on the eastern side of the Scheme (from Winnall Down) will be considered i.e. viewing locations are designed in where the topography aids views along / over the valley but the (lower level) roads can be screened out.	Y	The routing of the bridleway has been designed to maximise visual interest within the South Downs National Park and promote views away from the highway. Views will include those of both the surrounding landscape of the South Downs National Park and the urban area of Winchester.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	The SDNPA does welcome the intention to explore other improvements to the PROW network (as set out in 12.7.65 of the PEIR). However, it is disappointing that given the discussions to date and the creation of the joint package of mitigation measures referred to in the covering letter, that those improvements are not identified at this stage.	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
		Walkers, cyclists, and	In relation to 12.9.27 of the PEIR, we would also welcome further clarity about proposed measures for mobility impaired users. For	Y	The proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding routes have been designed to DMRB and LTN1/20 standards, which include guidance

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		horse-riders	example, further information is needed about the proposed gradients along the length of the route(s) and particularly around the access to subways.		on appropriate gradients and design of subways. Bridleways, footpaths and cycleways have been designed to allow all gradients to be less than 1:20 to comply with Department for Transport's (DfT) inclusive mobility impaired users. The walking, cycling and horse-riding routes are designed for cyclists, and therefore as all horizontal radii are suited for cyclists, they are also considered acceptable for mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of users have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	In relation to 12.9.28 of the PEIR, the SDNPA would expect to see any upgrade to facilities to accommodate sufficient headroom so that horse riders do not need to dismount at any point and also sufficient width for two way walking/cycling/equestrian traffic is provided. This is particularly relevant where vertical objects are adjacent to the path such as walls / fencing / parapets as these effectively reduce the usable width (as set out in LTN1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design).	N	A subway route with a ridden horse requires 3.7m headroom which is 1m more than a route with a horse being led. Due a combination of the space available within the gyratory and the increased depth of subway tie-in levels to the proposed Scheme, it is not feasible to provide a compliant design for a ridden horse-route. 4m wide subways have been proposed which are compliant with DMRB CD 143 (also compliant to non-trunk road scheme guidance LTN 1/20) and suitable space provided for mounting blocks according to British Horse Society advice literature. The provisions have been discussed with the British Horse Society.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	In addition, the SDNPA would like confirmation that links to the Itchen Valley Way and St Swithuns Way from the new proposed footpath bridges over the Itchen channels will be provided, as between them these new bridges would create a circular route around the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve without affecting access to the Reserve itself.	Y	Please refer to Figure 2.4 (Existing and New Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) of information on proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding routes.
		Population and health	Table 12-5 of the PEIR does not acknowledge the SDNPA's comments on the Scoping Opinion Request. The SDNPA would encourage that any assessment on health and population includes, where possible, the impact of COVID-19. For example, the need to address health implications of COVID-19, and our changing relationship with green space (and needs around access to green space) as part of COVID-19 recovery for communities.	N	Where relevant, consideration has been given to how the COVID-19 pandemic may have had impacts on the baseline section of Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , for example community land and assets usage or accessibility to facilities and services. During construction of the Scheme, access to open space would be maintained where possible, and provision of alternative routes or diversions provided.
		Traffic and transport	Whilst the SDNPA is not the Local Highway Authority, and no detailed traffic modelling information has been made available, we would like to understand if the traffic modelling has / will take into account future (potential) changing work patterns as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, is there any impact on the baseline assumptions around vehicle numbers and use, as well as potential peak time scenarios?	N	To date, no sensitivity testing relating to potential pandemic impacts on travel demand and behaviour has been undertaken. The requirement for this can be considered at later stages of the scheme development in line with emerging forecasting guidance. Low and High traffic growth sensitivity tests have been undertaken as part of the economic assessment and are reported in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) .

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Traffic and transport	Linked to transport and ‘cumulative effects’ with the M3 Junction 9 to 14 upgrade works, the SDNPA would like to understand with the recent Government announcement that motorway upgrade works will have increased requirements for radar based stopped vehicle detection (SVD) on motorways, will there be a need for additional gantries to carry these radar units and how have / are they being taking into consideration for the M3 Junction 9 proposals?	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment, however this comment is relevant to the M3 Motorway Upgrade Project team, as this element of work is separate from the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme.</p> <p>As outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Motorway Upgrade Project is formally paused following the ministerial statement on 12 January 2022. However, National Highways is planning to upgrade the existing central reservation barrier to concrete, to deliver safety benefits. This scheme is known as the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Safety Barrier Improvement Scheme.</p> <p>Given the central reservation work from the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Safety Barrier Improvement Scheme is due to take place prior to the construction of the Scheme, it has been considered as part of the future baseline.</p>

K.1.T: Eastleigh Borough Council

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Consultation	Thank you for consulting us on the proposed M3 Junction 9 Improvements Scheme. While it is noted that the proposed works are not located within Eastleigh Borough it is considered that impacts may arise within the borough and sufficient information is needed to ensure these can be fully assessed. Our comments are set out below using the subject areas used in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report & Non-Technical Summary, however please note there is some cross-over between subject areas in the comments made.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Consultation	Introduction – The proposed scheme It is noted that none of the proposed works are located within Eastleigh Borough however the following are some general comments about the nature of the proposals and supporting information.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	Improvements to facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians are welcomed as part of the scheme and additional information on this is needed. All improvements should be in accordance with the DMRB CD 143 – Designing for Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding and CD195 – Designing for Cycle Traffic, to ensure that routes are coherent, direct, comfortable, attractive and safe for all users. It is noted that equestrians will need to dismount and lead horses through the upgraded NCN Route 23. Ideally the requirement for this should be designed out of the scheme as horses are easier to control when being ridden rather than led. At the very least mounting blocks will be required and such facilities should be seamlessly designed into the landscape setting. Information on improvements to wayfinding for active travellers is also needed.	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length <p>The link between Winnall and Kings Worthy is proposed as a shared, unsegregated footpath/cycleway route. The adjacent roads (A33 and A34) throughout the route's extent form part of the trunk road network and, as such, are designed to DMRB CD 143.</p> <p>The Easton Lane to Long Walk has been designed to allow for horse</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					riders, with a maximum 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. During the pre-application process the Applicant has engaged with the British Horse Society to progress and refine the design. This includes the implementation of mounting blocks at the subways.
		Air quality	Air Quality Within the 1km buffer from the air quality study area is Eastleigh's Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). As per the response to Highway England's consultation on the Scoping Opinion and Eastleigh Borough Council's response, the report assesses air quality in Eastleigh including for the AQMA. From this, we note the inclusion of Eastleigh's monitoring data from 2015 to 2019 which ranges from mostly compliant to exceedance on the roadside of A335 within AQMA No. 1.	N	The Air Quality assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) includes consideration of impacts on a selection of representative receptors within the borough of Eastleigh, including the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and designated habitats within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN). Please refer to Figure 5.2 (Affected Road Network) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) .
		Air quality	According to the report, the potential magnitude for likely significant adverse effects during construction effects cannot be ruled out and work is ongoing in the assessment of air quality while traffic modelling of the construction phase is yet to be finalised.	N	An assessment of impacts on air quality during construction is provided in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Air quality	For the operational phase traffic emissions while modelling work is ongoing the report says due to falling background levels of pollution, concentrations of pollutants due the scheme will increase but may not be significant. It is noted that the report outlines the increase in road traffic flows on the M3 south of Junction 9 and so through Eastleigh and the AQMA will be 4608 AADT, which is a growth of about 3.5%.	N	An assessment of air quality impacts during operation is provided in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Consultation	Noting the outcome of the assessments is yet to come, we ask Highways England to continue to consult Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC) on air quality.	N	This comment is noted.
		Air quality	From an ecological perspective if the scheme intends to improve traffic flows only around Junction 9 of the M3 and not to increase capacity of the M3 generally then any changes to air quality and associated nitrogen deposition arising from the construction and operational phases should be relatively localised to the application area at Junction 9 and should have negligible effect on the habitats of Eastleigh Borough.	N	The Air Quality assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) includes consideration of impacts on receptors within the borough of Eastleigh, including the AQMA and designated habitats within 200m of the ARN.
		Landscape and visual	Landscape & Visual In considering the suggested Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) it is considered that some locations that appear to be at a higher elevation on the Ordnance Survey plan have not been included in the ZTV. It is requested that the preliminary ZTV assessment is reviewed	N	Additional ZTV modelling has been undertaken as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and presented as Figures 7.5 to 7.11 of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.3) . The analysis extends beyond the 3km study area to cover a 5km radius from the Application Boundary which includes areas of

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			to ensure all potential locations at a higher level have been included in the final version of the report.		elevated landform within this area. This extent is considered proportionate to the nature of the proposals and their location within the Itchen Valley.
		Landscape and visual	It is noted that none of the proposed works are located within Eastleigh Borough however the following are some general comments about the nature of the proposals and supporting information.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Landscape and visual	<p>The indicative General Arrangement Plan illustrates the considerable scope of the proposed works, and there are a number of elements which will be of interest from a landscape perspective as detailed design progresses as follows and the relevant information should be included in the Environmental Impact Assessment in due course:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed earthworks - in particular the very extensive chalk/grass bund - the landscape and visual impact of this bund should be assessed, with appropriate mitigation to ensure this feature 'sits' comfortably within its setting. In this regard, some cross-sections through this bund and adjacent land will be helpful. The contouring and landscape treatment of the embankments needs to be detailed. 2. There are a number of proposed drainage basins and the design of these should be as naturalistic as possible, with the aim of maximising biodiversity gain. 3. The potential visual impact of this project is high as demonstrated by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility plan submitted. A comprehensive Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) is required, with particular emphasis on any visual impact on views from within the South Downs National Park to the East. The VIA should include assessing the impacts of any proposed lighting. 4. A Landscape Impact Assessment is required and measures to reduce and mitigate impacts on the River Itchen are required. 5. Details of protective fencing to areas of existing retained planting and soft landscape. 6. A detailed planting and earthworks specification is required, including a soils management plan. 7. Comprehensive and detailed soft landscape plans are required, with a focus on maximising habitat enrichment. 	Y	<p>Mitigation measures have been developed as part of the iterative design process. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) sets out the embedded and essential mitigation measures being proposed for the Scheme. The Applicant replies to Eastleigh Borough Council's comments below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) and Figure 2.8 (Scheme Long Sections) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) have been consulted on with the South Downs National Park Authority following their responses to the statutory consultation process undertaken in summer 2021. This has included removal of the proposed bunding and sympathetic placement of earthwork materials to support visual and acoustic mitigation whilst responding to the landscape landform profiles. 2. The design of the proposed attenuation basins has balanced spatial constraints with design requirements with due regard to their location, and maximising biodiversity value. Some of the attenuation features will be typically dry in nature, reflecting the surrounding landscape features, whilst others will contain permanent water allowing for further biodiversity options to be explored. 3. Additional ZTV modelling has been undertaken as part of the LVIA and presented as Figures 7.5 to 7.11 of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.3). This includes further analysis of elevated features, such as gantries and variable message signs (VMS), as well as consideration of the existing retained vegetation and proposed mitigation. The effects of lighting have been considered within the LVIA, see Section 7.10 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Appendices 7.3 and 7.4 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). 4. Relevant landscape receptors are identified Section 7.7 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), and potential effects set out analysed.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>5. Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary AIA) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), sets out the vegetation loss and tree protection measures required in accordance with BS 5837:2012.</p> <p>6. A draft Soil Management Plan is appended to the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>7. Detailed planting proposals, including specification, will be developed as part of the detailed design of the Scheme. These will be informed by the parameters defined on the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) and identified in Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p>
		Air quality	<p>Air Quality</p> <p>As noted above if the scheme intends to improve traffic flows only around Junction 9 of the M3 and not to increase capacity of the M3 generally then from an ecological perspective any changes to air quality and associated nitrogen deposition arising from the construction and operational phases should be relatively localised to the application area at Junction 9 and should have negligible effect on the habitats of Eastleigh Borough.</p>	N	The Air Quality assessment presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) includes consideration of impacts on receptors within the borough of Eastleigh, including the AQMA and designated habitats within 200m of the Affected Road Network.
		Noise and vibration	<p>Noise & Vibration</p> <p>Similarly, from an ecological perspective any changes to noise and vibration should be relatively localised to the application area at Junction 9 and have negligible effects on the habitats of Eastleigh Borough. However, it should be clearly stated that ecology is a sensitive receptor. "Designated areas" (Section 8.3 of the Non-Technical Summary) is ambiguous.</p>	N	The study area for noise and vibration is outlined in Figure 11.1 (M3 Junction 9 Noise Study Areas, Noise Measurement Locations and Receptors) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) . The assessment methodology is outlined in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Water Quality</p> <p>Please note that comments in relation to water quality are included under Road Drainage and Water Environment below.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Landscape and visual	<p>Wildlife corridors</p> <p>These are important functional features to consider and they extend significantly beyond the surrounds of the development. They allow for the natural dispersal and migration of species and prevent the isolation of habitats. The River Itchen is a major wildlife corridor for the region and any restrictions to the natural movement of wildlife either during the construction or operational phases could have a significant impact on wildlife over a wider area, including that in</p>	N	Effects from severance and fragmentation of habitats have been assessed within the Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and measures included within the design to enable continued movement of wildlife through the Scheme and wider area. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) includes habitat creation and enhancement measures which provide substantial additional areas of biodiversity rich habitats.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>Eastleigh Borough. Physical obstacles, which include noise, lighting and vibration can act as barriers and impede movement. A long term-change of habitat structure caused by Nitrogen deposition could also potentially form a barrier for some species e.g. Southern damselfly. Effects on the River Itchen will be considered as part of the Environmental Statement and Habitats Regulations Assessment but other wildlife corridors must also be considered and protected and any increase in obstacle size (such as road widening), will have to be appropriately mitigated. Free movement within wildlife corridors must be retained throughout the construction phase and connected wildlife networks strengthened and restored through the scheme for the operational phase (through well located and designed green-blue infrastructure).</p>		<p>Field surveys for suitable southern damselfly habitat undertaken in 2020 following methods set out in Thompson <i>et al.</i> (2003) have confirmed that habitats within and adjacent to the Application Boundary are sub-optimal for southern damselfly and unlikely to support this species.</p>
		Noise and vibration	<p>Noise & Vibration As for air quality, it is assumed that the traffic modelling currently in progress will inform an update to the noise assessment. The study area for noise is, from the assessment methodology, much less than for air quality. Increases in flows as mentioned above have effect over a much greater range however, including from heavy good vehicles naturally because of the eastern and northern regional routes to the port. The preliminary findings for the study are that significant effects are unlikely at human receptors during the operational phase and for construction, the effects will be more likely near works and worksites which are distant from Eastleigh.</p>	N	<p>The construction and operational effects of the Scheme on noise and vibration receptors is presented in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). During construction, mitigation outlined within the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) will result in less significant effects on noise receptors.</p>
		Noise and vibration	<p>Noting the outcome of the assessments is yet to come, we ask Highways England to continue to consult EBC on noise impact.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>
		Noise and vibration	<p>As noted above, from an ecological perspective any changes to noise and vibration should be relatively localised to the application area at Junction 9 and have negligible effects on the habitats of Eastleigh Borough. However, it should be clearly stated that ecology is a sensitive receptor. “Designated areas” (Section 8.3 of the Non-Technical Summary) is ambiguous.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	<p>Road Drainage and the Water Environment Eastleigh Borough is downstream of Junction 9 within the River Itchen catchment and therefore has the potential to be affected by the proposals, however the extent of the proposed assessment area regarding this is unclear. Section 10.1.1 of the Non-Technical Summary states that the “the road drainage and the water environment assessment comprises a buffer zone of 500m around the Proposed Scheme boundary”. If this means that the assessment</p>	Y	<p>The study area has increased from 500m proposed within the Scoping Report to 1km due to stakeholder requests and further review of the Zone of Influence. The 1km buffer is considered a suitable extent to assess direct potential impacts as well as encompassing indirect pathways, such as the migration of surface-borne pollutants, and the effects of any prolonged interception of groundwater flows. The study area encompasses surface water and groundwater features and</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>will only extend 500m downstream of the application boundary, then this is not far enough and should be in the order of kilometres. It should be noted, for example, that the important salmonid spawning gravels that lie along the stretch of the Itchen (including tributaries) between Junction 9 and into Eastleigh Borough are particularly susceptible to the slightest increase in sediment. This matter was discussed in detail at the hearing into the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) in December 2020/January 2021.</p>		<p>associated uses, located up to 1km from the Application Boundary. Land within the study area is considered to be in hydraulic connectivity with the Scheme to assess potential indirect impacts. The study area is based on the source-pathway-receptor' pollutant linkage principle. A 1km study area is considered appropriate for the assessment of surface water and groundwater quality soluble pollutants as beyond this dilution would be expected to occur and therefore reduce potential impacts.</p> <p>Although located further than 1km from the Application Boundary, the River Itchen Navigation Canal (a heavily modified water body located just under 5km to the south of the site) has been included in this assessment due to its status as a Water Framework Directive designated waterbody. The mitigation measures outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3), Water Framework Directive Assessment (Document Reference 7.7), Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) and Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) will ensure sediment loads within the River Itchen are not increased.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	<p>The Non-Technical Summary acknowledges that the scheme may affect changes to flow and water quality of ground water and surface water during construction. However, these impacts are also likely to occur during the operational phase if the scheme is not designed correctly and therefore they must be assessed. This includes safeguarding against low flows in existing watercourses, therefore ensuring flow direction and quantities are maintained (or improved) and ensuring there is no increase in sediment or contaminants entering the watercourses (a baseline must first be established).</p>	N	<p>Appendix J (Temporary (Construction) Drainage Strategy) of the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) has been prepared which outlines the management of the risk of silt-pollution through mitigation measures.</p>
		Climate	<p>Climate</p> <p>It is noted that in terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, the Environment Statement has taken into account "... a future uptake in electric vehicles." However, electric vehicles still contribute to congestion and, like petrol or diesel vehicles, cause pollution from tyre wear and break dust emissions. The manufacturing process of batteries also has a significant environmental impact.</p>	N	<p>Pollution from tyre wear and dust emissions are not within the scope of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Emissions from the manufacturing of EV vehicles is not within the boundaries of the Scheme, just as assessing the manufacturing of petrol and diesel vehicles is not within the Scheme boundaries or influence. The Defra Emissions Factor Toolkit used to model the estimated GHG emissions from vehicle movements, accounts for likely changes to vehicle fleet composition such as increasing use of electric vehicles (EVs) up to 2050 which is applied to both the 'Do-Minimum' (DM or baseline scenario) and 'Do-Something' (DS) scenarios for each assessment year. This approach is in line with DMRB LA 114 Climate methodology (National Highways, 2021).</p>
		Climate	<p>The supporting information confirms that the scheme will increase traffic and therefore the full impact of the scheme in relation to its impact on the Climate Emergency declared by Hampshire County</p>	N	<p>Traffic modelling results are recorded in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10).</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			Council, Winchester, Eastleigh and others needs to be considered and mitigated against. Consultation with Landscape and Ecology Officers will be critical in this regard to ensure a biodiverse landscape can be created to enhance the setting of the scheme and ensure substantial green and blue infrastructure corridors are created that link cohesively to surrounding networks.		The Applicant has worked with stakeholders to develop a biodiversity and landscaping mitigation package which includes provision of habitats of ecological and landscape value which are appropriate to the local area. This is presented on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
		Climate	There is potential for the public artwork/s (referred to on Figure 6) to support the mitigation process and this will need to be acknowledged and explored further in the Artist's Brief. For example, artworks could harness sustainable energy generation and partly or fully cover their own maintenance costs.	N	The provision of public artwork lies outside of the scope of this Scheme and will not be provided.
		Climate	<p>Other opportunities to support commitments to mitigate climate change include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduce green and blue walls to reduce hard surfaces and control water at source ▪ Maximise tree and soft landscape planting to reduce hard surfaces, slow surface water run-off, provide shade and create habitats / corridors for biodiversity ▪ Incorporate where possible permeable surfaces and multi-functional SUDS in accordance with advice from Landscape and Ecology Officers ▪ Retain and enhance existing green and blue infrastructure ▪ Utilise low carbon materials 	N	<p>Proposed planting for the Scheme is shown in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>SuDS opportunities have been maximised across the Scheme in coordination with the landscaping and ecology proposals. The majority of drainage attenuation, treatment and discharge elements are SuDS features. Permeable surfaces are being considered as part of the footway/cycleway routes.</p> <p>As part of the Scheme, the Applicant proposes to use warm mix asphalt (WMA) instead of hot mix asphalt, reducing embodied carbon associated with the production of materials.</p> <p>Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) outlines the embedded and essential mitigation that would reduce GHG emissions from the Scheme.</p>
		In-combination and cumulative effects	<p>In Combination and Cumulative Effects</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given as to how this scheme, other future road improvement works, and strategic and planned developments together will impact on Eastleigh and what provisions will be accommodated to ameliorate an intensification of air pollution and noise levels in particular. As road traffic modelling progresses and the inclusion of relevant other developments is updated, together with the motorway we understand the cumulative assessments including for temporal overlap will be reconsidered. We trust improvements and any other new schemes will be included for in a proportionate way to safeguard positive outcomes in the future. Noting the outcome of the cumulative impact assessments is yet to come, we ask Highways England to continue to consult EBC on these regarding air quality and noise.</p>	N	A cumulative effects assessment has been undertaken in line with Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 17. Refer to Chapter 15 (Cumulative Effects) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The study area over which an effect from a project is likely to be experienced is presented in the chapter.
		In-	It is noted that a number of developments proposed within Eastleigh	N	A 'long list' and subsequent 'short list' of other developments which

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		combination and cumulative effects	Borough are being considered as part of the assessment of cumulative effects. It would be useful to include plans showing the extent of the various Zones of Influence used to assess the cumulative effects to ensure all appropriate developments are captured. In addition given the timescales involved with this project it is advised that the status and timing of other planned developments are updated in due course.		could potentially have a cumulative effect are shown in Figures 15.1 and 15.2 of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) .
		Consultation	<p>Comments from other bodies</p> <p>In making the above comments it is assumed that the view of Hampshire Council will be sought in relation to Archaeology, Highways & Transportation, Minerals & Waste and Flooding & Surface Water Drainage. Similarly it has been assumed that Environment Agency and Natural England have also been consulted.</p>	N	The Applicant has consulted with Hampshire County Council, the Environment Agency and Natural England throughout the development of the application documents.

K.1.U: New Forest District Council

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Principle of development	NFDC wishes to express support in principle for this improvement to the strategic highways network in South Hampshire. Improved reliability and capacity at this junction will be important to accommodate planned growth in the sub-region, including the future operation of the Solent Freeport and the likely ongoing importance of the Port of Southampton to the UK car industry. NFDC has no comments to make on the details of the design.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

K.1.V: PIL ID 159

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Landscape and visual	Concerned if any of the trees at the end of garden were to be removed or damaged in the process of any works which may need to take place. The trees on the slope and the conifer hedge act as a pollution break.	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Application Boundary has been reduced and as a result PIL ID 159's land will not be affected by the proposals. PIL ID 159 is not included within the Book of Reference (Document Reference 4.3) .

K.1.W: PIL ID 209

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Construction - deposition areas	The positioning of the northern spoil area is in contradiction of the statement made by HE that "landscape and visual effects are to be minor" and that the use of agricultural land would be "reduced to a minimum".	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation the Applicant has removed all 3 deposition areas which were included as options at statutory consultation and integrated material into the landscaping proposals through more sympathetic ground reprofiling, with shallower land raising across a wider area which provides functional as mitigation for the Scheme (earthwork bunds) and the opportunity for chalk grassland creation.
		Construction - deposition areas	The 2021 consultation specifically states that the material deposited would "sit sensitively and help create better surroundings".	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the landscaping plans have been revised and the deposition areas have been removed.
		Construction - deposition areas	Strongly oppose PIL M3J9_209's land being proposed for landfill and therefore lodge an objection to the Scheme and for the following reasons:-	Y	The Applicant acknowledges this objection. All three deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme proposals.
		Construction - deposition areas	<p>1. Alternative Sites and Re-use of Spoil on Site</p> <p>HE have not supplied any justification as to why this land has been identified as one of three sites chosen for such purposes. There are other sites locally, including former quarry and chalk pit sites which would be far better suited for landfill than this otherwise quality and productive arable land in such close proximity to a dwelling. There are a large number of other possible sites, which would have significantly less impact on their own or other residential properties nearby. Whilst HE have stated that other sites have been considered, they have not provided any evidence as to why these three sites have been chosen or whether any of these sites are preferred to the other two.</p> <p>Why can't more of the excess spoil be retained on site within the proposed earth moving works areas, creating further bunds to reduce noise, light and dust pollution and reducing the volume of landfill off site on otherwise productive arable farmland.</p> <p>The central of the three sites is the most appropriate site for landfill. We have been informed that it is the "favoured site" and it alone has the capacity to accommodate all the estimated excess spoil. It is located in the centre of the works, adjacent to the main compound. The central area could easily be expanded and extended without adverse impact on the landscape character of the immediate area should more capacity be needed. What is the benefit of three landfill sites, which will create three times the impact in a much more open landscape than a single larger site?</p> <p>If the central site can be shown to accommodate all of the surplus</p>	Y	As outlined in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , as a result of concerns from stakeholders, alternative solutions for spoil deposition were investigated after the 2021 statutory consultation and a solution was found which should allow the excess spoil to be used without the need for additional disposal areas. The solution created a sensitively designed re-profiling of land immediately to the east of the M3, see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) . Figure 2.8 (Scheme Long Sections) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) provides detail on the existing and proposed topography and how new features sit within the landscape. Therefore, the Applicant has removed all three deposition areas from its proposals.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>spoil, could it be confirmed that the northern site will be removed from within the DCO red line boundary entirely?</p>		
		<p>Construction - deposition areas</p>	<p>Having studied all the available consultation documents, it appears there have not been any reports or surveys undertaken or published for public consideration which examine the overall impacts of the Scheme on this property or any forms of potential mitigation. The works are to be within 80m of the house with 12 hour working days as well as weekend and bank holiday working. This will have a significant impact on the quiet enjoyment of this home and immediate surroundings.</p> <p>The physical impact and deleterious effects of noise, dust and light pollution emanating from the landfill site in such close proximity to a dwelling has neither been assessed nor addressed or mitigated.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The Applicant decided to remove all three deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>
		<p>Air quality</p>	<p>We have been told the site will only be used in the "summer months" (this time period has not been defined or limited). The extracted chalk will create a huge amount of dust especially when crushed and the movement of heavy goods vehicles and tipping of such waste and then leaving the site will further exacerbate that.</p> <p>In the summer months the doors and windows need to be open in the mornings and evenings to regulate the temperature within the house; this will allow dust into the house and cause a constant disturbance and will require continuous cleaning. It could also affect the health of those living there with adverse respiratory health conditions.</p> <p>We have been told that there may be occasional tractor water bowsers and tankers to dampen down the dust, but this is only a token gesture and will not mitigate the issue. How do HE propose to address the issue of dust adversely affecting the property and those living there? No consideration has been given as to how restricted the occupants' use and enjoyment in the garden and grounds of the property would be with such activity just a stone's throw away.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality (National Highways, 2019) and discussed with key stakeholders including Winchester City Council and Eastleigh Borough Council. With regards to the impact of dust generation on air quality during construction, mitigation would be implemented to reduce the impact to a negligible level. Mitigation measures are outlined in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3). The final EMP will be secured through a DCO requirement. During construction the impact of emissions from construction traffic are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given the anticipated duration of changes to traffic flows and background concentration of air pollutants.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant decided to remove all three deposition areas from its proposals. Therefore, air quality effects relating to the movement and disturbance of soil at the deposition areas have been removed as site arisings are proposed to be integrated into the landscaping design.</p>
		<p>Noise and vibration</p>	<p>The noise impact of heavy vehicles, bulldozers, large articulated dumper trucks and diggers working 12 hours a day in such close proximity to an occupied dwelling will have a significant nuisance effect on the quiet enjoyment of their home. The physical dumping and subsequent levelling, compaction and redistribution and constant profiling of chalk will also have a considerable and extended noise impact. We have not been made aware of any assessments of the noise impact on the property or any possible noise mitigation</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The effects of the Scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed based on the forecast traffic flows using the road and the proximity of nearby residential properties.</p> <p>Construction noise and vibration from the Scheme is anticipated to have a small to neutral effect at some existing receptors (e.g. residential properties and commercial buildings). With the inclusion of</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			measures which might be intended to be put in place to reduce the impact on the dwelling and those living there.		mitigation outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) , some residential areas located close to the Scheme will experience short-term significant and non-significant adverse effects from demolition and construction noise and vibration. Noise arising from night-time diversions are not anticipated to be significant. Noise effects relating to the movement and disturbance of soil at deposition areas have been removed as site arisings are proposed to be integrated into the landscaping design.
		Landscape and visual	All of the vehicles to and from and within the site will have flashing lights and constant headlights going from dawn to dusk; these lights will shine through the glass windows on the western elevation of the building. The dwelling naturally looks directly at and down into and across the proposed site. We have been told there will be no outside lighting. This must be confirmed in writing. How does this conform in any way with the South Downs National Park's "Dark Skies" policy?	Y	Effects from lighting related to the movement and disturbance of soil at deposition areas have been removed as site arisings are proposed to be integrated into the landscaping design. The Scheme includes lighting of the underpasses and two gantries. The Applicant has considered South Downs National Park Authority's <i>Dark Skies Technical Advice Note (updated May 2021)</i> when preparing the operational lighting design. A lighting assessment for the proposed gantry mounted illuminated signage has been undertaken as reported in Appendix 7.7 (Technical Note: Lighting Assessment of Gantry Signage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . The M3 and A34 underpasses will be lit to a 50% of full daytime lighting level, however the exit portals of the underpasses will be unlit during the day and night-time environment. A lighting assessment has not been undertaken for the underpasses as lighting features are limited to the underpasses and not visible from the wider landscape.
		Construction – general	The impact on the private amenity and quiet enjoyment of the property will be immense and for many years. The lawns, gardens and sitting out patio area will all be overlooked by and overlooking the site, with workers and mechanical equipment and machinery on site most of the time throughout the week. How will Highways England ensure to limit the impact and mitigate the significant adverse effects on the quiet enjoyment of the property?	N	The construction stage works will be controlled through an Environmental Management Plan which will be secured through a requirement in the DCO. The fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) provides details of how the environmental effects of the Scheme will be managed during construction. This document will be submitted with the DCO Application and includes various commitments to control the impact of the construction works. Necessary engagement during construction and management of the traffic impacts is outlined in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) .
		Construction – general	We have verbally been told that the working hours will be 7am to 7pm Monday to Friday, 7am to 1pm Saturday, with the possibility for "occasional overnight", Sunday and Bank Holiday working. We must be reassured that there will be no vehicle movement or dumping or other activities within the site out of hours, Sundays and Bank Holidays? Please can it also be confirmed that these are the maximum working hours and that workers will not be permitted onto	N	Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) provide details on the proposed construction working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme. Working hours would be restricted to the following core hours:

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			the site outside of these hours.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07.00 to 19.00 Monday to Friday • 07.00 to 13.30 Saturday • No Sunday working <p>Works outside of the core working hours are likely to be required in certain circumstances and would be carried out following consultation with Winchester City Council.</p> <p>As the design develops towards construction phase, mitigation would be refined and included within the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (siEMP), which would be secured through a DCO requirement. The EMPs would be drafted in consultation with statutory bodies, and regular contact would be had with these parties through the subsequent detailed design and delivery (construction) phases.</p> <p>Furthermore, with the removal of deposition areas from the Scheme, construction work is moved away from the property.</p>
		Construction - deposition areas	<p>The land is being farmed with intensive arable cereal cropping. It is, we understand, proposed that this landfill activity is to occupy only part of the field, however it makes the remaining land effectively unusable for farm production during the period that the landfill is in use due to the size, shape and impact of the proposed works.</p> <p>The dust will settle on the crop, reducing photosynthesis and significantly reducing growth, yield, quality and output of the crop. It is likely to make cropping unviable during the construction period.</p> <p>The landfill site will significantly impact the natural field drainage of the land which exists unchanged since time commenced; bunds will cause wet areas and crops will fail. The compacted chalk will take years to return to any semblance of its normal drainage characteristics.</p> <p>The top soils will be stripped and stored for up to 5 years and will lose all nutrients and organic matter, which will result in many years of reinstatement to re-establish any organic matter, nutrients and soil structure back into the productive top soil level of this land.</p> <p>The compacted chalk will take many years to settle and is unlikely to settle equally, therefore there may be hollows and mounds through the field for years to come however carefully any reprofiling is undertaken.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant decided to remove all three deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Landscape and visual	<p>There is very limited information available to allow the affected landowners to make informed decisions and representations.</p> <p>Highways England have not prepared any plans/ drawings/ section layouts at all to give an indication of the quantity of soils which might be dumped on this site, how this is going to look once the works have been completed, either in the form of a landscape profile or technical drawing. Without this information it is impossible to properly represent the overall impact of the Scheme on this land. Where is the all important Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment which would be expected for a Scheme of this magnitude?</p> <p>We have only used the limited information which has been made public, but the communication with HE has been poor. Only one meeting has taken place with Ardent to date.</p> <p>We have had discussions with other affected landowners, all of whom appear to be totally in the dark about this project and its implications and detailed information has not been forthcoming.</p> <p>There is a level of frustration, that our clients are not being informed in any significant detail of what is proposed on their property and their related farm business activities.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. At the 2021 statutory consultation, the information shown in the PEIR reflected the preliminary design of the Scheme. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, Applicant decided to remove all three deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. The Applicant Boundary has been updated to reflect this change.</p> <p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) includes an assessment of effects from the Scheme on the landscape (both its character and features), and on visual amenity within the South Downs National Park and its setting. In so doing, the effects of the Scheme are assessed against the special qualities of the surrounding area.</p>
		Landscape and visual	<p>The entire site is within the South Downs National Park. The National Park came into being in 2011; the special qualities of the National Park include the tranquil and unspoilt places, an environment shaped by centuries of farming and a rich variety of wildlife and habitats. All of these special qualities will be significantly and adversely affected by the proposed dumping of spoil on this site.</p> <p>Highways England should be looking to have their excess spoil landfill areas within and directly adjacent to their proposed road construction works which could easily be achieved by moving spoil west of the M3 & A34.</p>	Y	<p>The deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme which avoids any impact from those features on the National Park.</p>
		Road drainage and the water environment	<p>The choice of site for this dumping of chalk and other material on top of and in close proximity to a main aquifer which feeds Winchester is clearly flawed and would significantly impact on this vital natural waterbody.</p> <p>The land drains naturally north and west down towards the natural chalk stream of the River Itchen and is adjacent to the River Itchen Site of Special Scientific Interest and River Itchen Special Area of Conservation (SSSI and SAC).</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant decided to remove all three deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>
		Walkers, cyclists, and	<p>To the north of the land is a restricted byway. We have had no communication on how the proposed scheme will impact the public and other users of this popular and well used byway that connects</p>	N	<p>Potential impacts on PRoWs during the construction period have been assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Transport Assessment</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		horse-riders	Winchester into the wider South Downs National Park.		Report (Document Reference 7.13). Temporary diversions will be required during construction and this will be subject to design and approvals prior to construction commencing. Diversion Plans will be set out in the Traffic Management Plan. An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been prepared for the DCO application.
		Biodiversity	<p>The site has an abundance of wildlife, from mammals (deer, fox and badgers), farmland birds and birds of prey (sparrow hawk and buzzard) and bees, butterflies and other ecology. There has not been any assessment of dust impact on the bees.</p> <p>No surveys have been undertaken to date on the land. HE have designed a scheme without first understanding the impact it will have on the local natural environment.</p> <p>No investigation has been published on the impact of the Scheme on fly life in the SSSI or SAC.</p> <p>A single landfill site would have less impact on the local ecology than three sites in close proximity.</p> <p>The Northern Landfill site is directly overlooked by Worthy Park House, part of Princes Mead School a Grade II* listed property. The impact on this heritage has not been fully assessed by Highways England.</p>	Y	<p>As set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), the assessment of the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity has been prepared in accordance relevant legislation, national and local planning policies and professional standards and guidance, as well as, through consultation with statutory bodies such as Natural England and the Environment Agency. A list of the wildlife surveys have been undertaken and are recorded in Appendix 8.1a to 8.z2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts on designated sites (including; SSSIs and SACs) and species (including; bats, hazel dormice, otter, breeding birds and wintering birds) within the study area as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme. Following the implementation of mitigation measures set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), potential impacts from construction activities on designated sites (including; SSSIs and SACs) and species (including; bats, hazel dormice, otter, breeding birds and wintering birds) within the study area are not significant. No significant effects on designated and species within the study area are predicted as a result of the Scheme's operation</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant decided to remove all three deposition areas from the proposals. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. No surveys have since been undertaken on these parcels of land as they are no longer required for the Scheme.</p>
		Land ownership	<p>There has not been any discussion with Highways England or their appointed contractors, as yet, as to the terms on which HE propose to acquire the rights over all or any part of this land.</p> <p>Section 122 (2) of the Planning Act sets out the purpose for which compulsory acquisition is sought. The Secretary of State will need to</p>	Y	The Applicant decided to remove all three deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<p>be satisfied that the development could only take place if the land in question were compulsorily acquired and that the land to be taken is no more than is "reasonably necessary" for that purpose, and that it is "proportionate".</p> <p>We question whether this land is necessary, given that there are two other apparently preferred sites for such landfill.</p> <p>Given the lack of information available, we don't know how much spoil is proposed to be dumped on the land, we don't know the proposed mitigation or landscaping or finished ground levels. Therefore at this stage it is impossible to assess whether all of the land is actually "reasonably necessary" or "proportionate".</p>		<p>The Applicant has engaged with landowners during the pre-application as detailed in Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) and the Statement of Reasons (Document Reference 4.1).</p>

K.1.X: PIL ID 170

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Principle of development	PIL ID 170 has no objection to the project to improve the M3 junction 9.	N	This response is noted by the Applicant. As part of ongoing diligent inquiries, PIL ID 170's interest will not be affected by the proposals. PIL ID 170 is not included within the Book of Reference (Document Reference 4.3) .
		Principle of development	We applaud Highways England on the scope of the scheme, this is likely to improve all our members usage of the junction. Long overdue!	N	This response is noted by the Applicant.
		Land ownership	The mention of compensation in the consultation document would be useful to the Club.	N	This response is noted by the Applicant.
		Land ownership	We understand you would need to acquire a parcel of land adjacent to the Itchen Bridge.	N	The General Arrangement Plans (Document Reference 2.5) and the Book of Reference (Document Reference 4.3) outline the proposed works, including works by the River Itchen.
		Land ownership	We have our own project on the site nearer to the 3 lakes where we need to replace fencing.	N	This response is noted by the Applicant
		Land ownership	If the compensation was to equate the cost of fencing it would be very much appreciated.	N	Provision of replacement fencing does not fall within the remit of this Scheme. A Vehicle Restraint System (VRS) is proposed between the A34 and land to the west.

K.1.Y: PIL ID 211

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Land ownership	We formally object to the red line boundary of your proposed work area across our property.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Application Boundary has been reviewed and the title is no longer included within the Scheme. PIL ID 211 is not included within the Book of Reference (Document Reference 4.3) .
		Land ownership	I gather that at a site meeting on 17.06.2021 your surveyors appreciated that this area is 2-3m below the carriageway level and unsuitable for use as a temporary compound or any other use to you.	N	

K.1.Z: PIL ID 151

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Land ownership	Confirm subsoil section 596 is required and what the red line boundary impact is to our land. We need exact measurements of exactly what is needed by your project.	Y	<p>During the 2021 statutory consultation, subsoil section 596 was identified as potentially been required for the Scheme. The land identified within the Application Boundary shown on plans is subsoil / a road support embankment / road verge area which appears to be outside of the property's physical boundary and (presumably) in the local authority or National Highways ownership as it appears to be a support embankment / road verge area for the A34 / B3047.</p> <p>The indicative Application Boundary presented at the 2021 statutory consultation aimed to provide space for verge assessments for traffic management, signage and cabling as the design was not yet fully developed.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Scheme has been refined and subsoil section 596 is no longer within the Application Boundary. Please refer to the General Arrangement Plans (Document Reference 2.5) which outline the proposed works.</p>
		Noise and vibration	It is utmost importance to fully understand the impact of your project on the noise levels and ensure mitigating measures are incorporated. Kindly provide the current and your future sound levels at the residential properties close to the A34 Bridge?	N	<p>The buildings dataset did not include this specific property PIL ID 151 noted in their response and therefore noise levels at this specific building have not been modelled. The nearest dwelling which has been modelled is Meadow Cottage, which is a similar distance to the A34 as this property. The model indicates a negligible noise increase (less than 1 dB) in the opening year and a negligible noise increase (less than 1 dB) in the future year.</p> <p>A noise assessment has been submitted as part of the DCO Application, please see Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Where mitigation is considered necessary to reduce impacts, these are presented within the ES and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p>
		Noise and vibration	Is there a plan to incorporate sound barriers on the A34 and A33 around residential and commercial properties? If so what is the plan and what type of sound barriers?	N	<p>The noise modelling has indicated there is no requirement for the provision of additional noise barriers. Refer to Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) for further details of the noise modelling that has been undertaken.</p>
		Design	What will be the new speed limit of the A33 and A34 around Kingsworthy/Headbourne Worthy as you north and south bounds?	N	<p>Speed limits are as shown on the Speed Limit Plans (Document Reference 2.9).</p>

K.1.AA: PIL ID 185

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
27 May 2021	8 July 2021	Mitigation	PIL ID 185 strongly objects to the current proposals for the M3 Junction 9 improvements scheme. We consider that the current proposals for mitigation are inadequate to address the ecological damage caused by this scheme and the legacy of Highways England schemes before it.	N	Mitigation measures incorporated into the design of the Scheme are reported as embedded mitigation in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Essential mitigation is outlined within the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
		Consultation	Proposals for the expansion on the M3 Junction 9 follow significant commitments for nature’s recovery by the Government (as set out in the Government’s 25-year Environment Plan and draft Environment Bill). The Trust engaged positively with Highways England’s previous stakeholder engagement, expecting a modern approach to development that prioritises the urgency of nature’s recovery, as made clear by the Dasgupta Review and current government priorities. However, the lack of consideration for any of the stakeholder recommendations for mitigation and enhancement, including from the Trust, the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) and Statutory Agencies, shows Highways England’s blatant lack of regard and care for nature or proper consultation within this scheme.	Y	<p>The Applicant is working to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been working collaboratively with stakeholders to develop its proposals.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revised the landscape strategy and Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) to respond to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that ‘embedded avoidance and mitigation measures’ for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it has evolved. These measures include the provision of habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) presents the results of a biodiversity metric calculation which assesses the predicted habitat losses and gains from the Scheme.</p>
		Biodiversity	The proposals represent a regressive approach to development. A continuation of a road-building philosophy that is unconcerned by the obligation to prevent harm and misses opportunities to make restitution for previous damages. This scheme forgoes any credible attempt to achieve the biodiversity net-gain that any responsible developer must put front and centre and represents a colossal failure of ambition and responsibility to achieve development that builds	Y	<p>The Applicant has applied the mitigation hierarchy to the Scheme. This is outlined in Chapter 4 (EIA Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) includes habitat creation and enhancement measures which provide substantial additional areas of biodiversity rich habitats. In addition, Figure 2.3 shows further</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			sympathetically with nature.		<p>mitigation measures such as bat and bird boxes, along with provision of habitats for specific species</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a biodiversity assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes that the Scheme would result in a net gain in biodiversity based on the assumptions by providing chalk grassland and hedgerow units.</p>
		Consultation	We own and/or manage internationally and nationally important nature reserves totalling nearly 200 hectares within the locus of the Junction 9 project and the area is a strategic priority for us. We are therefore not only very interested in how the Junction 9 Scheme is unfolding but are increasingly concerned about both the level of ambition for the natural environment and the process of stakeholder consultation.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and continues to engage with stakeholders including PIL ID 185.
		Biodiversity	We object to the current proposals on the basis of insufficient biodiversity net gain and mitigation, especially when considering the historic severance of the landscape and ecological network due to previous development of the road network. We are also extremely concerned with the potentially severe impacts to our Winnall Moors nature reserve (SSSI, SAC) which we do not believe have been fully considered in the current proposals.	Y	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a biodiversity assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes that the Scheme would result in a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals. The Applicant has considered the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p>
		Biodiversity	We are extremely concerned about the current mitigation plans for this scheme, which appears to be incredibly limited and damage control at best. The Mitigation Design Plan contains very little detail on the net gains expected and focuses mitigation on limited on-site improvements to land which they will impact during construction.	Y	<p>The Applicant has applied the mitigation hierarchy to the Scheme. This is outlined in Chapter 4 (EIA Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) includes habitat creation and enhancement measures which provide substantial additional areas of biodiversity rich habitats. In addition, Figure 2.3 shows further mitigation measures such as bat and bird boxes, along with provision of habitats for specific species</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
		Biodiversity	The lack of off-site mitigation is incredibly concerning as the immediate 'red-line' footprint of the scheme is very limited, so net gains must be realised in the wider zone of impact. We join others in saying that this project should not be viewed in isolation – it comes as part of a long-term programme of road developments in the M3 corridor which have caused huge ecological impacts and therefore must address historical issues such as severance of ecological connectivity. We would also like to see long term management plans, knowing that Highways Agency land at Bar End has been neglected for almost a decade, becoming unsuitable for the species it was designed to support after the building of the M3 through Twyford Down.	N	<p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) includes habitat creation and enhancement measures which provide substantial additional areas of biodiversity rich habitats. In addition, Figure 2.3 shows further mitigation measures such as bat and bird boxes, along with provision of habitats for specific species</p> <p>Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) presents the results of a biodiversity metric calculation. This report concludes that the Scheme would result in a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Associated with the Scheme, but not taken into account as part of the assessment, is an application that has been made for Designated Funds that, if successful, will further increase the amount of chalk grassland and the enjoyment by the public of the area. The habitat provision through Designated Funds, when considered together with habitats delivered through the Scheme, would deliver a substantial increase in habitat of ecological value to the local area.</p>
		Biodiversity	Overall, the scheme's approach to biodiversity net gain and mitigation lacks any ambition to make enhancements to the wildlife and nature recovery network locally. In addition, following the recent announcement by the Government that the Environment Bill will be amended to legislate for biodiversity net gain for new Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, it is the Trust's view that Highways England should be including within this Scheme proposals to achieve significant biodiversity net gain. We do not currently consider that these proposals currently meet the legally required 10% minimum net gain. We recommend that Highways England commit to a 20% biodiversity net gain, to lead the way in nature-positive transport development. We also encourage Highways England to clearly demonstrate how they could achieve that requirement, with stakeholder engagement.	N	Relevant biodiversity legislation is covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current programme indicates the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.
		Consultation	We, alongside other stakeholders, have previously tabled suggestions for mitigation which we would like to see considered. We consider that the scope of mitigation and enhancement for the scheme appears to be greatly diminished against the proposals that the stakeholder group tabled.	N	The Applicant has been working closely with stakeholders to develop and share the Scheme proposals prior to submission of the DCO Application.
		Consultation	We appreciated being included in round-table discussions about the Scheme at a relatively early stage and exploring opportunities presented by it and other related projects. We invested a lot of time to these discussions but consider that both ours' and our partners' proposals, including suggestions for biodiversity net gain and	N	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the mitigation for the Scheme has progressed. The Scheme design at the 2021 statutory consultation was preliminary.

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			mitigation, have been largely ignored.		
		Construction - deposition areas	For example, our suggestion that excess spoil could be used for land restoration on Southern Water's land adjacent to St. Catherine's Hill seems to have been dismissed. However, current plans for spoil in the Mitigation Design Plan suggests that the optional zones for spoil are to be returned to agricultural management. We are concerned that this is not part of any ecological enhancement with in-perpetuity and long-term management security.	Y	The Applicant decided to remove all three deposition areas from its proposals. In re-profiling the landform between Easton Lane and Long Walk, in response to South Downs National Park Authority and Natural England's comments, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
		Consultation	We remain committed to helping the Scheme realise shared objectives in a positive way. Together with key partner organisations, we feel that the process of stakeholder consultation for this high-profile project is falling short.	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. The planning regime established by the Planning Act 2008 places a significant importance on pre-application consultation. The Applicant has encouraged a range of stakeholders, including the local community, those with an interest in the land, local authorities and statutory consultees, to express their views on the Scheme through non-statutory engagement, non-statutory consultation and statutory consultation activities. The main stages of the Applicant's pre-application consultation is described in Table 2.1 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1). The Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) demonstrates that the Applicant has complied with all statutory requirements of the Planning Act 2008 in relation to carrying out pre-application consultation.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has continued to work with the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust to develop the Scheme proposals.</p>
		Consultation	We would be keen to recommence discussions with Highways England about the Scheme and the need to address key questions that remain unclear to us and our partners on these and other matters.	N	This comment is noted by the Applicant.
		Environment – general	The history of the M3 and Twyford down is an example of the kind of retrograde thinking that we can no longer afford to tolerate in a climate and nature emergency. When the scheme was first announced by the Department of Transport, there was justified widespread outrage over the destruction proposed. Twyford Down was one of the most protected habitats in Southern England, a rich site of ecological importance with 6 species of rare orchid and the threatened chalk hill blue butterfly. Yet the M3 construction destroyed	N	This comment is noted by the Applicant. The Scheme Application Boundary has been minimised as far as possible and a comprehensive mitigation plan, proportionate to the impacts of the Scheme has been prepared. This is shown on the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.		
		Environment – general	Our nature reserve at St Catherine’s Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed, and the local natural environment has been slowly put under increasing pressure by the development and industrial sprawl facilitated by this roadbuilding scheme. The damage has never been adequately addressed and the new proposals will only act as a catalyst to further development and compound pressures on an already greatly damaged landscape. We have no assurances that there will not be further expansions to the road network in another 25 years. The damage must stop.	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the historic impacts on St Catherine’s Hill.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapters 6 (Cultural Heritage), 7 (Landscape and Visual) and 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) assess the likely significant effects on designated sites such as the SAC / SSSI, scheduled monuments and the South Downs National Park with mitigation developed through consultation with statutory consultees. Mitigation measures proposed to reduce likely significant effects are also included in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes no direct or indirect impacts on St Catherine’s Hill SSSI are anticipated during the construction phase, due to the distance and physical separation from the Scheme. St Catherine’s Hill SSSI is located approximately 500m south of the Scheme and as such there would be no change to the St Catherine’s Hill SSSI.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p>
		Landscape and visual	We are deeply concerned that the new preferred route for the new Junction 9 will see yet more chipping away at the remaining chalk	N	The Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) explains how the Scheme has been designed to balance the needs

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			downland nature sites, but the significance of the problem extends beyond specific damage to a wider malaise in strategy.		of the Scheme and its landscape context, whilst developing design proposals which respond positively to the environment and look to respond to recommendations made by the South Downs National Park Authority, Natural England and the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust. The landscape design is presented on the Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) .
		Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders	It took just two years for the M3 to sever Winchester from the landscape, permanently hemming our reserve at Catherine's Hill against the city and splitting people and nature from the land beyond. In 2010, the South Downs National Park, on the other side of the M3 chasm became a designated National Park for the nation, yet the people and nature in Winchester remain cut-off from the green spaces that we rely on for our health and wellbeing.	N	One of the key objectives of the Scheme is to provide improvements for walkers, cyclists including connecting the National Cycle Network Route 23 which is severed by the current junction layout. The Scheme aims to improve the existing PRowWs with culverted and bridge crossings under and over the highways. Improvements to the reconfigured gyratory roundabout, including the creation of a new walking, cycling and horse-riding link between Easton Lane on the west side of M3 and NCN Route 23 on the east side of M3 are included in the proposals.
		Biodiversity	Rather than continue to cut away at the isolated fragments of habitat, widening the wounds of the past, we must have the ambition to correct policy errors of the past and reconnect the landscape.	N	Effects from severance and fragmentation of habitats have been assessed within the Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and measures included within the design to enable continued movement of wildlife through the Scheme and wider area.
		Environmental – general	This scheme does not match the ambition or priorities of central government, particularly in the upcoming Environment Bill that seeks to, 'embed environmental principles in future policy making and takes the essential steps needed to strengthen environmental oversight and improve on the way things have been done in the past.'	N	The Applicant notes this statement. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.
		Biodiversity	As part of these policy ambitions, the government has committed to a 'Nature Recovery Network'. This Network will be a joined-up system of places important for wild plants and animals, on land and at sea. Allowing plants, animals, seeds, nutrients, and water to move from place to place and enabling the natural world to adapt to change. It will create the corridors and areas of habitat they need to move in. It can only do this effectively if, like our road network, it is treated as a joined-up whole. It would be unthinkable for the M3 to be cut off at Winchester and likewise, the policy direction of government considers it unthinkable for habitats, like those at our protected reserves around Winchester, to remain fragmented from the wider landscape.	Y	New areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape during operation. Much of the additional woodland and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. Please refer to Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) which forms part of the DCO Application.
		Biodiversity	We are deeply concerned therefore that this M3 Junction 9 proposal is predicated on outdated logic, widening the wounds of the past. We	N	The Applicant notes this comment; however, the Scheme Application Boundary does not include any land south of Junction 10. The work

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			must have the ambition to correct policy errors and reconnect the landscape. We urge instead a new approach, building on policy momentum to create a 'Green Bridge' spanning the damaged chasm at Twyford Down and creating a green artery for people and nature in Winchester.		required focuses on Junction 9 and the immediate roads.
		Biodiversity	A Green Bridge would relieve the intense recreational and development pressures on protected reserves at St Catherine's Hill and Winnall Moors and give nature the flexibility to move and adapt. It would reconnect the City of Winchester to the wider landscape and stand as a statement of intent for future policy; road building and development cannot come at the expense of our fragile natural world.	N	Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed. An improved PRoW network is proposed as part of the Scheme to connect Winchester to the South Downs National Park through footways and cycleways.
		Biodiversity	We own and manage Winnall Moors Nature Reserve which is a designated nature reserve of national (Site of Special Scientific Interest) and European (Special Area of Conservation) importance.	N	The Applicant recognises that the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is located to the west of the Scheme, and west of the Winnall Industrial Estate. At its northern extent, the reserve boundary lies parallel to the Application Boundary along the existing alignment of the A34, however the Nature Reserve boundary does not interact with the Application Boundary.
		Land ownership	Overall, we are gravely concerned that the M3 Junction 9 proposals, including to potentially compulsory purchase land in the North-East strip of our reserve, will lead to the erosion of the wildlife on our site and in the surrounding area, and will severely impact our ability to manage the reserve.	N	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Application Boundary has been refined and reduced. At its northern extent of the Application Boundary, the reserve boundary lies parallel to the Application Boundary along the existing alignment of the A34, however the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve boundary does not interact with the Application Boundary.
		Biodiversity	With regards to the direct impact to wildlife on our reserve, we consider that the proposals present five key issues, all of which impact the integrity and functioning of Winnall Moors nature reserve: 1. Cutting the connectivity between the reserve and our meadow adjacent to the A34 2. Impact the management of the reserve, including drainage 3. Exacerbating existing pressures on the reserve	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Biodiversity	The current proposals to compulsory purchase the North-East strip of Winnall Moors nature reserve would sever the connectivity between the main reserve and our meadow adjacent to the A34. This would hinder the ability of the local ecological network to function sufficiently to allow the movement of wildlife between the main part of the reserve and our meadow, as well as impact our ability to manage the reserve for the benefit of wildlife.	N	As part of the Scheme, a new footway/cycleway is proposed over the River Itchen SAC/SSSI in this location. It is proposed that this bridge is a clear span structure, with no piers within the river channel. In addition, the abutments would be set back from the riverbank, outside of the SAC and SSSI, to allow passage for wildlife. The bridge deck also follows the same horizontal alignment as the existing adjacent road bridges (Itchen Bridge and Kings Worthy Bridge), to make certain it does not present an additional blockage to animals such as bats commuting along the River Itchen. This bridge

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					is shown in the General Arrangement Plans (Document Reference 2.7) .
		Biodiversity	The SSSI meadow adjacent to the A34 is in unfavourable recovering condition. The 2.5ha area has been in active management for the past twelve years, reducing scrubby cover and using conservation grazing to restore the rare grassland habitats. The 2018 HBIC survey, states 72 species were recorded, including 7 county notables. The National Vegetation Classification (NVC) communities include, S28, tall herb fen, S6 swamp, M22 Fen Meadow, S4 swamp and reed beds and S23, other water margin vegetation. It is the carefully managed mosaic of habitats that makes the site home to the following notable species: reed warbler, Cetti's warbler, reed bunting, water vole, otter, ragged-robin, marsh valerian and common valerian.	N	Wildlife surveys have been undertaken and are recorded in Appendix 8.1a to 8.1z2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) .
		Biodiversity	We consider that the current proposals could significantly impact the wildlife and habitats found on our reserve as well as the wider ecological network, considering that Winnall Moors SSSI, is a core wildlife-rich site that is fundamental to the functioning of the wider nature recovery network.	N	The effects on wildlife are reported in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . It is concluded that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.
		Biodiversity	Highways England's current plans would cut the connectivity between two parts of our reserve, preventing us from moving livestock between the fields. Livestock are crucial to the management of the reserve for the benefit of nature. Disruption to the management of the livestock could prevent the Trust from being able to manage the reserve to ensure maximum benefit for wildlife.	Y	The proposed footway/cycleway bridge crossing the River Itchen is designed to be 3.5m in width with a span of 35m. The construction methods are outlined in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . It is proposed that the truss structure is supported on reinforced concrete abutments founded on piled foundations without the need for direct or intrusive works within the River Itchen. The design aims to allow the free movement of animals and wildlife.
		Land ownership	We also consider that the proposed plans would adversely impact the infrastructure on site, including the bridge we use for access and water level management control systems in the north-eastern corner of the reserve which is critical for managing the sites hydrology and maintaining the carefully managed habitats. The current plans also appear to encompass an important drainage pathway into Winnall Moors nature reserve. Although, without further information from Highways England, we are unable to identify exactly how our reserve will be impacted.	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation the Application Boundary has been revised and the Scheme land take has been reduced. The Application Boundary now lies parallel with the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.
		Land ownership	Currently we maintain critical access to the meadow adjacent to the A34 via two bridges, one in the northeast corner, used year-round, and a bridge to the south, used after haymaking (Aug – Dec). We are concerned that the current scheme could impact these bridges and	N	During construction, stakeholders, such as the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust, will be engaged with throughout the construction stages of the Scheme to ensure essential access to land. As listed in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) in

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			thus our ability to manage the reserve.		Section 3 if the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) the relationship with the landowners and stakeholders will be maintained throughout the construction phase through the Scheme website and a dedicated stakeholder representative appointed by the Principal Contractor.
		Road drainage and the water environment	We are not satisfied that Highways England have properly considered the impact of their plans on the drainage along the Northern boundary with Winnall Moors, nor have they considered the wider potential impacts of their proposed scheme on our reserve.	N	The Applicant has discussed the proposed works in relation to drainage with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority to inform Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
		Biodiversity	Our reserve at Winnall Moors is increasingly being subject to pressures from development, including this current scheme. Winnall Moors is the 'crown jewel' for wildlife locally and forms an integral part of the River Itchen SAC and SSSI and is central to the functioning of the local nature recovery network. The increasing development pressures demonstrates the overall lack of care and concern for our few remaining wildlife refuges locally. In a climate and nature emergency, we cannot keep squeezing wildlife into smaller and smaller spaces, it needs space to recover. We expect Highways England to demonstrate their concern for the nature reserve and its wildlife by ensuring it suffers no damage.	N	A biodiversity assessment of the Scheme has been carried out. The associated impacts of the Scheme, outlined in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , have been consulted with Natural England and the Environment Agency.
		Climate	We are living through a climate and nature emergency and can no longer tolerate further habitat destruction and missed opportunities for nature's recovery. Highways England must deal with the legacy of damage from previous schemes and ensure that there is real and tangible net gain for nature. Nothing short of consistent investment in nature and decarbonisation is now acceptable across all Highways England projects. We call on you to rethink these plans so that instead they represent a nature-positive approach, paving the way for forward-thinking developments and enabling nature's recovery.	N	Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) outlines mitigation to climate change vulnerability, including the use of an appropriate planting strategy that considers climate change for the selection of species used. The landscaping plans have been developed with climate change in mind. Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) outlines that species of local provenance have been chosen. In addition, a diverse mix has been designed which supports resilience to climate change.
		Landscape and visual	Any proposed scheme must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No net damage to the wildlife of our nature reserve at Winnall Moors and significant biodiversity net gain overall. ▪ Large scale habitat creation. Significant new areas of chalk downland could be restored, utilising chalk excavated during construction. ▪ Restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. ▪ A green bridge across the motorway, re-uniting the severed down of St Catherine's Hill and the 'dongas' and establishing a proper gateway to the South Downs National Park. 	Y	It is calculated that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity, refer to the assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) . Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) includes habitat creation and enhancement measures which provide substantial additional areas of biodiversity rich habitats. New planting has been proposed adjacent to new elements of road infrastructure to provide visual screening and green infrastructure connectivity, as shown on the Figure 2.3 . A green bridge is not proposed as part of the Scheme because no existing ecological corridors are being severed by the Scheme. In

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A commitment to investing in sustainable transport for the future, improving public transport. 		<p>addition, the Application Boundary does not extend south of Junction 10.</p> <p>Revised proposals since the 2021 statutory consultation provide greater opportunities for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders to access the South Downs National Park. In addition, the route from Winnall to Kings Worthy has been revised to include cyclists. This has been discussed with stakeholders.</p>
		Consultation	<p>We expect Highways England to address the issues raised in this letter, and I would like to reiterate that we want to continue to work with you to enable these issues to be addressed prior to a Development Consent Order application being submitted in early 2022.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

M3 Junction 9 Development Consent Order 202[x]

APPENDIX K – SUMMARY OF RELEVANT RESPONSES TO THE 2021 STATUTORY CONSULTATION

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR010055
Application Document Reference:	5.1
BIM Document Reference:	HE551511-VFK-LSI-X_XXXX_XX- RP-LE-0004
Author:	M3 Junction 9 Improvement Project Team, National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev Draft	October 2022	Stage 3B – draft for comment

Contents

Appendix K.2	Section 47 and Section 48 statutory consultation comments and the Applicant’s response (May-July 2021)	185
K.2.A	Introduction	185
K.2.B	Air quality	188
K.2.C	Cultural heritage.....	202
K.2.D	Landscape and visual	218
K.2.E	Biodiversity.....	253
K.2.G	Material assets and waste.....	296
K.2.H	Noise and vibration	297
K.2.I	Population and human health.....	330
K.2.J	Road drainage and the water environment	336
K.2.K	Climate	341
K.2.L	In-combination and cumulative effects	370
K.2.M	Environment – general	371
K.2.N	Design	425
K.2.O	Safety	477
K.2.P	Mitigation.....	485
K.2.Q	Land ownership.....	512
K.2.R	Consultation	514
K.2.S	Traffic and transport	546
K.2.T	Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.....	574
K.2.U	Legislation and policy	663
K.2.V	Lighting	675
K.2.W	Principle of development.....	681
K.2.X	Construction – general	714
K.2.Y	Construction – spoil deposition areas	742
K.2.Z	Construction – compound locations	774

Appendix K.2 Section 47 and Section 48 statutory consultation comments and the Applicant’s response (May-July 2021)

K.2.A Introduction

Appendix K.2 (this Appendix) contains details of the relevant responses to the Applicant’s consultation carried out under Sections 47 and 48 of the Planning Act 2008, together with details of how the Applicant has had regard to those relevant responses when deciding whether the application it has made should be on the same terms as proposed when the consultation was carried out, in accordance with its duty under Section 49 of the Planning Act 2008.

Issues led approach

In compiling **Appendix K.2**, the Applicant has had regard to the Planning Inspectorate’s Advice Note 14 and considers that it is appropriate to follow an “*issues led approach*”, grouping response under the key themes arising from the consultation. The Applicant considers that the key themes arising from the consultation under Sections 47 and 48 are as follows (in no particular order):

Topics	
PEIR related topics	Additional topics
Air quality	Design
Cultural heritage	Environment - general
Landscape and visual	Safety
Biodiversity	Permits and consents
Geology and soils	Assets
Material assets and waste	Mitigation
Noise and vibration	Utilities
Population and health	Land ownership
Road drainage and the water environment	Aviation
Climate	Protective provisions
In-combination and cumulative effects	Consultation
	Traffic and transport
	Walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders
	Legislation and policy
	Lighting

Topics	
PEIR related topics	Additional topics
	Principle of development
	Construction – general
	Construction – deposition areas
	Construction – compound locations

Feedback mechanisms

Throughout the consultation under Sections 47 and 48 of the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant encouraged consultees to make use of a standard questionnaire form (see **Appendix J.9**) which posed 10 questions¹ intended to elicit views on a diverse range of topics relating to the Applicant’s proposals. The majority of consultees used the questionnaire and the Applicant considers that the questions are relevant to the context in which the relevant responses should be understood.

Some consultees provided their response in the form of a letter or email. These are also considered in this Appendix.

Structure of this appendix

PINS Advice Note 14 cautions applicants that choose to adopt an issues led approach that “*care must be taken to ensure that in doing this the responses are not presented in a misleading way or out of context from the original views of the consultee.*” The Applicant considers the issues led approach is appropriate as it enables consultees, and others with an interest in the Scheme, to easily identify other aspects of a theme that they may have an interest in.

To ensure the context of the relevant responses is presented clearly, both in terms of thematic approach to the Applicant’s consideration of the relevant responses and in terms of the questions posed by the Applicant that elicited the relevant responses, the Applicant has organised the relevant responses into tables arranged according to theme. Within each table a heading repeats the text of the question included on the questionnaire that prompted the relevant response.

In the fourth column, the Applicant has set out how it has had regard to the relevant response in respect of the matters that pertain to theme of that table.

Some relevant responses raised issues that relate to more than one theme. Where this occurs, the Applicant has adopted the following approach:

- Where a discrete body of text, sufficient to appreciate the context in which the relevant response is made, raises matters in respect of a theme, then

¹ The questionnaire contained a total of 29 numbered questions, however 19 were closed-ended questions and responses to these questions are not considered further in this Appendix.

that discrete body of text has been set out under the appropriate theme in **bold** text;

- Where a body of text within a relevant response raises issues across two or more themes, the Applicant has shown the text to which it is responding in **bold** text; and
- Text comprised in a relevant response that is not shown in bold text is not being considered by the Applicant under that theme and is instead considered elsewhere under the corresponding theme.

For example, a relevant response that reads “...it is clear this change will result in habitat loss and pressure to local chalk down land and the chalk streams/ rivers locally. What mitigation will be in place to restore these green spaces at the end of the project? As a local resident I am also concerned about the impact of increased road noise which does not appear to be considered. Again, what mitigation is in place?” raises issues that fall under the themes of biodiversity, noise and mitigation. In the biodiversity table, this would be shown as “...**it is clear this change will result in habitat loss and pressure to local chalk down land and the chalk streams/ rivers locally. What mitigation will be in place to restore these green spaces at the end of the project? As a local resident I am also concerned about the impact of increased road noise which does not appear to be considered. Again, what mitigation is in place?**”. The Applicant’s consideration of this response in relation to the theme of biodiversity would be set out in the fourth column of that table.

Conversely, that same part of the response would appear in the table addressing noise as “...it is clear this change will result in habitat loss and pressure to local chalk down land and the chalk streams/ rivers locally. What mitigation will be in place to restore these green spaces at the end of the project? **As a local resident I am also concerned about the impact of increased road noise which does not appear to be considered. Again, what mitigation is in place?**”. The same principle would apply under the mitigation theme.

The Applicant has maintained a database of relevant responses received and has carefully checked that it has considered all relevant responses in compiling this appendix in this way.

Identifying Section 47 and Section 48 responses

None of the relevant responses received by the Applicant have specifically identified themselves as having been prompted by Section 48 publicity. As such, it has not been possible for the Applicant to present Section 48 relevant responses as a distinct "strand" of consultation. As recommended by PINS Advice Note 14, the Applicant has assumed that any relevant responses received from persons who were not consulted by it under Section 42 have arisen as a result of Section 47 consultation and Section 48 publicity and those responses are detailed and considered in this Appendix.

K.2.B Air quality

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	<p>I understand that you like to reduce congestion with all of it's negative effects. However, extending this junction will increase the traffic which will cause further congestion elsewhere. Increased traffic will increase noise and air pollution and increase green house gas emissions. Furthermore, it will lead to massive disruptions of traffic during the building phase that will effect Winchester and Badger Farm Road. Badger Farm Road is already very busy and cycling is very dangerous. For this expense it would be much better to do following alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase capacity on railways and electrify towards Oxford and consider reopening the Watercress line between Arlesford and Winchester 2. Help people to use buses instead of their cars by building a bus network similar to CPRE's proposal, every village should have half hourly bus service to Winchester and or train stations 3. Build cycle ways along all high traffic roads, the M3 and especially this junction is much used for short distance travel too 	N	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the operation of the Scheme on air quality. The assessment was carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality (National Highways, 2019) and discussed with key stakeholders including Winchester City Council and Eastleigh Borough Council.</p> <p>The operational traffic model flows have been analysed to identify roads exceeding the DMRB LA 105 criteria and a 200m buffer used to define the Affected Road Network. The Affected Road Network (see Figure 5.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) extends along the A34 towards the south of Newbury in the north, several roads within Winchester, the M3 south to Junction 12 and the A272 and B3047 to the east. As shown in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), the majority of roads considered by the traffic model within Winchester experience a decrease in traffic flows as a result of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	Congestion and more importantly the impact this will have on open space and noise and pollution levels.	N	<p>Operational traffic emissions were modelled and indicate that the Scheme results in both predicted increases and decreases in NO₂ concentrations and PM₁₀ concentrations at a number of locations. The majority of decreases were located within Winchester City Centre due to predicted decreases in traffic flows on these routes, and increases were located in proximity of the M3 and Easton Lane (and adjoining roads) due to predicted increases in traffic flows on these routes.</p>
Local community	<p>Although the changes to the A33 route improve safety concerns for those who were concerned about crossing traffic at 70mph, the new plan forces everyone going southbound to use the new junction, rather than pass under it. This is regrettable since the aim was to reduce traffic actually on the junction. There is little about implication of noise, pollutants on the changes.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that there are no exceedances of the relevant air quality thresholds and therefore, in accordance with DMRB LA 105, the Scheme is not predicted to result in a significant effect on air quality as a result of the operation of the Scheme.</p>
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	<p>How you will reduce traffic. How you will reduce the number of road journeys. How you will dramatically reduce vehicle emissions and overall road pollution, including litter. How you will protect and progressively enhance the environment. How you will use sustainable materials and avoid fossil-derived tars etc.</p>	N	<p>The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality (National Highways, 2019) and discussed with key stakeholders including Winchester City Council and Eastleigh Borough Council. Operational traffic emissions were modelled and indicate that the Scheme results in both predicted increases and decreases in NO₂ concentrations at a number of locations. The majority of decreases were located within Winchester City Centre due to predicted decreases in traffic flows on these routes, and increases were located in the proximity</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			of the M3 and Easton Lane (and adjoining roads) due to predicted increases in traffic flows on these routes. The assessment undertaken demonstrates that there are no exceedances of the relevant air quality thresholds (i.e. no locations where NO ₂ concentrations exceed the air quality threshold (40 µg/m ³)); according to the DMRB LA 105 methodology, therefore there would be no significant effects as a result of the Scheme.
Local community	If improvements are to be made consideration must be given to noise and pollution . It is not acceptable that noise levels may increase albeit by small margins. If the improvements are going to be made the aim should also to reduce noise and pollution levels by a) speed limit of 50mph on new link roads, b) noise reducing surface to road, c) proper sound insulation screens to either side of roads from new junction to north of Kings Worthy.	N	The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The ES (Document Reference 6.1) includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme. With regard to speed limits, the Applicant has submitted Speed Limits Plans (Document Reference 2.9) as part of this DCO application to show the proposed speed limits. Speed limits of 30 mph to 70 mph are proposed on new link roads. Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that there are no exceedances of the relevant air quality thresholds and therefore, in accordance with DMRB LA 105, there is no requirement for lower speed limits.
Local community	You should abandon plans for new and wider carriageways and focus solely on constructing noise and pollution barriers , and on improving walking, cycling, and equestrian infrastructure to ensure the junction is no longer a barrier of any sort. In particular plans, for cycling and pedestrian connections between King's Worthy and Winnall should revert to the previous plan, and more work needs to be done on the NCN 23 proposals. Effective noise and pollution barriers are needed to reduce conditions on footpaths and in housing to acceptable levels along the Itchen Valley to the north and south of the site at all points where the M3 and A34 are on embankments.	N	Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) confirms that the Scheme's operation does not have a significant air quality impact and does not affect reported compliance with the Air Quality Regulations. Therefore, in accordance with DMRB LA 105, no mitigation during the Scheme's operation has been proposed.
Local community	There should be a focus on provision for cycling and equestrian infrastructure. New / widened carriageways should be discouraged and focus also be made on noise and pollution barriers.	N	
Local community	It is highly disappointing that you have not even followed the promises given 2 years ago to include the building of cycle links between Winchester and Easton as well as Winnall and Kings Worthy. Why did you avoid working together with main local stakeholders like Cycle Winchester? The only work needed on this junction is to build barriers for noise and air pollution as well as building a proper cycle link to Easton.	N	
Local community	You should consider the environment before starting work, the pollution caused by construction and the destruction to the local wildlife habitats will take decades to recover.	N	Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction of the Scheme on air quality.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>During construction, mitigation would be implemented to reduce the impact of dust generation on air quality to a negligible level. Mitigation measures are outlined in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the first iteration of the Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3)).</p> <p>During construction the impact of emissions from construction traffic are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given the anticipated duration of changes to traffic flows and background concentration of air pollutants.</p>
Local community	<p>Concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased noise - day and night • Increased pollution • Negative Impact on health and well being • Lack of effective mitigation actions regarding noise and pollution • Impact on wildlife eg. Skylarks and yellowhammers along the South Downs way - impacted by infill and construction, loss of habitat, fracturing habitats <p>Therefore if this plan goes ahead mitigation plans need to be much more effective than those planned and their effectiveness needs to be monitored and where needed extended, changed.</p>	N	<p>An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on air quality, biodiversity, noise and population and health is set out in Chapters 5, 8, 11 and 12 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), respectively. The ES (Document Reference 6.1) includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p> <p>With regards to the impact of dust generation on air quality during construction, mitigation would be implemented to reduce the impact to a negligible level. Mitigation measures are outlined in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3). The final EMP will be secured through a DCO requirement. During construction the impact of emissions from construction traffic are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given the anticipated duration of changes to traffic flows and background concentration of air pollutants.</p> <p>During operation, the impact of emissions from operational traffic is considered to not be significant and therefore in accordance with DMRB LA105 mitigation is not required.</p>
Local community	<p>The noise and pollution impact to residents living next to the M3 between the Southdowns footbridge across the M3 that lies between Junction 10 and Junction 9. Residential properties exist close to the motorway cutting and experience continual loud noise and air pollution as vehicles accelerate up the incline on the northbound section of the carriageway. Air pollution monitoring should be established close to the bridge where the Alresford Road crosses the M3 (Spitfire Bridge) and also a comprehensive sound protection barrier and noise monitoring installed along the footpath that runs on the west side of the M3 cutting between Southdowns footbridge, passed Chalk Way up to the Spitfire Bridge. Speed traps would deter loud motorbikes racing between motorway Junctions 9 and 10 and also along the Spitfire Link road which is a continual issue particularly at weekends.</p>	N	<p>Section 5.5 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides details of the study area used for the air quality assessment. The operational traffic model flows have been analysed to identify roads exceeding the DMRB LA 105 criteria and a 200m buffer from these roads used to define the Affected Road Network Area as presented in Figure 5.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2). The Affected Road Network extends along the M3 south to Junction 12 and the A272 and B3047 to the east. Therefore the study area considers the areas between Junction 10 and Junction 9 and parts of Alresford Road. The assessment of effects from the Scheme has not identified effects which are considered likely to be significant. In accordance with DMRB LA105, no monitoring is therefore required in relation to air quality.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure			
Local community	Just stopping the environmental pollution and waste in queuing traffic will be a big environmental win	N	The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality (National Highways, 2019) and discussed with key stakeholders including Winchester City Council and Eastleigh Borough Council. Operational traffic emissions were modelled and indicate that the Scheme results in both predicted increases and decreases in NO ₂ and PM ₁₀ concentrations at a number of receptor locations. The majority of decreases were located within Winchester City Centre due to predicted decreases in traffic flows on these routes, and increases were located in the proximity of the M3 and Easton Lane (and adjoining roads) due to predicted increases in traffic flows on these routes. The assessment undertaken demonstrates that there are no locations NO ₂ concentrations exceed the air quality threshold (40 µg/m ³) according to the DMRB LA 105 methodology, therefore there would be no significant effects as a result of the Scheme. Furthermore, the changes in annual mean PM ₁₀ concentrations are not considered to be significant in accordance with the DMRB LA 105 methodology.
Local community	You don't really address the fundamental problems of increased noise and pollution and potential damage to wildlife and the countryside as a whole	N	The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality (National Highways, 2019) and discussed with key stakeholders including Winchester City Council and Eastleigh Borough Council. Operational traffic emissions were modelled and indicate that the Scheme results in both predicted increases and decreases in NO ₂ and PM ₁₀ concentrations at a number of receptor locations. The majority of decreases were located within Winchester City Centre due to predicted decreases in traffic flows on these routes, and increases were located in the proximity of the M3 and Easton Lane (and adjoining roads) due to predicted increases in traffic flows on these routes. The assessment undertaken demonstrates that there are no locations NO ₂ concentrations exceed the air quality threshold (40 µg/m ³) according to the DMRB LA 105 methodology, therefore there would be no significant effects as a result of the Scheme. Furthermore, the changes in annual mean PM ₁₀ concentrations are not considered to be significant in accordance with the DMRB LA 105 methodology.
Local community	I can't identify any analysis of how by improving traffic flow the scheme will generate increased car use and therefore increase pollution. I think this is key to the understanding of the environment impact.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	If traffic moves more freely, there will be a reduction in emissions. The impact to flora and fauna will be devastating in the short term but may be beneficial in the long term.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	New roads will initially reduce traffic but over time it will encourage more vehicles on the road, creating more air pollution. Not much consideration to noise and air pollution to residents between Junction 10 and Junction 9 in relation to mitigating these issues to resident for nearly 5 years of construction works and post implementation use.	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on air quality is set out in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme. Section 5.5 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides details of the study area used for the air quality assessment. The study area for the assessments of construction dust and operational traffic emissions considers receptors between Junction 10 and Junction 9 (see Figures 5.2 (Affected Road Network) and 5.3 (Construction Dust Buffer) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) . With regards to the impact of dust generation on air quality during construction, mitigation would be implemented to reduce the impact to a negligible level. Mitigation measures are outlined in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . The final EMP will be secured through a DCO requirement. During construction the impact of emissions from construction traffic are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given the anticipated duration of changes to traffic flows and background concentration of air pollutants.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			During operation, the impact of emissions from operational traffic is considered to not be significant and therefore in accordance with DMRB LA105, mitigation is not required.
Local community	<p>Even the outlined effects on the environment (that have still not fully explored) should be enough evidence to stop this project. More needs to be done to explore the effects: what are the health effects of extra pollution? How many people will die prematurely due to the increased traffic? Pollution measurements are incomplete. Even if electric cars will be used more widely in the future, each car will continue to cause air pollution due to break use and tyre decay. There is not enough renewable energy available to charge all cars if they were electric. Cars that use electricity from fossil fuels will continue to contribute to carbon emissions in a very significant way. One should not forget that resources to build electric cars are limited, especially for their batteries. It would increase mining activities which again contribute to carbon emissions. The effects of disturbing the soil and moving materials as well as emissions from tarmac and concrete have not been recognised fully.</p>	N	Impacts on human health are considered within Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . This has been prepared in accordance with the latest DMRB LA 112 Population and Human Health (National Highways, 2020). With respect to air quality, Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that the Scheme would result in a neutral health outcome on ambient air quality.
Local community	<p>You are predicting an increase in vehicle emissions just at a time when we should be reducing emissions. History shows us Highways England predictions are too conservative with numbers of cars and emissions increasing at a greater rate and so there is every reason to suggest your numbers are not big enough. Greater vehicle use will outstrip conversion to EVs for many years to come.</p> <p>There is not enough information on pollution levels with data from the middle of the lanes and particulate matter which will increase no matter what fuel is used in vehicles.</p> <p>Health impacts of higher pollution levels will mean high costs in other parts of society. Where is this recognised?</p>	N	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme on air quality.</p> <p>During construction, mitigation would be implemented to reduce the impact of dust generation on air quality to a negligible level. Mitigation measures are outlined in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the first iteration of the Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3)). The final EMP will be secured through a DCO requirement. Furthermore, Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) confirms that the impact of emissions from construction traffic are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given the anticipated duration of changes to traffic flows and background concentration of air pollutants</p> <p>Operational traffic emissions were modelled and indicate that the Scheme results in both predicted increases and decreases in the annual average NO₂ and PM₁₀ concentrations at a number of receptor locations. The majority of decreases were located within Winchester City Centre due to predicted decreases in traffic flows on these routes, and increases were located in the proximity of the M3 and Easton Lane (and adjoining roads) due to predicted increases in traffic flows on these routes. The assessment undertaken demonstrates that there are no locations where NO₂ concentrations are predicted to exceed the air quality threshold (40 µg/m³), therefore according to the DMRB LA 105 methodology there would be no significant effects as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Impacts on human health are considered within Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This has been prepared in</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			accordance with the latest DMRB LA 112 Population and Human Health (National Highways, 2020).
Local community	<p>The preliminary environmental reports appear weak and much work remains to be done to fill in the gaps before the final Environmental Impact Assessment. Research so far has been minimal. No pollution measurements are shown between the carriageways on M3 and A34 and health impacts on road users have been ignored. There have not yet been any attempts to project air quality or greenhouse gas data beyond the planned 2026 opening year. The modest anticipated traffic growth in 2026 will undoubtedly be outstripped in subsequent years. The 3,100 tonnes CO2 increase in traffic emissions identified in para 14.9.4 in 2026 could be an overly modest estimate, but even so it is an increase in CO2 we cannot afford to let happen. The rate of increase in traffic will be greater than the rate of decarbonisation of vehicles, so it is likely that emissions will continue to rise.</p> <p>Clear long-term year-by-year data on estimated traffic growth are lacking. Without this there can be no justification for para 5.4.16: “It is not considered necessary to also quantify air quality impacts at the design year of 2046 as the decrease in pollutant emissions (from traffic and other sources) in the interim period results in 2026 representing the worst case due to higher background concentrations and emissions.” PM pollution for example is rarely referred to, but will grow continually after 2026. Some of the data given in Appendix 2.1 part 2 are ridiculous e.g. 3 vehicles per day on Morestead Road in 2026, or the doubling of traffic on Easton Lane towards its north-eastern end compared with its south-western end. There is no data on the impact on Garnier Road or Springvale Road.</p> <p>In proportion as road vehicles undergo battery-electrification there will be a growing demand for electricity. Electricity demand for road transport will have to compete with electrification of domestic heating and industry. Energy will be in short supply if we stop using fossil fuels. This could have two equally undesirable results. Either there will be a shortage of energy, or there will be an unplanned continued use of fossil fuels. Private transport will be a relatively unproductive way of using up the inevitably limited supplies of clean energy. At some point we will have to discourage the use of private transport, and there is no satisfactory technology yet for the decarbonisation of heavy freight road transport. The most robust solutions to this dilemma would be to make fuller use of walking, cycling and public transport and to transfer bulk heavy freight to rail. These developments will make these proposals redundant. A full analysis of how decarbonisation of the energy supply is likely to affect transport policy should be included in the PEIR</p>	N	<p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the proposal on the environment. This includes details of the environmental mitigation and management such as Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3). The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Document Reference 6.1), with Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) and Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) reporting the likely significant effects of the Scheme on air quality, population and health, and climate, respectively.</p> <p>CO_{2e} emissions have been calculated for the construction and operation of the Scheme, based on the PAS 2080 (BSI, 2016) lifecycle stages and scopes, and are reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>During operation, the main source of emissions is from ‘end-users’ i.e. traffic. Green House Gases (GHGs) emitted from operational energy use (i.e. subway lighting, CCTV, VMS and traffic signalling) would contribute a relatively small amount to the overall operational carbon emissions. Based on the transport model for the Scheme, in 2027, end-user and operational energy is anticipated to emit ,217,562 tCO_{2e} annually and by 2042 this is anticipated to reduce to 2,500,142 tCO_{2e} annually. When compared to the baseline, net emissions from traffic and operational energy use are anticipated to result in 2,782 tCO_{2e} annually and by 2042, 2,302 tCO_{2e} annually. Section 14.5 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) outlines the assumptions and limitations to the assessment and that a conservative approach to calculating GHG emissions has been undertaken.</p> <p>The incorporation of active travel routes would encourage more sustainable, low carbon modes of transport, reducing emissions associated with private vehicles. The Scheme also includes tree and woodland planting which would provide minor carbon sequestration benefits once the maturity stage has been reached.</p> <p>Technological changes, including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the banning of the sale of petrol and diesel cars by 2030, and the decarbonisation of the National Grid, is anticipated to continue to reduce the GHG emissions associated with the Scheme over time.</p> <p>In comparison to the UK carbon budget, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK’s 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK’s 5th and 6th carbon budget. It is considered that the increase in emissions as a result of the Scheme would not have a material impact on the ability of UK Government to meet its carbon budgets, therefore in accordance with the DMRB, there would be no significant effect.</p> <p>Furthermore, in response to there “<i>not being any attempts to project air quality or greenhouse gas data beyond the planed 2026 opening year</i>”, it is not considered necessary to quantify air quality impacts at the design year of 2047 as the decrease</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			in pollutant emissions (from traffic and other sources) in the interim period, result in 2027 representing the worst case due to higher background concentrations (of NO _x and to a lesser degree PM ₁₀) and traffic related emissions (of NO _x). This is considered standard practice and in accordance with paragraph 2.89 of the DMRB LA105.
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	I can't see how local flooding risks or air pollution or noise pollution or ecological impacts or habitat loss or wildlife survival will be protected , any loss of habitat that affects the life of our wildlife is unforgivable and should not happen.	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on air quality, biodiversity, noise and local flooding is set out in Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 8 (Biodiversity), Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) and Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , respectively. The ES (Document Reference 6.1) includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.
Local community	Accepting that works will only increase noise and pollution by small amounts is not addressing the problem. Any improvements must not just be for the motorist but also for those whose lives are going to be directly affected. First the by pass, then the M3 now this, what is next. This is not progress in any sense of the word and planners must think about not only those who will both benefit but also those whose lives will be changed.	N	The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality (National Highways, 2019) and discussed with key stakeholders including Winchester City Council and Eastleigh Borough Council. Operational traffic emissions were modelled and indicate that the Scheme results in both predicted increases and decreases in NO ₂ and PM ₁₀ concentrations at a number of receptor locations. The majority of decreases were located within Winchester City Centre due to predicted decreases in traffic flows on these routes, and increases were located in the proximity of the M3 and Easton Lane (and adjoining roads) due to predicted increases in traffic flows on these routes. The assessment undertaken demonstrates that there are no locations NO ₂ concentrations exceed the air quality threshold (40 µg/m ³). according to the DMRB LA 105 methodology, therefore there would be no significant effects as a result of the Scheme.
Local community	Increase in traffic means more pollution.	N	The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality (National Highways, 2019) and discussed with key stakeholders including Winchester City Council and Eastleigh Borough Council. Operational traffic emissions were modelled and indicate that the Scheme results in both predicted increases and decreases in NO ₂ and PM ₁₀ concentrations at a number of receptor locations. The majority of decreases were located within Winchester City Centre due to predicted decreases in traffic flows on these routes, and increases were located in the proximity of the M3 and Easton Lane (and adjoining roads) due to predicted increases in traffic flows on these routes. The assessment undertaken demonstrates that there are no locations NO ₂ concentrations exceed the air quality threshold (40 µg/m ³). according to the DMRB LA 105 methodology, therefore there would be no significant effects as a result of the Scheme.
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what me might plant on them			
Local community	There is no way of disguising the fact that this scheme will fill a whole fold in the landscape with tarmac, ugliness, noise and pollution . There will be little landscape left for planting.	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on air quality, landscape and visual, and noise is set out in Chapters 5, 7 and 11 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.
Local community	You go nowhere near far enough. It is possible to reduce noise and pollution. Your proposals are a bog standard scheme to try and make it all look and sound acceptable when the reality is very different.	N	
Local community	This is in part of the South Downs and includes areas of SSSI and the River Itchen. Laying tarmac over green land so it will be possible to increasing traffic and noise/emission pollution will only adversely affect these. The construction period particularly.	N	Construction works (including earthworks, piling and spoil storage) have the potential to result in short term temporary impacts from increased pollutants such as silt and dust, and as such, a reduction in water quality, which could result in degradation of SSSI habitats adjacent to the Scheme. However, a package of pollution prevention

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>measures, designed to avoid increased pollution during construction have been set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>There is potential for indirect impacts to the River Itchen SSSI as a result of changes to groundwater flows as a result of excavation and piling. As set out in Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), following mitigation secured through the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3), there would no measurable change to groundwater receptors resulting in a negligible impact.</p> <p>Following the inclusion of the mitigation outlined in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) all identified potential impacts from construction activities would result in no change or negligible impacts to the River Itchen SSSI (a receptor of National importance). This results in an effect of 'slight' significance which is not significant.</p> <p>St Catherine's Hill SSSI is located approximately 500m south of the Scheme. No direct or indirect impacts on the SSSI are anticipated during the construction phase, due to the distance and physical separation from the Scheme. As such there would be no change to the St Catherine's Hill SSSI.</p>
<p>E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.</p>			
Local community	Would you really want to be travelling through this spaghetti like structure close to a polluting motorway when there are better local green spaces	N	<p>The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality (National Highways, 2019) and discussed with key stakeholders including Winchester City Council and Eastleigh Borough Council. Operational traffic emissions were modelled and indicate that the Scheme results in both predicted increases and decreases in NO₂ concentrations at a number of receptor locations. The majority of decreases were located within Winchester City Centre due to predicted decreases in traffic flows on these routes, and increases were located in the proximity of the M3 and Easton Lane (and adjoining roads) due to predicted increases in traffic flows on these routes. The assessment undertaken demonstrates that there are no locations NO₂ concentrations exceed the air quality threshold (40 µg/m³). according to the DMRB LA 105 methodology, therefore there would be no significant effects as a result of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	I don't understand why the access to cyclists and horse-riders has been so drastically curtailed - can only assume this is a simple oversight. The 'new footpath Easton lane to long walk' connects with a bridleway (wrongly labelled as a footpath in your documents) on to Easton village and it makes no sense for this not to be available as a bridleway.	N	<p>The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality (National Highways, 2019) and discussed with key stakeholders including Winchester City Council and Eastleigh Borough Council. Operational traffic emissions were modelled and indicate that the Scheme results in both predicted</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The other new footway route along the scenic A34 seems to offer marginal benefit to pedestrians (who can already use Nun's Walk) while it could be a very useful link to Kings Worthy for cyclists who are otherwise limited to Worthy Road, which has high volumes of traffic and an inadequate shared pavement provision for cyclists.</p> <p>All of these routes will be mired with noise pollution and fumes, making it hard to imagine that they will be attractive for walkers.</p>		<p>increases and decreases in NO₂ concentrations at a number of receptor locations.. The majority of decreases were located within Winchester City Centre and increases were located in the area of the M3 and Easton Lane (and adjoining roads) due to predicted increase on traffic flows on these routes. The assessment undertaken demonstrates that there are no locations where NO₂ concentrations exceed the air quality threshold (40 micrograms per cubic metre (µg/m³)) according to the DMRB LA 105 methodology. Therefore, there will be no significant effects as a result of the operation of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>Footpaths along the Itchen Valley will have to contend with a new layer of noise pollution and fumes without substantial sound and pollution barriers. Failure to retain the proposal for a cycle route between King's Worthy and Winnall, and poor design of the revised NCN23 are deeply disappointing given the budget for this project. The walking route from King's Worthy will be horrifically dominated by speeding traffic and should be diverted away from the roads wherever possible e.g. by using the road to the west of Homebase. Footpath interconnections between the new path and the existing footpath network are poor and dysfunctional. Concessions to the horse-riding community should not have been abandoned.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) does not assess the impacts on footpaths as it is not identified as a sensitive receptor in accordance with DMRB LA 105 Air Quality (National Highways, 2019) and the exposure is transient.</p>
Local community	<p>The existing junction causes noise and air pollution for miles around, who wants footways and cycleways parallel to even more roads?</p>	N	
Local community	<p>Why have you abandoned the previous proposals for a cycle way between Kingsworthy to and Winnall? It was probably the only good things on the whole proposal.</p> <p>The proposed footpath route is so close to the traffic that it will be unpleasant, noisy, pollute the air, and thus it's not a useful amenity at all.</p> <p>The M3 should be destroyed. If not, it should be or put into a tunnel to prevent its noise and pollution affecting people who travel in more planet-friendly ways.</p>	N	
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	<p>The northern construction compound on Christmas Hill does seem a bit distant from the works, and I am a bit concerned it might bring noise/dust/congestion into that area.</p>	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, further work was undertaken by the Applicant to consider the potential impacts of the locations of the construction compounds in relation to carbon emissions. As a result, the northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides further details.</p>
General commentary			

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>A scheme of this nature requires a huge amount of effort and planning. I understand that the aim is to reduce congestion at the Winnall roundabout and A34 but whenever we attempt to solve one problem it shifts the problem somewhere else and is inevitably at the expense of someone, nature, the environment. The M3 at Winchester solved the congestion at the Hockley traffic lights, this led to noise, pollution, impact on our natural environment and inevitably congestion somewhere else - at the Winnall roundabout and A34. Your scheme will solve the congestion on the A34 but - at the expense of increased noise, traffic, pollution, lowering of quality of life for those who live near the scheme, and no doubt lead to congestion elsewhere (M3/M27 junction etc).</p> <p>It would be good to interrupt this cycle and not accept increasing volume of traffic, lorries and cars as the solution. It really is time we acted on climate, environment and health concerns. It's time to be creative and come up with alternative solutions to more lanes, more cars, more lorries! What about freight trains, lorry lanes, local suppliers etc?</p>	N	<p>The operational traffic model flows have been analysed to identify roads exceeding the DMRB LA 105 criteria and a 200m buffer used to define the Affected Road Network. The Affected Road Network (see Figure 5.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) extends along the A34 towards the south of Newbury in the north, several roads within Winchester, the M3 south to Junction 12 and the A272 and B3047 to the east. As shown in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), the majority of roads considered by the traffic model within Winchester experience a decrease in traffic flows as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Operational traffic emissions were modelled and indicate that the Scheme results in both predicted increases and decreases in NO₂ concentrations at a number of residential locations. The majority of decreases were located within Winchester City Centre due to predicted decreases in traffic flows on these routes, and increases were located in the proximity of the M3 and Easton Lane (and adjoining roads) due to predicted increases in traffic flows on these routes. The assessment undertaken demonstrates that there are no locations NO₂ concentrations exceed the air quality threshold (40 µg/m³). according to the DMRB LA 105 methodology, therefore there would be no significant effects as a result of the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Impacts on human health are considered within Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This has been prepared in accordance with the latest DMRB LA 112 Population and Human Health (National Highways, 2020). With respect to air quality, Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that the Scheme would result in a neutral health outcome on ambient air quality.</p>
Local community	<p>Please reassess the need for the scheme against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduced traffic post Covid - increased pollution from increased traffic - increased local noise from faster traffic - use of public funds which may be better suited to increasing green opportunities 	N	<p>The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality (National Highways, 2020) and discussed with key stakeholders including Winchester City Council and Eastleigh Borough Council. Operational traffic emissions were modelled and indicate that the Scheme results in both predicted increases and decreases in NO₂ concentrations at a number of residential locations. The majority of decreases were located within Winchester City Centre due to predicted decreases in traffic flows on these routes, and increases were located in the proximity of the M3 and Easton Lane (and adjoining roads) due to predicted increases in traffic flows on these routes. The assessment undertaken demonstrates that there are no locations NO₂ concentrations exceed the air quality threshold (40 µg/m³). according to the DMRB LA 105 methodology, therefore there would be no significant effects as a result of the operation of the Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	More emphasis needs to be made to mitigate the noise from increased road traffic and faster speeds for those living next to the motorway on the western side of the cutting between Chalk Ridge to the south and Tesco's at Junction 9. All road surfaces used should be of the latest type to minimise road noise from the M3 and connecting roads and sufficient drainage to avoid build up of water in torrential rain, which again generates considerable noise. Regular air pollution monitoring should take place and provided to residents at routine intervals to ensure they remain at safe levels for residents in the area.	N	<p>During construction, mitigation would be implemented to reduce the impact of dust generation on air quality to a negligible level. Mitigation measures are outlined in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the first iteration of the Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (Document Reference 7.3). The final EMP will be secured through a DCO requirement. Furthermore, Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) confirms that the impact of emissions from construction traffic are not considered to have the potential to result in significant air quality effects given the anticipated duration of changes to traffic flows and background concentration of air pollutants.</p> <p>During operation, according to the DMRB LA105 methodology the impact of emissions from operational traffic is considered to not be significant and therefore no monitoring is required.</p>
Local community	Junction 9 needs to be improved to avoid queueing traffic on both the M3 and A34, which lead to increased pollution, not only on those roads but within the city of Winchester, when drivers try to avoid the junction by leaving the roads at either Littleton or Compton.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	I object to the widening of the M3 near Winchester as part of the planned improvements as I believe it is contrary to tackling air pollution and climate change.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed, including those received objecting the principles of the Scheme.
Local community	<p>The road scheme is not appropriate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it will destroy and fragment important protected habitats for wildlife which is rapidly declining (State of Nature reports, RSPB) • building roads induces: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. traffic (SACTRA reports) b. CO2 emissions and noxious pollutants • it contravenes government targets to reduce climate change and public efforts to deal with the climate emergency • it contravenes cycling and walking strategies and need for investment in public transport • it contravenes need for an integrated transport policy • it contravenes government's 25-year Environment Plan (government earlier manifesto to leave the environment in a better place than the one in which they found it) • it contravenes the SDNP nature plan where its efforts for nature's recovery would be an interconnected 'nature network' • it contravenes people's need for green spaces and landscapes for health, recreation and visual upliftment 	N	<p>CO₂ emissions are reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Scheme is estimated to lead to an increase in CO₂ emissions over a 60-year operational period. It is considered that the emissions from the scheme in isolation would not have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon budgets.</p> <p>The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The assessment takes into account the impact of the Scheme during both construction and operation and concludes that it would not have a significant effect on air quality concentrations at assessed receptors.</p>
Local community	I want to object to the proposed widening, extending and enlarging of the M3 around Junction 9 at Winnall. I know that you have your instructions to follow	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>through with a road programme. However, I would ask that you all think of the consequences of this proposal at this time in our history.</p> <p>We are facing the gravest threat to humanity ever known in the form of the heating of our planet. We need to shift away from fossil fuels very rapidly within the next 10 years. So, road building needs to be held in check whilst a holistic programme is developed of how we are going to make this shift.</p> <p>Widening the M3 will emit carbon in its building and once built the traffic will increase, and the destruction to the local flora and fauna may not be recoverable. Pollution levels around Winchester already breach safe levels. It is time to be moving us all towards public transport, to put goods on trains, to increase bus services, to minimise long distance travel.</p> <p>The money to be spent on this road could be better spent on so many other things that would contribute to a cleaner, safer future. We all have individual and collective responsibilities for the world we live in and for the way we are leaving it for future generations.</p>		
Local community	<p>The Winchester Movement strategy work suggests that improvements to the capacity of and flow through this junction will have a positive impact on the city's traffic issues, air pollution, carbon footprint etc. I remain unconvinced, because in many cases, the issues are caused by accidents on the M3 or A34 outside the proposed plan area. I do not see any data in the consultation report to show expected movements, % of non polluting vehicles by 2035, etc in the papers. This leads to build up of traffic which is avoided by going through Winchester instead. Unless these plans reduce accidents on the feeder trunk roads (the M3 and A34,) the traffic build ups will still occur, all too often as traffic levels are returning to pre pandemic levels.</p> <p>These are my specific points for your consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The layout is better for local people using the A33 who were worried about crossing heavy traffic, but it now means that all local users will have to use the new junction every time (which wasn't the case in the previous design). This may lead to congestion so it has not served our needs as well as we would hope. The north exit from the A33 on to the M3 north brings faster traffic movements closer to the communities that I represent- hence potentially noisier, which is unacceptable. 2. The positioning of the soil deposits has been done to suit HE/landowners. It is a missed opportunity to mitigate the noise of the road in operation all along the route from south to north. (see also point 12) Princes Mead has concerns about the setting of the listed building too. There is no assessment of flood risk when these soil heaps are in place. 	N	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments and sets out its response to the matters relating to air quality below. Other matters raised in this response are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p> <p>Response to point 9:</p> <p>The effects of the Scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The assessment takes into account the impact of the Scheme during both construction and operation and concludes that it would not have a significant effect on air quality concentrations at assessed receptors.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>3. The omission of the cycle route to Kings Worthy when it was so clearly described in the first proposal is a failure in this design. It is a need that is clearly described in the WCC/HCC Infrastructure Funding Statement (previously the R123 list) which I have already sent to the design/project team. I believe it is a duty to consider the needs of Non Motorised Users to be taken into account in any NSIP scheme, so this omission is disappointing.</p> <p>4. The lack of traffic lights may be ok initially, but inevitably, there will be a need to control traffic flows in years ahead. Please include electricity schemes to enable traffic lights to be fitted later.</p> <p>5. Failure to show signage and gantries in the scheme means that we cannot tell what views these will present to local people, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area. Already, the traffic lights of the junction can be seen from miles away in my division, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area, and cross motorway gantries can be viewed from Martyr Worthy in the national park.</p> <p>6. If this country is to embrace walking and cycling for local commuting use, then the 3m wide cycle routes are inadequate to pass and should be wider. This includes actually on the roundabout where at one point, the walk/cycle way is alongside the main road. The Winnall area will continue to provide employment opportunities as well as retail etc. Other larger lorries go into the city from this junction. The paths created should not be shared for walkers and cyclists on planned bridleway that connect and to the NCN 23 where cyclists can be riding faster than is safe for walkers sharing the same surface (all should be at least to LTN1/20).</p> <p>7. Impact on Cart and Horses junction traffic going onto the A33 from the B3047</p> <p>a. The design has no traffic breaks in traffic moving north on the A33 from Junction 9. Currently, there are traffic breaks (traffic lights create this) which create gaps in traffic to allow people to exit from the Cart and Horses junction, allowing it to function. This is particularly important at peak times when traffic entering and leaving Winchester is heavy on both routes. The new arrangement may create congestion, reduce safety and even more confusion at this junction. (It is also an opportunity to improve the gateway into the National Park at this point.)</p> <p>b. The road layout of the A33 is changing, with one lane in each direction, and a bike lane coming into/through the junction. Currently there are sections of two lanes for filtering etc. These changes will impact on the junction itself which will need redesign to ensure it is safe, congestion doesn't occur and ideally actually improves for traffic going south (Morning Basingstoke traffic into Winchester), and Worthys /Winchester traffic going north and south at all times of day, but particularly at peak times, and traffic from the B3047 east going north.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>8. The project statement states that one aim is to reduce Spitfire Link congestion, which severely impacts drivers there. There is no evidence in the project plan that the team have provided that shows how the new design will reduce congestion. At present, large traffic accelerates from a stop slower than smaller vehicles which results in no gaps for Spitfire Link traffic. There is no evidence provided that this will improve, because although much of the heavy traffic will be on the through road, not all of it will take that route; daytime traffic in particular, includes a considerable amount of large and small vehicles into Winnall.</p> <p>9. The levels on the project plans are difficult to follow, and I asked HCC to seek more traffic data, and full levels plan to see the implications for views, noise, pollutants fall out.</p> <p>10. The drive through video is poor, and difficult to follow : I requested an improved version but was told this was impossible.</p> <p>11. There is a considerable amount of biodiversity work to be considered: which includes interconnectivity between areas being 'managed' for biodiversity. I am leaving this to the experts at WCC, HCC and to SDNPA, but I do have concerns about the long term management of the water areas, set within the road system.</p> <p>12. The DEFRA 2016 noise map showed that improvement to noise mitigation were desirable at points through Winchester and for the A34 at the Headbourne Worthy site. A noise reference along Willis Way is included in your scheme. Anything worse, even by a slight margin would be unacceptable in planning terms 'for the enjoyment of the property' and other properties affected in this way. Since Willis Way was built, a considerable number of properties have been built in this area, alongside the A34 margins and I am seeking noise defence for these residents. Original tree planting is unsatisfactory: acoustic fencing is necessary here to mitigate noise.</p> <p>13. I must also express my regret that an 'open air' event wasn't organised for this consultation. With many other events taking place, this was a missed opportunity to engage the public face to face.</p>		

K.2.C Cultural heritage

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	Damaging an already environmentally damaged area further with no care to the biological and archaeological history or importance of the site to save 5 minutes of traffic.	N	<p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). The assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies outlined within the DMRB LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (National Highways, 2020) and the DMRB LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (National Highways, 2020) and agreed with key heritage stakeholders.</p> <p>It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p>
Local community	This area has both ancient historical significance as well as being a corridor for wildlife and an area of natural importance and beauty.	N	
F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.			
Local community	Concerned about uncovering historic buildings like Fishbourne.	Y	<p>The Applicant has removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals.</p> <p>In regard to uncovering any historic buildings, Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes).</p> <p>The assessment study area comprises 1km around the Application Boundary for designated cultural heritage assets and a 300m study area around the Application Boundary for non-designated cultural heritage assets. These study areas were deemed acceptable by the Winchester City Council, South Downs National Park Authority and Historic England.</p> <p>A programme of archaeological investigation to inform the baseline consisting of geophysical surveys and trial trenching was carried out to inform the assessment. No remains were identified that were of such high value that would warrant preservation in-situ.</p> <p>The archaeological fieldwork described in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Appendices 6.1 to 6.7 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) has reduced the risk of previously unknown archaeological remains</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			being present. However, there is still considered to be the potential, albeit low, for further as yet unidentified archaeological remains to be present. Any further remains identified would most likely be of a similar character and value (low) to remains so far identified.
Local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil bunds could be used for proactive noise mitigation, not merely to raise levels. • Soil spoils affect settings of rights of way, listed building (Princes Mead school) • Soil spoil by St Swithuns risks covering archaeological remains of Morn Hill camp • Soil spoil could provide opportunity for obscuring gantry views etc. <p>It is difficult to see the implications for flooding in future years, and to see long views as I couldn't find these on the consultation website, except through the drive through.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas has resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect less 'best and most versatile' (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>As a highly sensitive building the potential impacts upon Princes Mead School have been fully considered within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). No significant impacts have been identified. A programme of archaeological investigation to inform the baseline consisting of geophysical surveys and trial trenching was carried out to inform the assessment and no remains associated with the Morn Hill camp have been identified within the Application Boundary.</p>
Local community	<p>Letter setting out basis of the representation:</p> <p>These representations are submitted in specific response to one element of the proposed works at Junction 9 of the M3, notably the proposed areas of land identified as potential deposition sites for surplus soil from the works.</p> <p>The OBJECTION in the strongest terms is submitted on four principal grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Process and Procedure b) Landscape Impact c) Heritage Impact d) Access Implications <p>The order of the objections should not be regarded as conveying any order of significance to the objections being raised.</p> <p>a) Process and Procedure</p> <p>Despite the stated intention by Highways England that this is the final round of consultation prior to the submission of the formal application to government, it is our understanding that this is the first consultation that any consideration has been given to the important issue of how to deal with surplus soil generated from the works. This is clearly a critical matter that should have been addressed much earlier in the development of the scheme.</p> <p>Even at this stage, the proposals for the deposition of surplus soil are extremely vague and lacking in any detail. All that can be gleaned from the available consultation material is that three potential sites have been identified and that the land levels may be increased by 4m at two of them, with no detail of intent for the third northern site. However, if the 4m increase represents the</p>	Y	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to deposition areas:</i></p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, all three deposition areas have been removed for the Scheme. In re-profiling the landform between Easton Lane and Long Walk, in response to South Downs National Park Authority and Natural England's comments, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>As a highly sensitive building the potential impacts upon Princes Mead School have been fully considered within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). No significant impacts have been identified. A programme of archaeological investigation to inform the baseline consisting of geophysical surveys and trial trenching was carried out to inform the assessment and no remains associated with the Morn Hill camp have been identified within the Application Boundary.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to walkers, cyclists and horse-riders:</i></p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>envisaged level of excess soil requiring deposition, it would seem plausible that a similar amount of deposition may be envisaged for the northern site, potentially leading to an infilling of the natural valley. It is also not yet known whether 1, 2 or 3 of these sites might be required; the actual landfill requirements; the proposed profiles of the land after deposition and future uses apart from a vague indication of returning to agriculture.</p> <p>There is therefore no basis upon which the impact can be properly assessed and therefore a considered response made and submitted.</p> <p>There is also no understanding of how these sites have been selected; this should be compared with the earlier consultation versions on alternative options for the junction works themselves. It is assumed, but it is not clear, that a range of potential sites have been considered and analysed. It is also hoped that discussions have been held with local authorities and organisations who have a detailed knowledge of the local area and would most probably be able to identify potential sites for soil deposition and subsequent enhancement works.</p> <p>Whilst we understand that the process can be ongoing from now onwards, up to and during the application process, there is limited opportunity for individual landowners, local residents and organisations to be directly involved, notwithstanding that they will be directly affected by the proposals.</p> <p>An OBJECTION must therefore be raised to the unfair and unsound process and it is requested that the opportunity be provided for a further round of consultation when the proposals for the deposition of surplus soil have been properly addressed and refined, taking into account the representations received from this stage of consultation.</p> <p>The following objections are therefore necessarily based on the limited information available and apply directly to the proposed northern area identified as a potential site for soil deposition. This site actually has the most limited information available; the flythrough of the scheme touches upon the central and southern sites but does not even refer to the northern site. The potential for the northern site is really only picked up from the site plans showing areas of land, which appear largely unrelated to the actual existing landforms.</p> <p>b) Landscape Impact</p> <p>Please refer to the attached assessment undertaken by the terra firma Consultancy Ltd. Terra firma are a well-respected firm of landscape architects advising on a local and national basis and who have advised the Trust on a number of projects over many years.</p> <p>The report concludes that there is the potential for significant harm on landscape character of and visual amenity within the SDNP, as well as on the setting of Worthy Park House.</p>		<p>The effects on existing PRowS during construction are outlined in Chapter 12 (Population and Human health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The impacts of the construction of the Scheme on these routes are considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted an outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) as part of its DCO application. The Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) provides details of how the construction works will be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measure, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase. The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p>Due to the removal of the deposition areas, the existing walking, cycling and horse-riding routes within the vicinity of the Scheme would not be affected.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to cultural heritage:</i></p> <p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). The assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies outlined within the DMRB LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (National Highways, 2020) and the DMRB LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (National Highways, 2020) and agreed with key heritage stakeholders.</p> <p>It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to Worthy Park House:</i></p> <p>Worthy Park House is recognised as a designated built heritage asset in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). An assessment of the impact on this receptor is provided in the chapter. It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p> <p>Specifically, a very small part of the area between the A34 and M3 is visible in long distance views from the listed building and overall, it is considered that construction</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>c) Heritage Impact Please refer to attached Heritage Impact Assessment from LJE Planning Ltd. This concludes the potential for significant harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* designated heritage asset of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>d) Access Considerations The northernmost site is within an existing agricultural field with very limited access. Existing access to the site is via narrow country lanes, most of which have to go through the very attractive and historic village of Easton. These existing routes cannot be contemplated as any means of access to the northern site.</p> <p>Looking at the plans that have been submitted it can only be deduced that the intention would be to create a new haul route parallel to the south side of the M3. This is not shown on any of the plans; only the final environmental improvements along this land. Its potential use as a haul route would need its own environmental assessment given the proximity to the River Itchen SSSI and there is no indication that such work has been undertaken. Noise, contamination and air quality issues in such a sensitive environment must also be considered.</p> <p>On the basis of the access limitations and considerations which would apply to the introduction of a new haul route, the access to this northern identified site would seem unrealistic and impractical.</p> <p>Summary Significant OBJECTION must necessarily be raised to the proposals in so far as they relate to the deposition of excess soil as a result of the J9 changes. There is just insufficient information available to enable a proper assessment to be made of potential impacts, which is a major objection in itself to the process and procedures.</p> <p>However, and even on the limited information available, there would be significant landscape, heritage and access impact issues arising from the proposed use of the northern site. These are sufficient that this site should not be progressed any further as a potential soil deposition site. The site would be returned to agricultural use but leaving an irreversible impact on landscape and heritage which could and would not be mitigated by environmental measures.</p> <p>The enhancements along the line of the haul road, if indeed this is the intended means of access cannot be construed to be enhancements as they would appear to being promoted generally as part of the overall enhancement works and not specific to the deposition of soil at the northern site.</p> <p>There may be other sites (and not necessarily the other two identified sites) which would be much better suited with less adverse impacts and where there could be environmental benefits to be secured. It is understood that other objectors, including the South Downs National Park Authority have</p>		<p>activities are unlikely to be visually or audibly noticeable from the listed building and the current character experienced from the listed building would be retained. Therefore, the impact of magnitude would be negligible to Worthy Park House, resulting in a temporary slight adverse effect which is not significant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the LVIA concludes that the construction phase will have a slight effect that is also not significant on Worthy Park House during construction. By summer year 15, there will be no change of effect on Worthy Park House. See Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) for further details.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to landscape and visual:</i></p> <p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on landscape and visual amenity and likely significant effects following implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>At the foremost the Scheme proposals look to avoid impacts and the Scheme retains as much existing vegetation as possible, with landscape mitigation measures including extensive areas of native woodland planting, linear planting, roadside tree planting, species rich grass verges, and areas of chalk grasslands creation (which all complement biodiversity and respond to the key characteristics of the landscape in which the Scheme is located). There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape.</p> <p>The Scheme also includes re-profiling of existing landform to create sympathetic features and reinforce existing characteristics and aid visual screening together with improving the network of public rights of way and new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes). These mitigation measures are presented in detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been included as part of the application to deliver any mitigation required. This describes the proposed outline management and monitoring of the landscape and ecological mitigation elements with detail of the objectives, and success criteria for the establishment to achieve its environmental function. This would be updated into a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) during detail design and would include further detail on the long-term management.</p> <p><i>Response in relation Landscape Character Areas:</i></p> <p>Landscape Character Areas considered in the study area for the Scheme are outlined in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Scheme and study area lies within three of the landscape character areas (LCAs) identified in the <i>South Downs Landscape Character Assessment (South Downs National Park Authority, 2020)</i>. These are LCA A5, LCA F5, LCA G5. The study</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>recommended other sites for consideration, where tangible and long lasting enhancements can be achieved.</p> <p>It is very much hoped that the next stages of the process will not only take account of these objections but also find a way to involve all those parties, including individual residents and landowners who will be directly impacted by these proposals.</p> <p>Summary of report on Landscape Impact:</p> <p>The element of the proposals that is covered by this report is the deposition of spoil, in particular to the potential northern site as identified on the extract below from the 'Indicative Land Uses' plan. The PEIR states at section 7.7.2 that 'The landscape of the areas of search for potential excess spoil management is defined by undulating arable farmland bounded by hedgerows and hedgerow trees. These areas of search for potential excess spoil management lie within the boundary of the SDNP' and at 7.7.6 that 'post construction the 'landscape east of the M3 within the SDNP would continue to exist as arable farmland with associated crop and land management changes.'</p> <p>PEIR states at 2.4.42 that 'The construction process would re-use excavated materials as fill (where possible) to reduce the number of construction vehicles travelling on the network.'</p> <p>There are three areas being considered for spoil deposition from the construction works. Our response concerns the northern area.</p> <p>The potential extent of the northern spoil deposition site is included within the Indicative Application Boundary on the proposals plans. However there is limited further information; on viewing the flythrough of the scheme it is clear that, whilst this covers the central and southern spoil deposition sites and a raising of levels by approximately 4m to accommodate spoil, it does not refer to the northern site.</p> <p>The northern boundary line of the site runs immediately adjacent to the bridleway that links the western edges of Easton village with the subway below the M3 linking through to the Itchen Way and the Itchen Valley to the west of the M3.</p> <p>The site lies across a dry valley on the side of the downland, with the northern extent set at between approx. 50m AOD at the north-west corner rising to approx. 60m AOD at the north-east corner. The southern boundary at set at approx. 70m AOD at the south-west corner, dropping down to approx 66m AOD before rising up again to 80m to the south-east boundary.</p> <p>Worthy Park House is listed Grade II* and its Coach House separately listed Grade II; its grounds are listed on the Hampshire Register of Gardens Parks and Landscapes of Historic Interest.</p> <p>The site is located to the east of Abbots Worthy between the A33 and the M3 road corridors. The buildings, which include Worthy Park House, are set to the</p>		<p>area, as described in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), extends up to 3km from the Application Boundary, has been informed through consultation with stakeholders, visibility analysis and site survey. The published national, county and local character areas within the study area are shown on Figure 7.3.1 (Landscape Character Areas) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p><i>Response in relation to viewpoints:</i></p> <p>View Locations are shown on Figure 7.4 (View Locations) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2). Baseline photographs (winter and summer) are presented on photo sheets at Figure 7.12 (Photosheets (Daytime Winter and Summer)) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>In Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) view location 23 is recorded to have a negligible adverse magnitude of effect during construction. This is due to the fact that the deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme and the Application Boundary has been revised to reflect this change.</p> <p><i>Points in relation to South Downs National Park and its special qualities:</i></p> <p>The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Scheme design avoids introduction of tall bridge structures or elevated embankments and instead the Scheme is positioned within cutting with structures and associated headwalls set within the landform at as low an elevation as possible. Views of the Scheme from the designated landscape have been considered with the aim where possible to minimise any adverse effects.</p> <p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>north of the B3047 beyond intervening agricultural land and school playing fields. Vehicular access is from a private drive that runs from the B3047 I and also serves adjacent residential properties to the east of the site. To the west and north of the site lie areas of deciduous woodland, with the northern woodland within the ownership of our client. Sports pitches and courts are situated to the south and southwest of the school buildings.</p> <p>The site lies on ground falling towards the southern boundary with the B3047 on the north side of the River Itchen valley floor. The building is set at approximately 64m AOD, with the road set at approx 51m AOD. On a direct line between the House and the northern deposition site the Itchen Valley falls to a low point of approx 42m AOD.</p> <p>With reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011), the northern spoil deposition site lies in the Landscape Character Area (LCA) A5 East Winchester Open Downs.</p> <p>Relevant key characteristics of this character zone include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the open character of the East Winchester Open Downs, there are expansive views over Winchester and the Itchen Valley. • Open rolling upland chalk landscape of rolling Downs reaching 176m at Cheesefoot Head. • Dominated by large 18th and 19th century fields of arable and pasture, bounded by sparse thorn hedgerows creating a very open landscape supporting a range of farmland birds. • Large open skies ensure that weather conditions are a dominant influence creating a dynamic, moody landscape, particularly on higher ground e.g. at Cheesefoot Head. • A strong sense of remoteness and tranquillity away from the major transport routes (M3, A31, A272) which cross the landscape. • Other characteristics to note are: • Transport routes carve up the area – the M3 runs along the western boundary and the A31/A272 cut across the character area in an east-west direction. The sense of tranquillity and remoteness of this character area is diminished in the vicinity of these major transport routes. Also associated with the major transport routes out of Winchester is ribbon development, as seen along the B3404. • Of particular sensitivity is the remote and tranquil character of the East Winchester Open Downland which is threatened by its proximity to Winchester and numerous transport routes. • Given the proximity to, and views over, Winchester, this area is also sensitive to changes in the urban area and on the urban fringe beyond the South Downs study area. Also of particular sensitivity are the prominent scarps and open undeveloped skylines. • Observable changes in the past have included the introduction and upgrading of major roads, including the M3, A272, and A31 which have 		<p>focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p> <p>Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the special qualities of the South Downs National Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p><i>Response in relation to public consultation:</i></p> <p>As part of the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant presented a variety of plans and figures (including; the Indicative Application Boundary, a General Arrangements plan and environmental baseline figures). A 'red line' was included on all figures to illustrate the proposed site boundary of the DCO application.</p> <p>The 2021 PEIR and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the information presented in 2021 PEIR and supporting figures aligns with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements and the Infrastructure EIA Regulations 2017.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to construction:</i></p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) present assessments in relation to air quality, contamination and noise, respectively.</p> <p>As part of the DCO Application, Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) has been produced to show the haul roads and temporary construction compounds.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>severed the landscape and created some incongruous cuttings and bridges.</p> <p>Development considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent further fragmentation of the East Winchester Downs by roads and development. • Seek opportunities to reduce the visual impact of existing visually intrusive elements such as the infrastructure and traffic associated with the M3, A272, and A31, and prominent built elements on the edge of Winchester. • Maintain the open and undeveloped scarps and skylines – avoid siting of buildings, telecommunication masts, power lines and wind turbines on the sensitive skyline. • With reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011), Worthy Park House lies in the adjacent LCA E4 Itchen Valley. Characteristic points to note include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This character area includes the rural part of the valley of the River Itchen in two locations north east and south of Winchester. The boundaries are strongly defined by the topography and are drawn along the apparent skyline of the valley sides as seen from the valley floor. ○ Crossed by the M3 and A roads which interrupt the otherwise tranquil landscape. A sequence of settlements occur along the lower valley sides. ○ Although the valley has an overall tranquil quality this is disrupted in place by the audible ‘hum’ of traffic. <p>Key landscape sensitivities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The smooth form of the intact valley sides which reveal dramatic chalk landforms. • The setting of, and uninterrupted views to churches tower/spires, which are often seen against the rising downland backdrop of the valley sides are also important. • Designed landscapes which provide evidence of gentry houses and landscape parks of the wealthy population of the past. • The woodlands and • hedgerows generally limit visual sensitivity of these valley landscapes. However, the visibility of the chalk valleys from the adjacent downs increases their visual sensitivity. From within the valleys, the valley crests are seen against an open sky and are particularly visually sensitive. <p>Landscape management considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve the intact smooth form of the valley and its dramatic chalk landforms. 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conserve historic designed landscapes, and their settings, which provide evidence of gentry houses and landscape parks of the wealthy population of the past. <p>Development management considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor the effects of incremental change to buildings and land, and minimise such change by providing design guidance and encouraging applicants to enter into discussions at an early stage in the preparation of their proposals. Conserve the open skylines of the valley crests which are particular sensitive in views from the valleys. Consider views from the adjacent downs in relation to any change in the chalk river valleys. <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House are on the southern facade, with all the rooms, including the key internal spaces, looking out over the landscape to the south across the top of the lower level Itchen Valley, much of which is hidden in the intervening woodland on the valley floor, along with the M3 corridor. The eye is drawn beyond to the open arable downland above the valley floor where the rolling nature is clearly visible in the views from Worthy Park House, accentuated by the presence of the characteristic valley, central to views, which give rises to a distinctive contouring of the landform. The presence of the valley is also accentuated by the patterns of the arable farming landscape with straight lines seemingly folding and curving around the contours of the landform.</p> <p>The PEIR Heritage Chapter includes at section 6.8.13 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) states ‘Worthy Park House is located to the north of the IAB. Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape including south across land within the IAB. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding landscape, which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped retaining part of the views described in the nineteenth century and contributes towards the historic interest of the listed building. The construction of the Proposed Scheme, particularly areas of search for potential excess spoil management, potential construction compound areas and areas proposed for environmental mitigation on the eastern side of the M3 are likely to be prominent in views from the listed building introducing construction traffic and further eroding the character of the surrounding landscape which are part of the wider setting of the listed building. As part of the wider setting that has already been extensively altered the construction of the Proposed Scheme is likely to result in an impact of minor magnitude and a temporary slight or moderate adverse effect. This assessment will be reviewed in ongoing EIA work and reported in the ES</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>following the decision on which areas of search for potential excess storage will be included and once further details about construction activities in this area are available.'</p> <p>Section 7.4.4.sets out the relevant landscape character areas, stating these cover all the relevant areas - but there is no mention of the LCA to the north that Worthy Park House lies within: SDLICA LCA E4 Itchen Valley.</p> <p>Topography is described as 'a key characteristic of the undulating hills in the nationally designated SDNP. It is also important to the wider distinctive landscape of the River Itchen valley' and is 'therefore considered to be of medium to high value (sensitivity) depending on location relative to the SDNP and its setting'. Effects on topography are stated to be as follows: 'Construction: Temporary adverse landscape effects are anticipated for the topography within the IAB as a result of construction activities and land reprofiling' and 'Operation: Adverse effects on topography are anticipated to remain during operation as result of the earthworks required to enable the Proposed Scheme. However, earthworks have been designed to sympathetically tie into existing levels and surrounding landform within the SDNP.'</p> <p>Vegetation is described as 'The surrounding landscape contains numerous copses, blocks of trees, hedgerown trees and hedgerows alongside lanes, tracks and field boundaries. The area of the IAB contains fields of both arable and pastoral farmland, typically bounded by hedgerows' and 'is a key characteristic of the nationally designated SDNP and is fundamental to the distinctive landscape of the River Itchen valley. It is an important part of the green infrastructure of the area and it is therefore considered to be of high value (sensitivity).' No effects on vegetation are noted as being relevant to the northern spoil deposition site.</p> <p>Whilst Registered Parks and Gardens are assessed in this section, Heritage Statutory designations are not assessed as part of the landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>Landscape Statutory Designations include 'The SDNP covers around 117ha of the area of the IAB, principally around its northern and eastern lengths (see Figure 7.1, Appendix 7.1). The SDNP incorporates the more intimate local landscape of the River Itchen to the north-west, the north-east of the area of the IAB and also covers the downland to the east. Consideration will be given to both the direct and indirect effects upon this designated landscape, including effects upon its special qualities and representative views. Special qualities of the SDNP are defined by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA); those special qualities which have the potential to be affected by the Proposed Scheme are as follows: Diverse, inspirational landscapes and breath-taking views. This is in part a function of the downland topography, and tranquil; and unspoilt places.' and is stated to be 'a nationally designated landscape resource of very high value (sensitivity).</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Points on perceptual aspects include ‘Noise, lighting, vehicle movement and the presence of infrastructure, all associated with the urban fringe of Winchester and the transport routes including the M3, A34/Winchester bypass and A272/Spitfire Link all erode tranquillity in the area’ and that ‘Built development and transport corridors have also affected the pattern and texture of the landscape over time’ and that tranquillity ‘is a perceptual quality of the landscape, and is influenced by things that people can both see and hear in the landscape around them’ and that ‘Tranquillity and a sense of remoteness are important aspects of the nationally designated SDNP and the River Itchen valley and are of high value (sensitivity).’</p> <p>The PEIR states that relevant landscape character assessments will also be examined and used to inform the landscape assessment.</p> <p>The assessment methodology states that the assessment of the magnitude of impacts on landscape receptors, the evaluation of the significance of landscape effects and the reporting of residual landscape effects for each landscape receptor are all to be reported in ES.</p> <p>Table 7-11 sets out the 24 viewpoints selected and the potential visual effects. There are two that are likely to include views of the northern spoil deposition site: 23 and 24, both from public rights of way. No photographs are available at this stage for review.</p> <p>There are no views from Worthy Park House included.</p> <p>The assessment methodology states that assessment of the magnitude of visual impacts, evaluation of the significance of visual effects and reporting of residual visual effects are all to be reported in ES.</p> <p>Effects during operation for Viewpoint 23 area noted ‘Adverse effects would reduce over time as the landscape mitigation takes effect. Longer term beneficial effects are expected as a result of the landscape mitigation.’</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Mitigation Design Plan makes no reference to mitigation proposals for the northern spoil deposition site .</p> <p>The section states that ‘Anticipated further assessment relevant to landscape and visual matters, which will be submitted with the ES to accompany the Development Consent Order (DCO) process is as follows: A full assessment of landscape and visual effects on receptors and reporting of significance will be undertaken as part of the ES’ alongside continuing design work.</p> <p>The public consultation is being held with a considerable lack of information for review; proposals are diagrammatic, indicative and in some aspects simply not available. This gives very little scope for a full understanding of the nature of the proposals by the public. This information provided is not a full landscape and visual impact assessment and is subject to design development. Therefore the full proposals cannot be properly reviewed and commented on.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The figures included in the information include a red line that covers the entirety of the proposals for the construction and operational stages. This gives rise to difficulties in reviewing specific areas of the proposals and their effects.</p> <p>The statement that the ‘earthworks have been designed to sympathetically tie into existing levels and surrounding landform within the SDNP’ is not backed up by any proposals available for review. The information on the spoil deposition sites is very limited. The amount of spoil being relocated to the northern spoil deposition site will determine the final ground levels, however this is not known at this stage and therefore the form of the proposals cannot be determined. It should be noted that the central and southern spoil deposition sites are far more level in nature than the northern site which dips considerably in the middle and the blanket spreading of a 4m layer of spoil may give rise to significant adverse effects in a valley situation. Indeed, without clarity on the proposals for the northern spoil deposition site, if there is considerable spoil to be deposited on the northern site then this may in effect be used to ‘fill’ the valley, giving rise to significant adverse effects on one of the main key characteristics of the landscape identified in the SDILCA.</p> <p>The PEIR notes that, as mitigation, the adverse effects on Viewpoint 23 will reduce over time, however the raising of levels and changes to topography are permanent and will remain constant over the long term. With the key landscape characteristics for the spoil deposition site noted as the ‘open rolling chalk’ downland with ‘sparse hedgerows, the nature of the landscape character gives little opportunity for mitigation or enhancement.</p> <p>Any change in levels will affect the nature of the view from Worthy Park House. Regarding Worthy Park House, the PEIR Heritage section states that ‘Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape including south across land within the IAB. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding landscape, which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped retaining part of the views described in the nineteenth century and contributes towards the historic interest of the listed building.’</p> <p>It is exactly these views that have been identified as contributing to the historic interest of the House that will be affected by potentially significant adverse effects to the landscape character of the SDNP, identified by the PEIR as very highly sensitive.</p> <p>On the basis of the points raised above, this report concludes that there is the potential for significant harm on landscape character of and visual amenity within the SDNP, as well as on the setting of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>Report on Heritage Impact:</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>LJE Planning Ltd was instructed to consider the impact of the Scheme on the significance of the designated heritage asset, Worthy Park House (Grade II*) with particular regard to the impact on its setting. The assessment is undertaken with particular regard to the inclusion of proposals for identified sites for the deposition of excess spoil, one of which would be on the south side of the Itchen Valley, directly ‘opposite’ Worthy Park House and its grounds.</p> <p>There is regrettably very limited information available about the precise details of the proposed scheme for this potential deposition site. All that can be gleaned from the available consultation material is that three potential sites have been identified and that the land levels may be increased by 4m at two of them, with no detail of intent for the third northern site. However, if the 4m increase represents the envisaged level of excess soil requiring deposition, it would seem plausible that a similar amount of deposition may be envisaged for the northern site, potentially leading to an infilling of the natural valley.</p> <p>In the absence of any more precise details and analysis of the proposals, this assessment has necessarily had to be made on the basis of this extremely limited information; namely the location of the site as identified by the overall extent of the application site for the proposed works including the deposition sites, the suggestion in the consultation material that land levels may be raised or changed by 4m and that the land would revert to agricultural use in the longer term.</p> <p>Client’s land occupies a 5.68 hectare site on the northern side of the B3047 approximately 1km to the east of the junction with the A33 and within the countryside and South Downs National Park. The main building is Worthy Park House, a Grade II* listed, former residential house within a parkland setting, designed by Sir Robert Smirke and dating from the 1820s. The School has recently been successfully extended to the side facing the Coach House, but this extension is not generally visible from the southern side of the building.</p> <p>There are a small number of other buildings within the site, including the Coach House, which is separately listed Grade II to the immediate north-east of the house, and thought also to be by Smirke, as well as the much more recently built sports hall to the west. There is a hard surfaced play area / netball court to the immediate west of the main house and the main grassed playing fields, hard surfaced tennis courts/netball courts and play areas lie to the south.</p> <p>The grounds are also included on the Hampshire County Council’s register of Historic Parks and Gardens (No 1550).</p> <p>There is a Scheduled Monument (Saxon Cemetery) in the woodland area to the west of the Site.</p> <p>In the 18th century, Worthy Park belonged to William Evelyn who constructed a mansion in 1722. The Worthy Park estate passed to Kingston’s second wife</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Isabella, whose son by a previous marriage, Sir Chaloner Ogle, inherited in 1761.</p> <p>Sir Charles Ogle, grandson of Sir Chaloner Ogle constructed the present Worthy Park House in 1820 to a neo-classical design by Sir Robert Smirke. The layout of the property plot was redeveloped at this time. The west wing of the existing 1722 mansion was demolished and the new house built over its foundations (Butchart 1989). The existing rectangular plan building was retained and incorporated into 1820 house as the east wing and used as a service range. The stable block and stable yard wall were constructed at this time, also believed to be by Smirke.</p> <p>Ogle sold the Worthy Park Estate to Samuel Wall in 1825; it remained with his descendants (the Rivers, Fryer and Butchart families) until the late 1950s. During WWII it was used as the southern command headquarters for the Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers and accommodation for the Auxiliary Territorial Service.</p> <p>Following WWII, Worthy Park House was still owned by the Butchart family, although they did not live there. In the late 1950s it was sold to Currys Ltd and became their regional office and staff training centre. Currys left the property in 1985 and the house stood vacant for four years until T. S. Frobisher Ltd. bought it to use as a business centre. Prince's Mead School took over the Site in 1999 and continue to occupy the site.</p> <p>There is a statutory duty to have regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any special architectural or historic features that they possess.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) defines the setting of a heritage asset as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral. <p>Worthy Park House is listed Grade II* and its significance relates to both features of special architectural interest as well as historic interest relating to the design by Sir Robert Smirke. In addition, and of particular relevance to this issue under consideration, the setting adds to the overall significance of the listed building.</p> <p>Country houses defined their owners' relative social standing and the setting of a country house, in the landscape, was of considerable consequence. The site for an nineteenth century house was most particularly chosen for its potential views across parkland and where there might be some view of water or a water feature created.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>With respect to Worthy Park House, commentary in “Selected Illustrations of Hampshire” published in 1834 describes the importance of the southerly view from the house. ‘Below the south front of the mansion winds the river Itchen, on the opposite banks of which rise beautiful eminences, partly covered with wood, beyond, are the more romantic downs.’ The historical relationship between the house and the landscape should therefore not be underestimated.</p> <p>Worthy Park Hose, in its elevated position on the north side of the Itchen Valley gives it a commanding location over the valley. This relationship has not largely changed in character and appearance since the house was first built despite the changes to the use of the building and intervening development. The setting of Worthy Park House and its relationship to the landscape remains an essential part of the significance of the designated heritage asset.</p> <p>The setting of Worthy Park House, both in terms of views out from the house and its south facing grounds as well as views of the house from the surrounding area largely comprise the rolling downlands of the River Itchen valley.</p> <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House and the landscape setting for the Grade II* listed building are described more fully at paragraph 6.2 of the report by the terra firma Consultancy on the landscape and visual effects of the M3 J9 proposals:</p> <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House are on the southern facade, with all the rooms, including the key internal spaces, looking out over the landscape to the south across the top of the lower level Itchen Valley, much of which is hidden in the intervening woodland on the valley floor, along with the M3 corridor. The eye is drawn beyond to the open arable downland above the valley floor where the rolling nature is clearly visible in the views from Worthy Park House, accentuated by the presence of the characteristic valley, central to views, which give rises to a distinctive contouring of the landform. The presence of the valley is also accentuated by the patterns of the arable farming landscape with straight lines seemingly folding and curving around the contours of the landform.</p> <p>Despite the paucity of available information on the details of what is proposed for the possible northern deposition site, it is clear that the use of this site for the deposition of excess spoil would result in changes to this existing landscape, including potentially through the artificial infilling of a natural valley. This would seriously detract from the setting which has been present since the house was built in the early nineteenth century. The rolling downlands are an integral part of the landscape character of this local area and the proposed infilling of the valley and raising of the land would be an artificial intrusion in that natural landscape.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The proposed northern site for deposition of soils would be directly visible from the main building as well as from the grounds to the south of the building and the interrelationship of the building with its natural setting would therefore be harmed.</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (May 2021) (PEIR) produced by Highways England recognises at Table 6-5 that Worthy Park House, as a Grade II* listed building has ‘high’ sensitivity in relation to the proposals, and this is agreed.</p> <p>However, the Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline report undertaken by Highways England suggests at paragraph 5.2.17 and repeated in the PEIR at paragraph 6.8.13 that the existing setting has already been compromised by the construction of the M3 and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. It is contended that the effects of these later developments are overstated. The dominance of the house within the Itchen Valley and the relationship between the house and its setting is very largely unaltered since the time it was built and commented upon by the first owner, Sir Charles Ogle.</p> <p>Although it has been necessary to make certain assumptions about the extent of changes arising were the northern deposition site to be progressed, the conclusion is reached that there would be material impact to and therefore potentially significant harm to the setting of Worthy Park House. Such harm therefore would require to be offset by public benefits, which it is argued should be considered in the context of public benefits arising from the proposed northern deposition site. However, given that the proposal would appear to result in an artificial raising of the land and / or filling in of a natural valley, and its return to agricultural use, it is difficult to envisage any potential opportunities for landscape and / or environmental enhancements.</p> <p>This is of even more concern, given that it is noted that other parties submitting representations to this consultation exercise have raised the possibility of other areas of land for the deposition of excess soil, where there would be significant opportunities for landscape and environmental improvements.</p> <p>This report seeks to assess the potential impact of the works associated with the proposed northern site for the deposition of excess soils arising from the proposed works to J9 of the M3 on the setting and significance of Worthy Park House, a Grade II* listed building. Despite the serious shortcomings in the information available upon which the assessment necessarily has to be made, this report concludes that, on the understanding of the works envisaged, there would be significant harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* designated heritage asset of Worthy Park House.</p>		

K.2.D Landscape and visual

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	I think this is a much more creative scheme than the previous version. I particularly like that you've made use of the existing hillside to accommodate the crossing over of the various parts of A33, A34 and M3 at different heights. It is a great improvement that traffic for the A33 and local traffic from Tesco's towards Kings Worthy and Itchen Abbas gets an underpass to avoid having to cross several lanes of fast-moving traffic. I think this is a much safer solution.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	Although change is needed, this project should certainly consider the green space surrounded and work with the environment, not against it.	N	This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.
Local community	You will be destroying protected land in order to extend a motorway, shocking, traffic before wildlife and natural landscape.	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on the natural landscape and biodiversity is set out in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) and Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , respectively. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and includes appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.
Local community	This area has both ancient historical significance as well as being a corridor for wildlife and an area of natural importance and beauty.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	The impact the road system is having on havens such as the South Downs is significant. As much as we all realise the network needs to improve this can be done with a more harmonious and respectful design rather than cutting into the surroundings.	N	The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park. The Scheme design avoids introduction of tall bridge structures or elevated embankments and instead the Scheme is positioned within cutting with structures and associated headwalls set within the landform at as low an elevation as possible. Views of the Scheme from the designated landscape have been considered with the aim where possible to minimise any adverse effects.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p> <p>Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the special qualities of the South Downs National Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	The most important consideration should be to keep to the minimum changes to the visible landscape and to avoid these away from the junction site itself.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this view.
Local community	Landscaping and wild flower seed used on embankments and surrounding areas. Deterrent measures for deer crossing. A34 has shocking road kill toll .	N	In terms of landscape design, measures such as landscape earthworks and substantial woodland, tree and hedgerow planting would be included in the Scheme to integrate and visually screen the route. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure.			
Local community	It looks like the scheme is well landscaped and aimed to fit into the landscape very well. I like the way it appears to make use of the existing lie of the land to weave the various roads into the hillside instead of having to build extensive flyovers.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed, including those received in support of the proposed landscape strategy. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.
Local community	Landscaping and environmental concerns seem to be well considered.	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	The plans show landscape improvement works including planting to extend and enhance existing screening and to enhance the biodiversity of some existing agricultural land.	N	
Local community	The replacement of hedgerows and care for some areas is encouraging. However, I am concerned about the apparent excess earth, where it will go and what impact this will have both on the landscape and the environment. The information presented is vague and I am not sure which or how many deposition areas there will be and how these will be dealt with.	Y	<p>The Applicant has removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas has resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced potential impacts on tranquillity (both visual and acoustic intrusion) within the South Downs National Park and results in the need to affect less 'best and most versatile' (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme, including locations where new hedgerow would be planted are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p>
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	<p>The woefully poor proposals for reducing environmental impacts do nothing to tackle the nature & climate crisis we are in, with a focus on on-site measures and no understanding or ambition of the environmental contribution that could be made.</p> <p>I would want to see:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> large scale habitat restoration and creation at a landscape scale, including a green bridge to restore ecological connectivity across the M3, chalk grassland re-creation in the Chilcomb Valley to reconnect Deacon Hill & Magdalen Hill Down, wetland extensions and expansions for Winnall Moors and the River Itchen, to improve ecological function and ecosystem services including flood prevention downstream in Winchester, instead of the proposal to destroy parts of the SSSI large scale creation of woodland, natural regeneration and hedgerows to improve ecological connectivity for woodland and scrub species, not amenity plantings 	N	<p>The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. The assessment of these is provided within the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and has contributed to the design narrative set out in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9). The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental enhancements, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Due to the lifespan of the proposals, the Scheme design considers potential change from future climate change, including designing in appropriate water attenuation features for extreme events, specifying durable materials, and includes selection of a diverse species mix for the soft landscape planting for future resilience.</p> <p>There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape. The landscape strategy includes the use of native species of local provenance, to reflect the character of the local landscape, however the selected species mix will be as diverse as reasonably practicable to ensure resilience against potential future diseases and climate change whilst providing functional habitat for wildlife present in the local area. Opportunity for maximising biodiversity benefit has also been provided for with the use of scrub planting throughout the Scheme and species rich grasslands (including chalk grassland).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			At the detailed design stage, the planting specifications and tree mix would be further defined and will look to maximise the carbon sequestration benefits of landscape features.
Local community	Concerned about the construction impact of the works on biodiversity, such as “skylarks and yellow hammers, birds, butterflies and plants”, and the use of “good agricultural land” for the spoil deposition areas. I do not agree that the environmental impact of the Scheme is justified and believe the benefits do not outweigh the disadvantages. The landscape plans do not cover the whole area affected – for instance any plans for embankments or planting beside the M3 Highcliffe/ Petersfield Road, South Downs Way pedestrian bridge.	Y	The Applicant has removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas has resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced potential impacts on tranquillity (both visual and acoustic intrusion) within the South Downs National Park and results in the need to affect less ‘best and most versatile’ (BMV) agricultural land. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included for land within the Application Boundary.
Local community	This could be an opportunity to incorporate environmental re-build like the use of wildflower verges and green pathways.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	As stated, I think there is a lot of potential to improve the landscaping along the A33 by removing all the unnecessary tarmac. The road hasn't needed to be that wide since the M3 opened 40 years ago, and it would be such a shame to ignore the opportunity to fix the problem now, seeing as you are already changing the alignment of the road.	N	Details of the landscaping proposed for areas along the A33 that are within the Application Boundary are presented on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) . Where possible, vegetated slopes are provided to support landscape integration of the infrastructure.
Local community	Some respondents agreed that the landscape proposals presented were ‘fine’ in the context of the Scheme.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme.
Local community	Respondents wished for the landscape proposals to reflect the current landscaping of the M3.	N	
Local community	Some respondents wished for the proposals to “hide” and conceal the project within the landscape.	N	
Local community	The landscape is best left as is!	N	
Local community	There could be more green spaces.	N	
Local community	It's just window-dressing.	N	
Local community	No amount of landscaping is going to be able to improve the look of this concrete monstrosity	N	
Local community	We could do so much more. This is a missed opportunity.	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	It's an eye sore already, removed so much precious habitat from numerous SSSI just leave it be	N	
Local community	Replacing natural landscape with planned planting, no matter how sensitively done, can never replace the landscape destroyed by the scheme.	N	
Local community	Many respondents noted that the landscaping proposed would not be enough and were concerned that the "landscape that has been destroyed can't be build back" with additional landscaping.	N	
Local community	There is no way of disguising the fact that this scheme will fill a whole fold in the landscape with tarmac, ugliness, noise and pollution. There will be little landscape left for planting.	N	<p>The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on air quality, noise and the landscape is set out in Chapters 5, 8 and 7 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including chalk grassland creation. Details of the landscaping proposed for the Scheme is provided in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p>
Local community	Respondents wanted to know that the proposals would be as close as possible to current chalk down habitats. Some noted that the chalk down habitats "cannot be just "planted" but develop over centuries" and if damaged they do not suddenly recover.	N	<p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) provides details of the landscape design proposals for the Scheme. The proposals aim to maximise areas for the creation of chalk grassland on the open downlands, with a combination of species rich grassland with chalk grassland characteristics and woodland / scrubland within the Itchen Valley to reinforce the characteristics of this landscape and support ecological connectivity. An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been included as part of the application. This includes proposed outline measures for management and monitoring, including defined success criteria for the landscape elements proposed. A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan will be secured through a DCO requirement which will provide further detail on management of the landscape proposals.</p>
Local community	Any landscaping has to be large-scale and address the issues caused by the existing road as well as any potential new road works. As said before, concern for nature has to be at the centre of planning from now on, not come as an afterthought.	N	<p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on landscape and visual amenity and likely significant effects following implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>At the foremost the Scheme proposals look to avoid impacts and the Scheme retains as much existing vegetation as possible, with landscape mitigation measures including extensive areas of native woodland planting, linear planting, roadside tree planting, species rich grass verges, and areas of chalk grasslands creation (which all complement biodiversity and respond to the key characteristics of the landscape</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>in which the Scheme is located). There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape.</p> <p>The Scheme also includes re-profiling of existing landform to create sympathetic features and reinforce existing characteristics and aid visual screening together with improving the network of public rights of way and new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes). These mitigation measures are presented in detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been included as part of the application to deliver any mitigation required. A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan will be secured through a DCO requirement.</p>
Local community	We like the landscape as it is. The notion of creating public art to enhance the entrance to Winchester is nonsense. You're telling us people will now be able to travel at 70mph so at best will get a glimpse of this - assuming they are not the driver who is focused on the road ahead. And do you really think that Junction 9 is considered 'an entrance to Winchester'?	N	The Applicant is considering the opportunity for the inclusion of public art and interpretation boards or immersive technology including use of QR codes and augmented reality as part of the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. This would aid understanding of the landscape and specific cultural heritage aspects or ecology within the Itchen Valley and open downland landscape. These opportunities would be explored during detail design.
Local community	I think these proposals could go further. The land you are suggesting could be returned to agriculture should be turned to woodland and links would then allow locals greater outdoor opportunities and also return areas back to nature - this in part mitigates the impact of road usage.	N	<p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland within the open downland areas of the Scheme. This is a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland focuses on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the landscape characteristics Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) .
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			
Local community	<p>1. The proposed new footpath between Easton Lane and Long Walk, across the shoulder of Easton Down (east side of M3) is a welcome addition to the footpath network in the vicinity of Junction 9. Although no public footpath currently exists on this line, I have walked most of the suggested footpath route. From this experience it is clear the new path would be subject to significant traffic noise coming from the adjacent M3, A34, and associated slip roads. Such noise intrusion on this path would be unavoidable - whatever mitigation measures were put in place - but, despite the likely noise levels, the path is still one I would use and value during recreational walks in the area. I welcome this proposed eastern path.</p> <p>From the plans, it seems this path would be largely screened by earthworks and vegetation from the M3 and A34. While this is an understandable design feature, such screening would also block views west across the Itchen valley for people using the path. On some of the more elevated sections of this path I would welcome walkers having the benefit of distant views west across the Itchen valley, even if this meant reduced screening from the roads below. My experience is that walks with an open aspect are much more enjoyable than paths which are completely screened. Please arrange for some open views to the west along the elevated sections of this path.</p> <p>Also, my preference for this eastern footpath would be for it to be reserved for pedestrians only. There is already an existing suitable paved alternative route available for cyclists via Easton Lane and Long Walk. Horses using footpaths inevitably damage the path surface, to the detriment of pedestrians. Also, I have rarely if ever seen horses being ridden in the vicinity of Junction 9 – and there is no pre-existing network of bridleways in the Junction 9 area that would be enhanced by this path being designated as a bridleway. Please keep this proposed eastern path as a footpath only.</p> <p>2. The proposed new footway route on the west side of the M3 / A34, between Tesco's roundabout (Easton Lane) and Kings Worthy, would provide a useful and worthwhile link making effective use of the abandoned stretch of northbound A33 carriageway. However, it is</p>	Y	<p>The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions. The proposed route has been designed as a 1:20 gradient route to promote access for all and its position would provide an attractive opportunity for users to connect between Easton Lane and Long Walk and promotes access to the South Downs National Park. The proposed earthwork strategy and woodland planting on the valley slopes west of the proposed chalk grassland would also aid visual screening of the M3 corridor from areas of the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>It is considered that this new route would positively contribute to the special quality of a diverse inspirational landscape with breath taking views, and the qualities of tranquillity within the South Downs National Park, furthermore, allowing increased recreational access to the South Downs National Park from Winchester. The design solutions for the bridleway on the eastern slopes provides a well-considered user route which reinforces the special qualities of the South Downs National Park, whilst minimising visibility of the highway and overall achieving a varied visual experience for future users. The placement within an area of chalk grassland also positively responds to and provides opportunity for users to experience a feature which reinforces the landscape character of the open downlands. A visual study for users travelling along the proposed bridleway has been undertaken and is summarised in Figures 6.14 to 6.17 in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>difficult to see why this route is not proposed as a shared footpath and cycleway.</p> <p>The western route is one which cyclists from the north and west sides of Winchester would find very useful for reaching the eastern side of the town (especially the retail and employment areas of Winnall) without having to use the congested central town area. I would like to see this western route constructed as a shared cycle/pedestrian route.</p> <p>3. Also, as a footnote to both these proposed new routes for people travelling through the area other than by vehicle - could they be given official names? Naming paths helps identify them and raise public awareness - the local parish councils could undoubtedly suggest suitable and appropriate names if approached.</p>		
Local community	The footpath is better along the lines - proposed high level route wise be blighted by some and most unpleasant	N	<p>The impacts to views of Public Rights of Way users', including a description of sequential views and likely effects, have been assessed and is provided within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This chapter recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. These mitigation measures are presented in detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Appropriate visual screening would be implemented along the routes of the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions. These mitigation measures are presented in detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2). Green bridges do not form part of the Scheme's proposals.</p> <p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The assessment of effects on landscape character (including features and elements) and views during construction and operation is reported within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
Local community	Although some considerations have been made, I stress that the pedestrian areas should be in keeping with the surroundings using green bridges.	N	
Local community	Not good enough. People don't want old landscapes and environments destroyed.	N	
F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.			
Local community	All looks ok – but please use the opportunity to plant hedgerows and wildflowers once you complete the movement of spare soil.	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this</p>
Local community	Leave that to landscapers and engineers	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	All sounds a little up in the air on this one and how this will blend into the landscape, be good from an ecological point of view	Y	<p>area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>The earth spoil and site gained chalk material provides the opportunity for new creation of chalk grassland within the open downland areas of the Scheme as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).. This is a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p>
Local community	The earth spoil should be used to create new chalk grassland areas and be seeded with wildflowers. In addition, hedgerows and woodland should be planted in these areas to more than compensate for the losses, especially the valuable hedgerow in Easton Lane.	Y	
Local community	These strike me as insufficiently developed at this stage. On the one hand you say that you do not yet know how much excess soil you may have to deal with but on the other talk about up to four metres of excess soil spread over the locations you have identified. Four metres would make a significant adverse impact on the visual landscape especially at the southern location but also at the northern location. For interested parties to be able to assess the potential impact you need to provide better visuals.	Y	
Local community	What are the plans for reseeded/ integrating the spare soil into its dumped location(s)?	Y	
Local community	The spare soil may damage the views of the Itchen Valley and chalk downland.	Y	
Local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil bunds could be used for proactive noise mitigation, not merely to raise levels. • Soil spoils affect settings of rights of way, listed building (Princes Mead school) • Soil spoil by St Swithuns risks covering archaeological remains of Morn Hill camp • Soil spoil could provide opportunity for obscuring gantry views etc. <p>It is difficult to see the implications for flooding in future years, and to see long views as I couldn't find these on the consultation website, except through the drive through.</p>	Y	
F.4: Please let us know the reasons for your response to question F3 and any other views about the locations we've identified			
Local community	Should landscape the area thoroughly after completion to maximise the benefit to the biodiversity.	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs</p>
Local community	The south site is lower already the other two might have a higher visual impact.	Y	
Local community	<p>F : Spare soil</p> <p>If more chalk is to be excavated during construction than can be used in embankments and other changes of level in the redesigned junction, then clearly the excess needs to be put somewhere - and preferably not too far from the areas of excavation.</p>	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Three potential sites for disposal of excess excavated materials are identified : Northern Central Southern.</p> <p>Writing as someone who has lived in and explored this area of countryside surrounding Winchester for a lifetime, it is unfortunate that attractive natural landforms created over thousands of years should be significantly remodelled just to accommodate spare chalk.</p> <p>That said, the Northern and Central sites ARE acceptable to me as disposal sites since they do not form areas of particular scenic value, and disposing of spare chalk in them would be unlikely to significantly alter the overall appearance of those locations.</p> <p>The proposed Southern Spare Soil Area is a very different case, and I strongly object to this area of Chilcomb being used to dispose of excess chalk.</p> <p>The Chilcomb valley, before being incorporated into the South Downs National Park, was previously designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and occupies a denuded anticline geological feature visible from large parts of Winchester. Chilcomb possesses significant scenic value in the context of Winchester's setting.</p> <p>The Southern site within Chilcomb occupies what is effectively a natural gully deepened by erosion in the ice ages. Together with the adjacent Magdalen Hill Down, this gully forms part of a locally significant scarp slope downland feature. Using this Southern area to dispose of spare excavated chalk would reduce the overall height differential between the top and bottom of the Magdalen Hill Down scarp slope, and so have a significant detrimental effect on the appearance of the local landscape.</p> <p>Magdalen Hill Down - which directly overlooks the Southern site - is a nature reserve crossed by well-used public rights of way, and is designated as Open Access land much used by the local population and visitors. These factors mean the visual impact of altering the landscape by dumping excess chalk in the Southern site would be much greater than in the Northern and Central sites.</p> <p>This part of the Winchester landscape has already been greatly modified by major road-building schemes over the last century. Further detrimental changes to the landscape in the Southern area just to dispose of excess chalk should be avoided at all costs.</p>		<p>National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	As long as compounds are cleared up and re-landscaped choice should be down to contractors/design team	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	<p>From the published diagrams and maps it is difficult to precisely identify where some of the proposed temporary construction compounds will sit in the existing landscape or, at least, where their boundaries will lie. It would have been helpful if these plans were shown overlaid on a satellite view of the area to assist visualising how the proposed works would sit in the landscape.</p> <p>Nevertheless, examination of the diagram showing the construction compounds reveals that Temporary Construction Compound Number 1 will cover a large area of land east of the J9 roundabout and, in part, bordering the A272 Spitfire Link. Most of this land is currently arable - and I do not object to the temporary use of arable land for a construction compound.</p> <p>However - the plan also shows that Compound No. 1 will have an extension on its northern side, roughly rectangular in shape, stretching up towards Easton Lane. The plan shows this northern extension of Compound No. 1 as occupying an area of land simply shown as plain white - suggesting it is nothing more than arable land. This is incorrect.</p> <p>A walk around the proposed site of Compound No. 1, or even just a glance at a satellite view of the area (Google Maps), clearly shows that this northern extension of Compound No. 1 would cover and destroy the western end of a belt of young trees and natural grassland.</p> <p>Incidentally, while the published plan showing the temporary construction compounds does show the belt of young trees in question, the plan incorrectly shows the tree belt as stopping some distance to the east of the northern extension of Compound No. 1. This belt of trees and natural grassland in fact extends the whole way to the boundary of the existing Junction 9 roundabout, and does not end in the middle of a field as is wrongly shown on the plan.</p> <p>Why is an inaccurate and misleading plan being used?</p> <p>Is it really essential that Temporary Construction Compound No. 1 should extend over this northern area and so destroy a valuable natural resource of young trees and natural grassland?</p> <p>I support the need for Junction 9 to be improved and accept this will inevitably involve the loss of some valuable natural habitat, but it is not obvious that this particular piece of environmental destruction - just to provide space for the</p>	N	<p>Standard construction management practices would be adopted to reduce potential environmental effects during construction of the Scheme. Specific measures to reduce visual impacts of the construction compounds include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opportunities to reduce impacts of nearby highly sensitive visual receptors should be sought through sensitive design of construction compounds e.g. organising compound features and using earthworks / fencing to screen internal activities during the construction phase; and 2. Standard temporary boundary fences for construction compounds would be used. These reduce visual intrusion, assist in noise attenuation and ensure public safety (including uninvited intruder entrance to the site). <p>Further details are provided in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>northern extension of Temporary Construction Compound No. 1 is either essential or inevitable.</p> <p>Could the plans for Compound No. 1 be reviewed so as to dispense with, or at least reduce, the northern extension and so preserve the tree and grass belt?</p>		
Local community	<p>There is insufficient detailed information on Potential Compound 3 to be able to understand the potential impact arising from its use. It is located in an area where there could be potentially significant noise, landscape and visual and other impacts arising from its use. Further detailed information on the detailed proposals for the pound are needed, including uses, proposed hours of operation, visual screening, fencing, noise mitigation, lighting and other measures to be able to provide conclusive comments.</p>	N	<p>The construction of the Scheme would require a small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities. Details of the other construction compounds required to construct the Scheme can be found Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) provide details on the proposed construction working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme.</p> <p>Working hours would be restricted to the following core hours:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 07.00 to 19.00 Monday to Friday 2. 07.00 to 13.30 Saturday 3. No Sunday working <p>Works outside of the core working hours are likely to be required in certain circumstances and would be carried out following consultation with Winchester City Council.</p> <p>The temporary compounds would also be subject to surface water drainage measures to avoid significant environmental effects. Such measures would include (refer to the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) for further details):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reducing the amount of topsoil stripping where possible and soil stockpiles would be located as far from watercourses as practicable 2. Use of silt fences 3. Plant and wheel washing and haul road damping in designated areas 4. Plant to be re-fuelled in designated locations at a safe distance from water courses and good practise to be in place with relation to pollution prevention (adequate bunding, storage etc)

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>5. Spill kits are to be positioned at strategic locations on site and thorough training provided for staff to ensure a rapid and effective response to any pollution incidents that occur on site</p> <p>6. Use of an Ecological Clerk of Works / Environmental Manager, along with toolbox talks and training to promote contractor awareness of pollution risks</p> <p>The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited. Works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p>
General commentary			
Local community	The cut through of the South Downs will irreversibly destroy protected wildlife habitats and scar the natural landscape - I very strongly object to it.	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on landscape and biodiversity is set out in Chapters 7 and 8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme. Mitigation measures are included within the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
Local community	I want to very strongly oppose the proposed M3 Junction 9 plan. Headbourne Worthy village is already compromised on the sound aspect but retains some of its old charm. However, the proposed plans would make it like a rat run. Not only that, but from the looks of things the wildlife and the landscape would be harmed in the process. I appreciate the need but think a better way needs to be found.	N	
Local community	I believe to execute a huge structural change like this to an area of natural beauty like the South Downs requires an “eye for an eye” approach. With every area utilised the same is used in recovery of existing green space and native wildlife habitat.	N	<p>The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Scheme design avoids introduction of tall bridge structures or elevated embankments and instead the Scheme is positioned within cutting with structures and associated headwalls set within the landform at as low an elevation as possible. Views of the Scheme from the designated landscape have been considered with the aim where possible to minimise any adverse effects.</p> <p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland. The requirement for chalk spoil deposition, generated during construction of the Scheme, on agricultural land within wider areas of the South Downs National Park has been minimised. This is a landscape scale enhancement measure which responds to the objectives of the National Park and positively reinforces and enhances a key characteristic of the South Downs National Park through creation of priority chalk grassland habitat. The Scheme design also minimises agricultural severance to existing land parcels.</p> <p>Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the special qualities of the South Downs National Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	<p>Many of the trees along Spitfire Link and the whole of the link road from Junction 9 to Junction 10 have been or are being removed for HE depots. These should be replaced to screen the depot from the road. This is very near Winchester City and is detrimental to the environment and the semi-rural nature of the road.</p>	N	<p>The landscape design proposals for the Scheme are illustrated on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and show linear belts of trees and shrubs proposed within internal embankment flanked by A272/Spitfire Link.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the recent tree planting that has taken place in proximity to the Spitfire Link, however, the potential impacts along Spitfire Link and the link road from Junction 9 to Junction 10 from HE depots are not a result of this Scheme's proposals and have therefore not been assessed.</p>
Local community	<p>Overall, we are in favour of improving the junction to reduce congestion and enhance the national road network connectivity in our area. We hope this will also make it safer for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians in the local area especially where the B3047, A33, A34 and M3 interchanges are concerned. However, we do have concerns about the impact the works will have on traffic flow, congestion, landscape and biodiversity in and around the Winnall junction and especially along the Itchen valley to the north and east of the motorway.</p>	N	<p>An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on landscape is set out in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures are set out within the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p>
Local community	<p>The road scheme is not appropriate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it will destroy and fragment important protected habitats for wildlife which is rapidly declining (State of Nature reports, RSPB) • building roads induces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. traffic (SACTRA reports) b. CO2 emissions and noxious pollutants • it contravenes government targets to reduce climate change and public efforts to deal with the climate emergency 	N	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>In response to point 1:</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the effects on designations, habitats and species during construction and operation of the Scheme. The assessment identified a number of residual adverse and beneficial</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it contravenes cycling and walking strategies and need for investment in public transport • it contravenes need for an integrated transport policy • it contravenes government's 25-year Environment Plan (government earlier manifesto to leave the environment in a better place than the one in which they found it) • it contravenes the SDNP nature plan where its efforts for nature's recovery would be an interconnected 'nature network' • it contravenes people's need for green spaces and landscapes for health, recreation and visual upliftment 		<p>effects to biodiversity receptors predominantly during construction (as by operation effects would have been mitigated) including, European Designated Sites (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation), other statutory designated areas (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest), non-statutory designated areas, habitats, badgers, bats, hazel dormouse, otter, water vole, birds (breeding and over-wintering), reptiles, freshwater fish, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates and notable plants. Effects predicted were as a result of habitat loss and gain, fragmentation of populations / habitats, disturbance, habitat degradation, and species mortality. However, in all cases the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation during the construction and operation of the Scheme effects were predicted not significant.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity .</p> <p>In response to point 7:</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and the National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) set out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy. The Applicant has had regard to the South Downs Local Plan (2019) and has developed the Scheme design in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority.</p> <p>The Scheme constitutes major development within a National Park, and therefore strong justification for the project is required. The Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) demonstrates the rationale for the Scheme and the designs sensitive approach to the South Downs National Park, and how it has positively responded to the special qualities of the designation. Of particular note the Scheme increases opportunities for the public to access and enjoy by positively responding to severance issues caused by the existing M3.</p> <p>The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes.</p> <p>In response to point 8:</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			An assessment of the Scheme on landscape and visual amenity and population and human health is presented in Chapters 7 and 12 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.
Local community	<p>In general we are in favour of improving the junction configuration to create free-flow traffic from the A34 to the M3 and vice versa. More importantly, we support the separation of local traffic and the strategic road network around the junction with the creation of a separate link road. This will make driving to Winnall from Itchen Abbas a safer and more accessible journey. However, there are areas of the proposals we have specific concerns about. Our feedback is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction compound Number 4 would inevitably add construction traffic to the likely traffic management routes through the construction site, namely down the A34. There are no other sensible options to build either off highway haul roads or use local lanes to avoid the A34 with this construction traffic (narrow railway underbridge on Down Farm Lane, local villages not appropriate for HGVs and LGVs). This location seems unnecessary given the scale of other potential construction compounds in the vicinity. We recommend this compound Number 4 is dropped from the plans. If it is retained, we would expect to see in the DCO application/examination a detailed assessment and findings based upon how this site had been selected. This should include detailed traffic modelling results for the construction period to demonstrate minimal ill-effect from other traffic to local surrounding roads from the addition of construction vehicles leading to and from compound Number 4 and the Junction 9 site. Adding construction vehicles from this remote location up the A34, which is highly likely to be congested during extended periods of the construction phase, would compound delays on this already busy section of A34 and risk sending traffic heading south along the A34 on rat-runs using either the city of Winchester or local village roads in the Itchen Valley. This is avoidable with better choice of onsite or existing compound choice. 2. Construction compound Number 3 is a poor choice of construction compound given the immediate proximity to the sensitive River Itchen. This ground form slopes towards the river giving direct pathway from a proposed construction compound to the internationally designated river. This would likely be a very challenging location to confirm through the DCO application/examination on Habitat Regulations Assessment grounds alone. This site should be dropped from the plans and all efforts be made to distance the construction sites from River Itchen wherever practicable. 	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the support of the Scheme in principle and the range of views expressed.</p> <p><i>Response to point 5:</i></p> <p>It is expected that the following Environmental Control Plans will be prepared/finalised, as appropriate, for the Scheme as part of the Environmental Management Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Plan (LEMP) – sets out how landscape and ecological mitigation will be implemented. An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) can be found at Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) 2) Soil Management Plan – sets out measures to ensure protection, conservation and reinstatement of soil material, its physical and chemical properties and functional capacity for agricultural use. A draft can be found at Appendix C of the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) 3) Soil Resources Plan – sets out the areas and type of soil to be stripped, haul routes, the methods to be used, and the location, type and management of each soil stockpile to help protect and enhance soil resources on site. This plan will be prepared by the Principal Contractor during the detailed design stage and included within the siEMP <p>Further details are provided in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>3. We are surprised there is no mention of using the existing R&W materials compound site situated right next to Junction 9 between the M3 SB Onslip and the Spitfire spur road. This site is run by an established Highways England contractor; it is full of potential engineering fill material that will have come from elsewhere on the strategic road network over recent years; and, now that very ‘recycled’ fill material is piled to its current height the plant, other machinery and lighting used in that compound is a visual eyesore on the edge of the South Downs National Park. It would be bordering on disingenuous for Highways England not to look at the opportunities this compound offers both in terms of construction compound site location (instead of compound Number 3 or 4) and the reuse of fill material borne from years of ‘recycling’ from other Highways England schemes. Again, as in my point 1/ I would expect to see full assessment and reasoned findings in the DCO application, as to what the selection criteria against using this location with the potential use of the engineering fill material within, all of which is quite literally already on site.</p> <p>4. Given the constrained location of the proposed development site between the historic city of Winchester and the South Downs National Park and over the River Itchen, construction mitigation would have to be extremely well planned out, with best practice mitigation strategies and pollution prevention controls in place. This scrutiny over the construction phase should extend to design and logistics and include maximising off-site prefabrication of as much infrastructure as possible, delivering to site for installation in a quick and controlled manner. For example, the deck for the new footbridge over the River Itchen should be prefabricated offsite and dropped into place overnight from the adjacent A34 NB carriageway once pier footings have been installed. The underpass taking the A34 SB under the M3 could be built in square shape box sections and slid into place on rails. New junction infrastructure on Junction 9 itself ought to be prefabricated as far as possible and the onsite build be on as accelerated a timeline as possible to improve potential impacts on traffic movements during the construction phase. Prefabrication offsite would enable greater control of materials transfer and storage (reducing the potential for pollution incident) in the constrained development location between Winchester and the South Downs National Park, while having the potential to improve construction times for the overall project. With the construction site being on two significant highway routes (being the A34 and M3), there is ideal opportunity to bring in large elements of prefabricated infrastructure onsite, using appropriate abnormal indivisible load protocols, without need to go through local towns and villages.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>5. Re. landscaping, topsoil ought not be used where swathes of chalk grassland are intended. It should be made clear to landscaping contractors through means of detailed soil management plans, environmental masterplans and landscape design secured through the DCO that chalk grassland requires in part denudated substrate free of nutrients. Good case study here is the Weymouth Relief Road in Dorset where swathes of wildflowers complement the highway inclusion in the local landscape and has resulted in greatly reduced maintenance regimes. There is plenty of local expertise in this area with Butterfly Conservation (who manage the excellent Magdalen Hill Down butterfly reserve in line of sight of the M3 Junction 9 proposals), Hampshire and IOW Wildlife Trust, the Bumblebee Conservation Trust and the very local Wild Valley Verges group all in the county and who can advise appropriate design and management. Topsoil is a precious commercial resource nowadays and could be used agriculturally in the vicinity.</p> <p>6. With Biodiversity net gain for DCO consented schemes now in proposed amendments to the Environment Bill, all proposed biodiversity habitats created towards the end of construction should be maintained in line with an appropriate Handover Environmental Management Plan in perpetuity, if not by Highways England then by a suitable local agent who could acquire the areas in concern. This would secure real environmental legacy for the area.</p> <p>7. I could not find any detail about operational lighting proposals in the consultation material. I would expect highway lighting to be minimal unless absolutely required for safety. This view is to contribute to the dark night skies over South Downs National Park.</p> <p>8. It is not easy to see from the indicative general arrangement plans whether the proposed M3 Junction 9 improvements scheme goes as far north up the A33 as the 'Cart and Horses junction'. There is a most fantastic opportunity here for collaboration between Hampshire County Council, Winchester City Council and Highways England to incorporate the long needed upgrade of this awful staggered junction between the B3047 and A33 (which has seen so many road traffic accidents over many years) into the wider proposals, while Tier 1 contractors are on site. More detail on this would be welcome if it is being considered – from a local's perspective it certainly should be.</p>		
Upper Itchen Valley Society	We welcome the modifications to the original proposals which redesign the roads giving access to the valley to join the B3047. The creation of a new footpath between Church Lane, Easton, and Easton Lane at Junction 9 and the redesign of the national cycleway crossing there are also welcome. The	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p><u>cycleway is also a footpath and pedestrians should have a stepped route short-cutting the graded cycling loop through the roundabout area.</u></p> <p>We are concerned by the proposal to export waste soil from the development area into the valley. Insufficient information has been provided at this stage about the need for this or the form it would take, the duration of soil storage, the controls intended to avoid adversely affecting local hydrology, water quality, flora and fauna. One of the proposed sites is a large area of the side of Easton Down above the Itchen. There is no indication in the consultation document of the likelihood that this site or either of the other two, or whether all three of the large areas identified will be used. That said, the side of Easton Down is not, in our view, a suitable soil storage area due to the direct impact-pathway to the River Itchen. <u>We feel there is not sufficient information for us to adequately feedback on this matter fully. We would welcome further engagement before the DCO application is submitted, in sufficient time that our views may be given regard within the scheme proposals.</u></p> <p>At this stage we would emphasise the sensitivity of these sites within the National Park, and their visibility from footpaths and viewing points. We question the need to export soil waste at all instead of identifying sites in the part of the valley already compromised by dense highway development. For the short term we point out that during any disposal works the noise and disruption may be unacceptable to people living in Abbots Worthy and Easton as well as the pupils and staff at the two local schools potentially affected. <u>In particular we seek assurance that any transport of waste will take place on routes directly between the works and any disposal sites and will not use the narrow local road network.</u></p> <p>For the longer term there are indications in the consultation material that waste several metres in depth may be deposited and we object to any landscaping which detracts from the appearance of the rolling landscape or which risks depositing soil in the river Itchen and its tributaries.</p> <p><u>Ironically the disturbed chalkland around the M3 and Junction 9 are particularly diverse in plants and shrubs when compared to the farmed land around them and we encourage you to manage the works in a way that will recreate and enhance this diversity after completion.</u> As a Society we applaud local efforts to maintain wild verges throughout the Itchen valley. Long established local programmes such as the excellent Wild Valley Verges promote the establishment of low nutrient wildflower verges through initial seeding and altered maintenance. Highways England have also taken similar approaches, for example the Weymouth Relief Road in Dorset, where established wildflower swathes reportedly require little to no maintenance cutting and provide an incredible visual display and great biodiversity net gain for pollinators and insectivores. A similar approach to the legacy landscaping around the M3 Junction 9 restoration post-</p>		<p>area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2). Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the landscape characteristics Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland within the open downland areas of the Scheme and on proposed highway verges.</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been included as part of the application to deliver the mitigation, including proposed measures for management and monitoring including success criteria for proposed landscape elements. A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan will be secured through a DCO requirement.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>construction would fit with local landscape character and be very welcome. Planting around the proposed new ponds should similarly reflect their downland setting.</p>		
Local community	<p>The Winchester Movement strategy work suggests that improvements to the capacity of and flow through this junction will have a positive impact on the city's traffic issues, air pollution, carbon footprint etc. I remain unconvinced, because in many cases, the issues are caused by accidents on the M3 or A34 outside the proposed plan area. I do not see any data in the consultation report to show expected movements, % of non polluting vehicles by 2035, etc in the papers. This leads to build up of traffic which is avoided by going through Winchester instead. Unless these plans reduce accidents on the feeder trunk roads (the M3 and A34,) the traffic build ups will still occur, all too often as traffic levels are returning to pre pandemic levels.</p> <p>These are my specific points for your consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The layout is better for local people using the A33 who were worried about crossing heavy traffic, but it now means that all local users will have to use the new junction every time (which wasn't the case in the previous design). This may lead to congestion so it has not served our needs as well as we would hope. The north exit from the A33 on to the M3 north brings faster traffic movements closer to the communities that I represent- hence potentially noisier, which is unacceptable. 2. The positioning of the soil deposits has been done to suit HE/landowners. It is a missed opportunity to mitigate the noise of the road in operation all along the route from south to north. (see also point 12) Princes Mead has concerns about the setting of the listed building too. There is no assessment of flood risk when these soil heaps are in place. 3. The omission of the cycle route to Kings Worthy when it was so clearly described in the first proposal is a failure in this design. It is a need that is clearly described in the WCC/HCC Infrastructure Funding Statement (previously the R123 list) which I have already sent to the design/project team. I believe it is a duty to consider the needs of Non Motorised Users to be taken into account in any NSIP scheme, so this omission is disappointing. 4. The lack of traffic lights may be ok initially, but inevitably, there will be a need to control traffic flows in years ahead. Please include electricity schemes to enable traffic lights to be fitted later. 5. Failure to show signage and gantries in the scheme means that we cannot tell what views these will present to local people, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area. Already, the traffic lights of the junction can be seen from miles away in my division, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area, and cross motorway gantries can be viewed from Martyr Worthy in the national park. 	N	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments and sets out its response to the matters relating to landscape and visual impacts below. Other matters raised in this response are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p> <p>Response to point 9:</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on landscape is set out in Chapter 7 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures are set out within the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>6. If this country is to embrace walking and cycling for local commuting use, then the 3m wide cycle routes are inadequate to pass and should be wider. This includes actually on the roundabout where at one point, the walk/cycle way is alongside the main road. The Winnall area will continue to provide employment opportunities as well as retail etc. Other larger lorries go into the city from this junction. The paths created should not be shared for walkers and cyclists on planned bridleway that connect and to the NCN 23 where cyclists can be riding faster than is safe for walkers sharing the same surface (all should be at least to LTN1/20).</p> <p>7. Impact on Cart and Horses junction traffic going onto the A33 from the B3047</p> <p>a. The design has no traffic breaks in traffic moving north on the A33 from Junction 9. Currently, there are traffic breaks (traffic lights create this) which create gaps in traffic to allow people to exit from the Cart and Horses junction, allowing it to function. This is particularly important at peak times when traffic entering and leaving Winchester is heavy on both routes. The new arrangement may create congestion, reduce safety and even more confusion at this junction. (It is also an opportunity to improve the gateway into the National Park at this point.)</p> <p>b. The road layout of the A33 is changing, with one lane in each direction, and a bike lane coming into/through the junction. Currently there are sections of two lanes for filtering etc. These changes will impact on the junction itself which will need redesign to ensure it is safe, congestion doesn't occur and ideally actually improves for traffic going south (Morning Basingstoke traffic into Winchester), and Worthys /Winchester traffic going north and south at all times of day, but particularly at peak times, and traffic from the B3047 east going north.</p> <p>8. The project statement states that one aim is to reduce Spitfire Link congestion, which severely impacts drivers there. There is no evidence in the project plan that the team have provided that shows how the new design will reduce congestion. At present, large traffic accelerates from a stop slower than smaller vehicles which results in no gaps for Spitfire Link traffic. There is no evidence provided that this will improve, because although much of the heavy traffic will be on the through road, not all of it will take that route; daytime traffic in particular, includes a considerable amount of large and small vehicles into Winnall.</p> <p>9. The levels on the project plans are difficult to follow, and I asked HCC to seek more traffic data, and full levels plan to see the implications for views, noise, pollutants fall out.</p> <p>10. The drive through video is poor, and difficult to follow : I requested an improved version but was told this was impossible.</p> <p>11. There is a considerable amount of biodiversity work to be considered: which includes interconnectivity between areas being 'managed' for</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>biodiversity. I am leaving this to the experts at WCC, HCC and to SDNPA, but I do have concerns about the long term management of the water areas, set within the road system.</p> <p>12. The DEFRA 2016 noise map showed that improvement to noise mitigation were desirable at points through Winchester and for the A34 at the Headbourne Worthy site. A noise reference along Willis Waye is included in your scheme. Anything worse, even by a slight margin would be unacceptable in planning terms 'for the enjoyment of the property' and other properties affected in this way. Since Willis Waye was built, a considerable number of properties have been built in this area, alongside the A34 margins and I am seeking noise defence for these residents. Original tree planting is unsatisfactory: acoustic fencing is necessary here to mitigate noise.</p> <p>13. I must also express my regret that an 'open air' event wasn't organised for this consultation. With many other events taking place, this was a missed opportunity to engage the public face to face.</p>		
Local community	<p>Letter setting out basis of the representation:</p> <p>These representations are submitted in specific response to one element of the proposed works at Junction 9 of the M3, notably the proposed areas of land identified as potential deposition sites for surplus soil from the works.</p> <p>The OBJECTION in the strongest terms is submitted on four principal grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Process and Procedure b) Landscape Impact c) Heritage Impact d) Access Implications <p>The order of the objections should not be regarded as conveying any order of significance to the objections being raised.</p> <p>a) Process and Procedure</p> <p>Despite the stated intention by Highways England that this is the final round of consultation prior to the submission of the formal application to government, it is our understanding that this is the first consultation that any consideration has been given to the important issue of how to deal with surplus soil generated from the works. This is clearly a critical matter that should have been addressed much earlier in the development of the scheme.</p> <p>Even at this stage, the proposals for the deposition of surplus soil are extremely vague and lacking in any detail. All that can be gleaned from the available consultation material is that three potential sites have been identified and that the land levels may be increased by 4m at two of them, with no detail of intent for the third northern site. However, if the 4m increase represents the envisaged level of excess soil requiring deposition, it would seem plausible that a similar amount of deposition may be envisaged for the northern site,</p>	Y	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to deposition areas:</i></p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, all three deposition areas have been removed for the Scheme. In re-profiling the landform between Easton Lane and Long Walk, in response to South Downs National Park Authority and Natural England's comments, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>As a highly sensitive building the potential impacts upon Princes Mead School have been fully considered within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). No significant impacts have been identified. A programme of archaeological investigation to inform the baseline consisting of geophysical surveys and trial trenching was carried out to inform the assessment and no remains associated with the Morn Hill camp have been identified within the Application Boundary.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to walkers, cyclists and horse-riders:</i></p> <p>The effects on existing PRow's during construction are outlined in Chapter 12 (Population and Human health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The impacts of the construction of the Scheme on these routes are considered.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>potentially leading to an infilling of the natural valley. It is also not yet known whether 1, 2 or 3 of these sites might be required; the actual landfill requirements; the proposed profiles of the land after deposition and future uses apart from a vague indication of returning to agriculture.</p> <p>There is therefore no basis upon which the impact can be properly assessed and therefore a considered response made and submitted.</p> <p>There is also no understanding of how these sites have been selected; this should be compared with the earlier consultation versions on alternative options for the junction works themselves. It is assumed, but it is not clear, that a range of potential sites have been considered and analysed. It is also hoped that discussions have been held with local authorities and organisations who have a detailed knowledge of the local area and would most probably be able to identify potential sites for soil deposition and subsequent enhancement works.</p> <p>Whilst we understand that the process can be ongoing from now onwards, up to and during the application process, there is limited opportunity for individual landowners, local residents and organisations to be directly involved, notwithstanding that they will be directly affected by the proposals.</p> <p>An OBJECTION must therefore be raised to the unfair and unsound process and it is requested that the opportunity be provided for a further round of consultation when the proposals for the deposition of surplus soil have been properly addressed and refined, taking into account the representations received from this stage of consultation.</p> <p>The following objections are therefore necessarily based on the limited information available and apply directly to the proposed northern area identified as a potential site for soil deposition. This site actually has the most limited information available; the flythrough of the scheme touches upon the central and southern sites but does not even refer to the northern site. The potential for the northern site is really only picked up from the site plans showing areas of land, which appear largely unrelated to the actual existing landforms.</p> <p>b) Landscape Impact</p> <p>Please refer to the attached assessment undertaken by the terra firma Consultancy Ltd. Terra firma are a well-respected firm of landscape architects advising on a local and national basis and who have advised the Trust on a number of projects over many years.</p> <p>The report concludes that there is the potential for significant harm on landscape character of and visual amenity within the SDNP, as well as on the setting of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>c) Heritage Impact</p>		<p>The Applicant has also submitted an outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) as part of its DCO application. The Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) provides details of how the construction works will be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measure, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase. The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p>Due to the removal of the deposition areas, the existing walking, cycling and horse-riding routes within the vicinity of the Scheme would not be affected.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to cultural heritage:</i></p> <p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). The assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies outlined within the DMRB LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (National Highways, 2020) and the DMRB LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (National Highways, 2020) and agreed with key heritage stakeholders.</p> <p>It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to Worthy Park House:</i></p> <p>Worthy Park House is recognised as a designated built heritage asset in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). An assessment of the impact on this receptor is provided in the chapter. It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p> <p>Specifically, a very small part of the area between the A34 and M3 is visible in long distance views from the listed building and overall, it is considered that construction activities are unlikely to be visually or audibly noticeable from the listed building and the current character experienced from the listed building would be retained.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Please refer to attached Heritage Impact Assessment from LJE Planning Ltd. This concludes the potential for significant harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* designated heritage asset of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>d) Access Considerations</p> <p>The northernmost site is within an existing agricultural field with very limited access. Existing access to the site is via narrow country lanes, most of which have to go through the very attractive and historic village of Easton. These existing routes cannot be contemplated as any means of access to the northern site.</p> <p>Looking at the plans that have been submitted it can only be deduced that the intention would be to create a new haul route parallel to the south side of the M3. This is not shown on any of the plans; only the final environmental improvements along this land. Its potential use as a haul route would need its own environmental assessment given the proximity to the River Itchen SSSI and there is no indication that such work has been undertaken. Noise, contamination and air quality issues in such a sensitive environment must also be considered.</p> <p>On the basis of the access limitations and considerations which would apply to the introduction of a new haul route, the access to this northern identified site would seem unrealistic and impractical.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>Significant OBJECTION must necessarily be raised to the proposals in so far as they relate to the deposition of excess soil as a result of the J9 changes. There is just insufficient information available to enable a proper assessment to be made of potential impacts, which is a major objection in itself to the process and procedures.</p> <p>However, and even on the limited information available, there would be significant landscape, heritage and access impact issues arising from the proposed use of the northern site. These are sufficient that this site should not be progressed any further as a potential soil deposition site. The site would be returned to agricultural use but leaving an irreversible impact on landscape and heritage which could and would not be mitigated by environmental measures.</p> <p>The enhancements along the line of the haul road, if indeed this is the intended means of access cannot be construed to be enhancements as they would appear to being promoted generally as part of the overall enhancement works and not specific to the deposition of soil at the northern site.</p> <p>There may be other sites (and not necessarily the other two identified sites) which would be much better suited with less adverse impacts and where there could be environmental benefits to be secured. It is understood that other objectors, including the South Downs National Park Authority have</p>		<p>Therefore, the impact of magnitude would be negligible to Worthy Park House, resulting in a temporary slight adverse effect which is not significant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the LVIA concludes that the construction phase will have a slight effect that is also not significant on Worthy Park House during construction. By summer year 15, there will be no change of effect on Worthy Park House. See Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) for further details.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to landscape and visual:</i></p> <p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on landscape and visual amenity and likely significant effects following implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>At the foremost the Scheme proposals look to avoid impacts and the Scheme retains as much existing vegetation as possible, with landscape mitigation measures including extensive areas of native woodland planting, linear planting, roadside tree planting, species rich grass verges, and areas of chalk grasslands creation (which all complement biodiversity and respond to the key characteristics of the landscape in which the Scheme is located). There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape.</p> <p>The Scheme also includes re-profiling of existing landform to create sympathetic features and reinforce existing characteristics and aid visual screening together with improving the network of public rights of way and new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes). These mitigation measures are presented in detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been included as part of the application to deliver any mitigation required. This describes the proposed outline management and monitoring of the landscape and ecological mitigation elements with detail of the objectives, and success criteria for the establishment to achieve its environmental function. This would be updated into a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) during detail design and would include further detail on the long-term management.</p> <p><i>Response in relation Landscape Character Areas:</i></p> <p>Landscape Character Areas considered in the study area for the Scheme are outlined in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Scheme and study area lies within three of the landscape character areas (LCAs) identified in the <i>South Downs Landscape Character Assessment (South Downs National Park Authority, 2020)</i>. These are LCA A5, LCA F5, LCA G5. The study area, as described in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), extends up to 3km from the Application Boundary, has been</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>recommended other sites for consideration, where tangible and long lasting enhancements can be achieved.</p> <p>It is very much hoped that the next stages of the process will not only take account of these objections but also find a way to involve all those parties, including individual residents and landowners who will be directly impacted by these proposals.</p> <p>Summary of report on Landscape Impact:</p> <p>The element of the proposals that is covered by this report is the deposition of spoil, in particular to the potential northern site as identified on the extract below from the 'Indicative Land Uses' plan. The PEIR states at section 7.7.2 that 'The landscape of the areas of search for potential excess spoil management is defined by undulating arable farmland bounded by hedgerows and hedgerow trees. These areas of search for potential excess spoil management lie within the boundary of the SDNP' and at 7.7.6 that 'post construction the 'landscape east of the M3 within the SDNP would continue to exist as arable farmland with associated crop and land management changes.'</p> <p>PEIR states at 2.4.42 that 'The construction process would re-use excavated materials as fill (where possible) to reduce the number of construction vehicles travelling on the network.'</p> <p>There are three areas being considered for spoil deposition from the construction works. Our response concerns the northern area.</p> <p>The potential extent of the northern spoil deposition site is included within the Indicative Application Boundary on the proposals plans. However there is limited further information; on viewing the flythrough of the scheme it is clear that, whilst this covers the central and southern spoil deposition sites and a raising of levels by approximately 4m to accommodate spoil, it does not refer to the northern site.</p> <p>The northern boundary line of the site runs immediately adjacent to the bridleway that links the western edges of Easton village with the subway below the M3 linking through to the Itchen Way and the Itchen Valley to the west of the M3.</p> <p>The site lies across a dry valley on the side of the downland, with the northern extent set at between approx. 50m AOD at the north-west corner rising to approx. 60m AOD at the north-east corner. The southern boundary at set at approx. 70m AOD at the south-west corner, dropping down to approx 66m AOD before rising up again to 80m to the south-east boundary.</p> <p>Worthy Park House is listed Grade II* and its Coach House separately listed Grade II; its grounds are listed on the Hampshire Register of Gardens Parks and Landscapes of Historic Interest.</p> <p>The site is located to the east of Abbots Worthy between the A33 and the M3 road corridors. The buildings, which include Worthy Park House, are set to the</p>		<p>informed through consultation with stakeholders, visibility analysis and site survey. The published national, county and local character areas within the study area are shown on Figure 7.3.1 (Landscape Character Areas) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p><i>Response in relation to viewpoints:</i></p> <p>View Locations are shown on Figure 7.4 (View Locations) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2). Baseline photographs (winter and summer) are presented on photo sheets at Figure 7.12 (Photosheets (Daytime Winter and Summer)) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>In Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) view location 23 is recorded to have a negligible adverse magnitude of effect during construction. This is due to the fact that the deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme and the Application Boundary has been revised to reflect this change.</p> <p><i>Points in relation to South Downs National Park and its special qualities:</i></p> <p>The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Scheme design avoids introduction of tall bridge structures or elevated embankments and instead the Scheme is positioned within cutting with structures and associated headwalls set within the landform at as low an elevation as possible. Views of the Scheme from the designated landscape have been considered with the aim where possible to minimise any adverse effects.</p> <p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>north of the B3047 beyond intervening agricultural land and school playing fields. Vehicular access is from a private drive that runs from the B3047 I and also serves adjacent residential properties to the east of the site. To the west and north of the site lie areas of deciduous woodland, with the northern woodland within the ownership of our client. Sports pitches and courts are situated to the south and southwest of the school buildings.</p> <p>The site lies on ground falling towards the southern boundary with the B3047 on the north side of the River Itchen valley floor. The building is set at approximately 64m AOD, with the road set at approx 51m AOD. On a direct line between the House and the northern deposition site the Itchen Valley falls to a low point of approx 42m AOD.</p> <p>With reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011), the northern spoil deposition site lies in the Landscape Character Area (LCA) A5 East Winchester Open Downs.</p> <p>Relevant key characteristics of this character zone include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the open character of the East Winchester Open Downs, there are expansive views over Winchester and the Itchen Valley. • Open rolling upland chalk landscape of rolling Downs reaching 176m at Cheesefoot Head. • Dominated by large 18th and 19th century fields of arable and pasture, bounded by sparse thorn hedgerows creating a very open landscape supporting a range of farmland birds. • Large open skies ensure that weather conditions are a dominant influence creating a dynamic, moody landscape, particularly on higher ground e.g. at Cheesefoot Head. • A strong sense of remoteness and tranquillity away from the major transport routes (M3, A31, A272) which cross the landscape. • Other characteristics to note are: • Transport routes carve up the area – the M3 runs along the western boundary and the A31/A272 cut across the character area in an east-west direction. The sense of tranquillity and remoteness of this character area is diminished in the vicinity of these major transport routes. Also associated with the major transport routes out of Winchester is ribbon development, as seen along the B3404. • Of particular sensitivity is the remote and tranquil character of the East Winchester Open Downland which is threatened by its proximity to Winchester and numerous transport routes. • Given the proximity to, and views over, Winchester, this area is also sensitive to changes in the urban area and on the urban fringe beyond the South Downs study area. Also of particular sensitivity are the prominent scarps and open undeveloped skylines. • Observable changes in the past have included the introduction and upgrading of major roads, including the M3, A272, and A31 which have 		<p>focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p> <p>Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the special qualities of the South Downs National Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p><i>Response in relation to public consultation:</i></p> <p>As part of the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant presented a variety of plans and figures (including; the Indicative Application Boundary, a General Arrangements plan and environmental baseline figures). A 'red line' was included on all figures to illustrate the proposed site boundary of the DCO application.</p> <p>The 2021 PEIR and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the information presented in 2021 PEIR and supporting figures aligns with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements and the Infrastructure EIA Regulations 2017.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to construction:</i></p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) present assessments in relation to air quality, contamination and noise, respectively.</p> <p>As part of the DCO Application, Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) has been produced to show the haul roads and temporary construction compounds.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>severed the landscape and created some incongruous cuttings and bridges.</p> <p>Development considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent further fragmentation of the East Winchester Downs by roads and development. • Seek opportunities to reduce the visual impact of existing visually intrusive elements such as the infrastructure and traffic associated with the M3, A272, and A31, and prominent built elements on the edge of Winchester. • Maintain the open and undeveloped scarps and skylines – avoid siting of buildings, telecommunication masts, power lines and wind turbines on the sensitive skyline. • With reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011), Worthy Park House lies in the adjacent LCA E4 Itchen Valley. Characteristic points to note include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This character area includes the rural part of the valley of the River Itchen in two locations north east and south of Winchester. The boundaries are strongly defined by the topography and are drawn along the apparent skyline of the valley sides as seen from the valley floor. ○ Crossed by the M3 and A roads which interrupt the otherwise tranquil landscape. A sequence of settlements occur along the lower valley sides. ○ Although the valley has an overall tranquil quality this is disrupted in place by the audible ‘hum’ of traffic. <p>Key landscape sensitivities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The smooth form of the intact valley sides which reveal dramatic chalk landforms. • The setting of, and uninterrupted views to churches tower/spires, which are often seen against the rising downland backdrop of the valley sides are also important. • Designed landscapes which provide evidence of gentry houses and landscape parks of the wealthy population of the past. • The woodlands and • hedgerows generally limit visual sensitivity of these valley landscapes. However, the visibility of the chalk valleys from the adjacent downs increases their visual sensitivity. From within the valleys, the valley crests are seen against an open sky and are particularly visually sensitive. <p>Landscape management considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve the intact smooth form of the valley and its dramatic chalk landforms. 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conserve historic designed landscapes, and their settings, which provide evidence of gentry houses and landscape parks of the wealthy population of the past. <p>Development management considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor the effects of incremental change to buildings and land, and minimise such change by providing design guidance and encouraging applicants to enter into discussions at an early stage in the preparation of their proposals. Conserve the open skylines of the valley crests which are particular sensitive in views from the valleys. Consider views from the adjacent downs in relation to any change in the chalk river valleys. <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House are on the southern facade, with all the rooms, including the key internal spaces, looking out over the landscape to the south across the top of the lower level Itchen Valley, much of which is hidden in the intervening woodland on the valley floor, along with the M3 corridor. The eye is drawn beyond to the open arable downland above the valley floor where the rolling nature is clearly visible in the views from Worthy Park House, accentuated by the presence of the characteristic valley, central to views, which give rises to a distinctive contouring of the landform. The presence of the valley is also accentuated by the patterns of the arable farming landscape with straight lines seemingly folding and curving around the contours of the landform.</p> <p>The PEIR Heritage Chapter includes at section 6.8.13 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) states 'Worthy Park House is located to the north of the IAB. Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape including south across land within the IAB. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding landscape, which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped retaining part of the views described in the nineteenth century and contributes towards the historic interest of the listed building. The construction of the Proposed Scheme, particularly areas of search for potential excess spoil management, potential construction compound areas and areas proposed for environmental mitigation on the eastern side of the M3 are likely to be prominent in views from the listed building introducing construction traffic and further eroding the character of the surrounding landscape which are part of the wider setting of the listed building. As part of the wider setting that has already been extensively altered the construction of the Proposed Scheme is likely to result in an impact of minor magnitude and a temporary slight or moderate adverse effect. This assessment will be reviewed in ongoing EIA work and reported in the ES</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>following the decision on which areas of search for potential excess storage will be included and once further details about construction activities in this area are available.'</p> <p>Section 7.4.4.sets out the relevant landscape character areas, stating these cover all the relevant areas - but there is no mention of the LCA to the north that Worthy Park House lies within: SDLICA LCA E4 Itchen Valley.</p> <p>Topography is described as 'a key characteristic of the undulating hills in the nationally designated SDNP. It is also important to the wider distinctive landscape of the River Itchen valley' and is 'therefore considered to be of medium to high value (sensitivity) depending on location relative to the SDNP and its setting'. Effects on topography are stated to be as follows: 'Construction: Temporary adverse landscape effects are anticipated for the topography within the IAB as a result of construction activities and land reprofiling' and 'Operation: Adverse effects on topography are anticipated to remain during operation as result of the earthworks required to enable the Proposed Scheme. However, earthworks have been designed to sympathetically tie into existing levels and surrounding landform within the SDNP.'</p> <p>Vegetation is described as 'The surrounding landscape contains numerous copses, blocks of trees, hedgerown trees and hedgerows alongside lanes, tracks and field boundaries. The area of the IAB contains fields of both arable and pastoral farmland, typically bounded by hedgerows' and 'is a key characteristic of the nationally designated SDNP and is fundamental to the distinctive landscape of the River Itchen valley. It is an important part of the green infrastructure of the area and it is therefore considered to be of high value (sensitivity).' No effects on vegetation are noted as being relevant to the northern spoil deposition site.</p> <p>Whilst Registered Parks and Gardens are assessed in this section, Heritage Statutory designations are not assessed as part of the landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>Landscape Statutory Designations include 'The SDNP covers around 117ha of the area of the IAB, principally around its northern and eastern lengths (see Figure 7.1, Appendix 7.1). The SDNP incorporates the more intimate local landscape of the River Itchen to the north-west, the north-east of the area of the IAB and also covers the downland to the east. Consideration will be given to both the direct and indirect effects upon this designated landscape, including effects upon its special qualities and representative views. Special qualities of the SDNP are defined by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA); those special qualities which have the potential to be affected by the Proposed Scheme are as follows: Diverse, inspirational landscapes and breath-taking views. This is in part a function of the downland topography, and tranquil; and unspoilt places.' and is stated to be 'a nationally designated landscape resource of very high value (sensitivity).</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Points on perceptual aspects include ‘Noise, lighting, vehicle movement and the presence of infrastructure, all associated with the urban fringe of Winchester and the transport routes including the M3, A34/Winchester bypass and A272/Spitfire Link all erode tranquillity in the area’ and that ‘Built development and transport corridors have also affected the pattern and texture of the landscape over time’ and that tranquillity ‘is a perceptual quality of the landscape, and is influenced by things that people can both see and hear in the landscape around them’ and that ‘Tranquillity and a sense of remoteness are important aspects of the nationally designated SDNP and the River Itchen valley and are of high value (sensitivity).’</p> <p>The PEIR states that relevant landscape character assessments will also be examined and used to inform the landscape assessment.</p> <p>The assessment methodology states that the assessment of the magnitude of impacts on landscape receptors, the evaluation of the significance of landscape effects and the reporting of residual landscape effects for each landscape receptor are all to be reported in ES.</p> <p>Table 7-11 sets out the 24 viewpoints selected and the potential visual effects. There are two that are likely to include views of the northern spoil deposition site: 23 and 24, both from public rights of way. No photographs are available at this stage for review.</p> <p>There are no views from Worthy Park House included.</p> <p>The assessment methodology states that assessment of the magnitude of visual impacts, evaluation of the significance of visual effects and reporting of residual visual effects are all to be reported in ES.</p> <p>Effects during operation for Viewpoint 23 area noted ‘Adverse effects would reduce over time as the landscape mitigation takes effect. Longer term beneficial effects are expected as a result of the landscape mitigation.’</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Mitigation Design Plan makes no reference to mitigation proposals for the northern spoil deposition site .</p> <p>The section states that ‘Anticipated further assessment relevant to landscape and visual matters, which will be submitted with the ES to accompany the Development Consent Order (DCO) process is as follows: A full assessment of landscape and visual effects on receptors and reporting of significance will be undertaken as part of the ES’ alongside continuing design work.</p> <p>The public consultation is being held with a considerable lack of information for review; proposals are diagrammatic, indicative and in some aspects simply not available. This gives very little scope for a full understanding of the nature of the proposals by the public. This information provided is not a full landscape and visual impact assessment and is subject to design development. Therefore the full proposals cannot be properly reviewed and commented on.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The figures included in the information include a red line that covers the entirety of the proposals for the construction and operational stages. This gives rise to difficulties in reviewing specific areas of the proposals and their effects.</p> <p>The statement that the ‘earthworks have been designed to sympathetically tie into existing levels and surrounding landform within the SDNP’ is not backed up by any proposals available for review. The information on the spoil deposition sites is very limited. The amount of spoil being relocated to the northern spoil deposition site will determine the final ground levels, however this is not known at this stage and therefore the form of the proposals cannot be determined. It should be noted that the central and southern spoil deposition sites are far more level in nature than the northern site which dips considerably in the middle and the blanket spreading of a 4m layer of spoil may give rise to significant adverse effects in a valley situation. Indeed, without clarity on the proposals for the northern spoil deposition site, if there is considerable spoil to be deposited on the northern site then this may in effect be used to ‘fill’ the valley, giving rise to significant adverse effects on one of the main key characteristics of the landscape identified in the SDILCA.</p> <p>The PEIR notes that, as mitigation, the adverse effects on Viewpoint 23 will reduce over time, however the raising of levels and changes to topography are permanent and will remain constant over the long term. With the key landscape characteristics for the spoil deposition site noted as the ‘open rolling chalk’ downland with ‘sparse hedgerows, the nature of the landscape character gives little opportunity for mitigation or enhancement.</p> <p>Any change in levels will affect the nature of the view from Worthy Park House. Regarding Worthy Park House, the PEIR Heritage section states that ‘Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape including south across land within the IAB. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding landscape, which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped retaining part of the views described in the nineteenth century and contributes towards the historic interest of the listed building.’</p> <p>It is exactly these views that have been identified as contributing to the historic interest of the House that will be affected by potentially significant adverse effects to the landscape character of the SDNP, identified by the PEIR as very highly sensitive.</p> <p>On the basis of the points raised above, this report concludes that there is the potential for significant harm on landscape character of and visual amenity within the SDNP, as well as on the setting of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>Report on Heritage Impact:</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>LJE Planning Ltd was instructed to consider the impact of the Scheme on the significance of the designated heritage asset, Worthy Park House (Grade II*) with particular regard to the impact on its setting. The assessment is undertaken with particular regard to the inclusion of proposals for identified sites for the deposition of excess spoil, one of which would be on the south side of the Itchen Valley, directly 'opposite' Worthy Park House and its grounds.</p> <p>There is regrettably very limited information available about the precise details of the proposed scheme for this potential deposition site. All that can be gleaned from the available consultation material is that three potential sites have been identified and that the land levels may be increased by 4m at two of them, with no detail of intent for the third northern site. However, if the 4m increase represents the envisaged level of excess soil requiring deposition, it would seem plausible that a similar amount of deposition may be envisaged for the northern site, potentially leading to an infilling of the natural valley.</p> <p>In the absence of any more precise details and analysis of the proposals, this assessment has necessarily had to be made on the basis of this extremely limited information; namely the location of the site as identified by the overall extent of the application site for the proposed works including the deposition sites, the suggestion in the consultation material that land levels may be raised or changed by 4m and that the land would revert to agricultural use in the longer term.</p> <p>Client's land occupies a 5.68 hectare site on the northern side of the B3047 approximately 1km to the east of the junction with the A33 and within the countryside and South Downs National Park. The main building is Worthy Park House, a Grade II* listed, former residential house within a parkland setting, designed by Sir Robert Smirke and dating from the 1820s. The School has recently been successfully extended to the side facing the Coach House, but this extension is not generally visible from the southern side of the building.</p> <p>There are a small number of other buildings within the site, including the Coach House, which is separately listed Grade II to the immediate north-east of the house, and thought also to be by Smirke, as well as the much more recently built sports hall to the west. There is a hard surfaced play area / netball court to the immediate west of the main house and the main grassed playing fields, hard surfaced tennis courts/netball courts and play areas lie to the south.</p> <p>The grounds are also included on the Hampshire County Council's register of Historic Parks and Gardens (No 1550).</p> <p>There is a Scheduled Monument (Saxon Cemetery) in the woodland area to the west of the Site.</p> <p>In the 18th century, Worthy Park belonged to William Evelyn who constructed a mansion in 1722. The Worthy Park estate passed to Kingston's second wife</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Isabella, whose son by a previous marriage, Sir Chaloner Ogle, inherited in 1761.</p> <p>Sir Charles Ogle, grandson of Sir Chaloner Ogle constructed the present Worthy Park House in 1820 to a neo-classical design by Sir Robert Smirke. The layout of the property plot was redeveloped at this time. The west wing of the existing 1722 mansion was demolished and the new house built over its foundations (Butchart 1989). The existing rectangular plan building was retained and incorporated into 1820 house as the east wing and used as a service range. The stable block and stable yard wall were constructed at this time, also believed to be by Smirke.</p> <p>Ogle sold the Worthy Park Estate to Samuel Wall in 1825; it remained with his descendants (the Rivers, Fryer and Butchart families) until the late 1950s. During WWII it was used as the southern command headquarters for the Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers and accommodation for the Auxiliary Territorial Service.</p> <p>Following WWII, Worthy Park House was still owned by the Butchart family, although they did not live there. In the late 1950s it was sold to Currys Ltd and became their regional office and staff training centre. Currys left the property in 1985 and the house stood vacant for four years until T. S. Frobisher Ltd. bought it to use as a business centre. Prince's Mead School took over the Site in 1999 and continue to occupy the site.</p> <p>There is a statutory duty to have regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any special architectural or historic features that they possess.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) defines the setting of a heritage asset as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral. <p>Worthy Park House is listed Grade II* and its significance relates to both features of special architectural interest as well as historic interest relating to the design by Sir Robert Smirke. In addition, and of particular relevance to this issue under consideration, the setting adds to the overall significance of the listed building.</p> <p>Country houses defined their owners' relative social standing and the setting of a country house, in the landscape, was of considerable consequence. The site for an nineteenth century house was most particularly chosen for its potential views across parkland and where there might be some view of water or a water feature created.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>With respect to Worthy Park House, commentary in “Selected Illustrations of Hampshire” published in 1834 describes the importance of the southerly view from the house. ‘Below the south front of the mansion winds the river Itchen, on the opposite banks of which rise beautiful eminences, partly covered with wood, beyond, are the more romantic downs.’ The historical relationship between the house and the landscape should therefore not be underestimated.</p> <p>Worthy Park Hose, in its elevated position on the north side of the Itchen Valley gives it a commanding location over the valley. This relationship has not largely changed in character and appearance since the house was first built despite the changes to the use of the building and intervening development. The setting of Worthy Park House and its relationship to the landscape remains an essential part of the significance of the designated heritage asset.</p> <p>The setting of Worthy Park House, both in terms of views out from the house and its south facing grounds as well as views of the house from the surrounding area largely comprise the rolling downlands of the River Itchen valley.</p> <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House and the landscape setting for the Grade II* listed building are described more fully at paragraph 6.2 of the report by the terra firma Consultancy on the landscape and visual effects of the M3 J9 proposals:</p> <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House are on the southern facade, with all the rooms, including the key internal spaces, looking out over the landscape to the south across the top of the lower level Itchen Valley, much of which is hidden in the intervening woodland on the valley floor, along with the M3 corridor. The eye is drawn beyond to the open arable downland above the valley floor where the rolling nature is clearly visible in the views from Worthy Park House, accentuated by the presence of the characteristic valley, central to views, which give rises to a distinctive contouring of the landform. The presence of the valley is also accentuated by the patterns of the arable farming landscape with straight lines seemingly folding and curving around the contours of the landform.</p> <p>Despite the paucity of available information on the details of what is proposed for the possible northern deposition site, it is clear that the use of this site for the deposition of excess spoil would result in changes to this existing landscape, including potentially through the artificial infilling of a natural valley. This would seriously detract from the setting which has been present since the house was built in the early nineteenth century. The rolling downlands are an integral part of the landscape character of this local area and the proposed infilling of the valley and raising of the land would be an artificial intrusion in that natural landscape.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The proposed northern site for deposition of soils would be directly visible from the main building as well as from the grounds to the south of the building and the interrelationship of the building with its natural setting would therefore be harmed.</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (May 2021) (PEIR) produced by Highways England recognises at Table 6-5 that Worthy Park House, as a Grade II* listed building has 'high' sensitivity in relation to the proposals, and this is agreed.</p> <p>However, the Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline report undertaken by Highways England suggests at paragraph 5.2.17 and repeated in the PEIR at paragraph 6.8.13 that the existing setting has already been compromised by the construction of the M3 and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. It is contended that the effects of these later developments are overstated. The dominance of the house within the Itchen Valley and the relationship between the house and its setting is very largely unaltered since the time it was built and commented upon by the first owner, Sir Charles Ogle.</p> <p>Although it has been necessary to make certain assumptions about the extent of changes arising were the northern deposition site to be progressed, the conclusion is reached that there would be material impact to and therefore potentially significant harm to the setting of Worthy Park House. Such harm therefore would require to be offset by public benefits, which it is argued should be considered in the context of public benefits arising from the proposed northern deposition site. However, given that the proposal would appear to result in an artificial raising of the land and / or filling in of a natural valley, and its return to agricultural use, it is difficult to envisage any potential opportunities for landscape and / or environmental enhancements.</p> <p>This is of even more concern, given that it is noted that other parties submitting representations to this consultation exercise have raised the possibility of other areas of land for the deposition of excess soil, where there would be significant opportunities for landscape and environmental improvements.</p> <p>This report seeks to assess the potential impact of the works associated with the proposed northern site for the deposition of excess soils arising from the proposed works to J9 of the M3 on the setting and significance of Worthy Park House, a Grade II* listed building. Despite the serious shortcomings in the information available upon which the assessment necessarily has to be made, this report concludes that, on the understanding of the works envisaged, there would be significant harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* designated heritage asset of Worthy Park House.</p>		

K.2.E Biodiversity

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	Due consideration should be given to the wildlife habitats and chalk downs of the area and that green corridors should be created. The current plans will make it extremely difficult for Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust to look after the reserves that will be cut into.	N	<p>The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. An assessment of these is detailed within the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1), with Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) considering the effects on designations, habitats and species during construction and operation of the Scheme. The Scheme proposals are integrated within the sensitive landscape and where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including areas of chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.</p>
Local community	The queues on the M3 at peak times are not worth the expense to the environment and biodiversity in the area and that the government should make the use of trains more attractive than driving to ease congestion.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	<p>The change to the southbound route is welcomed as drivers would be able to move from the A34 to the M3 without using Junction 9 however the small reduction in travelling time is not worth “the destruction to even more habitats”</p> <p>The change northbound via Junction 9 is not supported. This change is unlikely to make a significant improvement to travelling times when the cause of holdups is the hill through Twyford Down to the south of Junction 9.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents the findings of an assessment of the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. The assessment of effects on biodiversity has been undertaken using the standard industry approach as set out in the Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland (Chartered Institute of Environmental and Ecological Management, 2018) which is endorsed in DMRB LA 108 Biodiversity (National Highways, 2020) and developed in consultation with statutory environmental bodies, including Natural England.</p> <p>The assessment identified a number of residual adverse and beneficial effects to biodiversity receptors predominantly during construction (as by operation effects would have been mitigated) including, European Designated Sites (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation), other statutory designated areas (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest), non-statutory designated areas, habitats, badgers, bats, hazel dormouse, otter, water vole, birds (breeding and over-wintering), reptiles, freshwater fish, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates and notable plants. Effects</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>predicted were as a result of habitat loss and gain, fragmentation of populations / habitats, disturbance, habitat degradation, and species mortality. However, in all cases the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation during the construction and operation of the Scheme effects were predicted not significant.</p> <p>In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including areas of chalk grassland.</p>
Local community	Concerns were expressed about the ecological impacts of the works and questioned the Applicant's consideration for effective mitigation.	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed. An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity is set out in Chapter 8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including areas of chalk grassland.</p>
Local community	Consult local experts in the biodiversity and conservation of wildlife rather than continuing doing your best to make Britain devoid of wildlife.	N	The biodiversity assessment presented in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) has been developed in consultation with a range of stakeholders, including South Downs National Park Authority, Natural England and the Environment Agency.
Local community	Do not agree with any increased road building that doesn't compensate for the environmental impact and impact on habitat loss, loss of wildlife, or the increased long term irreversible impact of eating away at our countryside and what keeps Winchester clean and beautiful and protects its natural and historical identity.	N	<p>The objection to the principles of the Scheme is noted.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. This specifically includes consideration of the impacts of all stages of the Scheme on habitats and species which are present in the local area, including; otters, water voles and kingfishers. Following the implementation of mitigation, the assessment concluded, that in all cases, the residual effects predicted are not significant.</p>
Local community	The wildlife has to be protected! It doesn't matter if people are waiting a few minutes.. Wildlife habitat is far more important. So much is being destroyed. Water voles are endangered. Otters have not long returned to the area. Kingfishers are rare to see. Totally against this development.	N	The mitigation hierarchy has been embedded within the design process, i.e. the design has sought to avoid adverse effects in the first instance through an iterative approach.
Local community	Concerns were expressed about the effect on the natural environment and plant/animal habitats that are going to be damaged and destroyed by this work. Yes, it is a very busy junction, but by making it bigger, it will only get easier to use and then even busier. This constant road building has to stop. Our environment is more important than any road. I STRONGLY object.	N	<p>During construction, mitigation measures would include the design of the proposed new foot/cycle bridge over the River Itchen, which is intended to be clear span and set back from the riverbank to allow for continued wildlife movement, reducing the volume of earth / spoil movements near the roundabout, replacement and enhancement of hedgerows, a sensitive lighting design and design of a Sustainable Drainage System that includes measures beneficial to wildlife. Further mitigation measures set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3), include; fencing to prevent access to important habitats, timing the construction works to avoid bird</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>breeding and bat roosting periods, obtaining the correct licenses to undertake ecological works and supervision from an ecological specialist whilst construction works are being undertaken. The final EMP will be secured through a DCO requirement.</p> <p>During operation, new habitats of ecological value (sensitively designed to the local area) would be created as part of the Scheme. This would include creation of areas of chalk / calcareous grassland, broadleaved and native scrub and species rich grassland. Further details are presented on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been submitted with the DCO application which addresses protection and appropriate working measures which will be required during construction and operation to protect the habitats and species within these nearby areas.</p>
Local community	Concerns were expressed that the proposals would see a National Park destroyed.	N	The Applicant has had regard to the National Park purposes and the special qualities South Downs National Park Authority is seeking to preserve in developing the Scheme proposals.
Local community	The M3 Junction 9 has already damaged sensitive natural habitats around Winchester and continues to do so with the encouragement of car use. Increased use of our road infrastructure is contrary to the UK governments commitment to stopping climate change.	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity is set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.
Local community	Environmental impact should be considered as a first priority. Road improvements should not come at the expense of environmental issues particularly with regard to climate change and lost wildlife habitat	N	An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the proposal on the environment. This includes details of the environmental mitigation and management such as Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , with Chapters 8 and 14 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) reporting the likely significant effects of the Scheme on biodiversity and climate, respectively.
Local community	The scheme is not necessary and it is currently unclear how the scheme meets net gain targets for biodiversity under the 25 year environment plan.	Y	The National Policy Statement for National Networks is the primary planning document against which the Scheme is assessed by the Secretary of State in deciding whether to grant a Development Consent Order. An assessment of the Scheme against the requirements of the National Policy Statement for National Networks is set out in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) . The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) also includes an assessment of the Scheme against other relevant national and local planning policy.
Local community	I am delighted that Boris Johnson committed to '30 at 30' ie a 30% increase in biodiversity by 2030 and also to carbon reduction targets for the UK. These policies are completely incompatible with road upgrades such as the Junction 9 works on the M3. Furthermore, the A34 is at full capacity and already has a high accident rate. Pushing more volumes of traffic onto this road is simply unsafe. This money needs to go into public transport improvements and lower carbon ways of working ie working from home or in a virtual office. I would like to	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>register my objection to these works going ahead, as we need to focus on stopping climate change and the collapse of the ecology on our country.</p>		<p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. It is calculated that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity, refer to the assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p>
Local community	This area has both ancient historical significance as well as being a corridor for wildlife and an area of natural importance and beauty.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
Local community	Suggestion that a wildlife bridge or wildlife underpasses should to be incorporated into the Scheme so animals are not cut off from the national park by the new roads.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.
Local community	Suggestion for more wildlife friendly proposals.	N	A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details).
Local community	<p>In order to achieve the Government's carbon reduction targets we need to be curbing road transport and not encouraging it. It has been proven that increasing road capacity is only ever a temporary measure in reducing congestion and indeed often results in extra congestion at other pinch points on the road network. We should instead be looking for options that remove traffic from the junction.</p> <p>This is a major construction project that will have a significant impact on the surrounding countryside and the flora and fauna that rely on it. Preserving our natural environment is more important than creating more roads. Our natural environment is important to our mental health and wellbeing and plays a vital role in countering climate change and the extreme weather events that occur as a result.</p>	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on landscape, biodiversity and human health is set out in Chapters 7, 8, and 12 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Suggestion that better traffic management would be more beneficial and should be considered before construction to prevent increased pollution and disruption to local ecology.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this view. Consideration of traffic management can be found in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) and the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) .
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	Concerns were raised about the potential impacts on biodiversity during the construction phase, specifically in relation to the impacts on the South Downs National Park, habitat loss, habitat degradation and species disturbance and mortality.	N	The biodiversity assessment presented in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the effects on designated areas (including South Downs National Park), habitats and species during construction. During construction, the assessment identified a number of residual effects to biodiversity receptors. However, following the implementation of mitigation the assessment concluded, that in all cases, the residual effects predicted are not significant. Details of the mitigation measures to be implemented during construction can be found in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
Local community	Wildlife and SSSIs should be protected and the original M3 cutting at St Catherine's Hill should be improved with a green bridge linking over the M3.	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts on SSSIs and species (including; bats, hazel dormice, otter, breeding birds and wintering birds) within the study area as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Following the inclusion of mitigation measures set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), potential impacts from construction activities would result in no change or negligible impacts to the River Itchen SSSI. St Catherine's Hill SSSI is located approximately 500m south of the Scheme and therefore no direct on the SSSI are anticipated during the construction phase due to the distance and physical separation.</p> <p>Following the implementation of mitigation measures set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), potential impacts from construction activities on bats, hazel dormice, water voles, otters and breeding birds and wintering birds are not significant.</p> <p>No significant effects on SSSIs and species within the study area are predicted as a result of the Scheme's operation.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			(Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme
Local community	You should consider not starting construction and should consider ways on getting more people to use public transport or to work from home. Our environment and the wildlife within it are far more important to this world than a few drivers being held up for a short period of time.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed relating to the need for the Scheme. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports.	Y	A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity are set out in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The mitigation hierarchy has been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design, e.g. informing alignment to avoid sensitive receptors where possible. In areas where avoidance is not possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant negative effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate negative effects have also been included, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.
Local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the environmental damage the proposals will cause. • Incorporating plans for proper, real, substantial biodiversity net gain. • Build in large scale habitat creation and build a green bridge to link St Catherine's Hill with the land to its east, to mitigate some of the damage the Twyford Down cutting has done. 	Y	<p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies.</p> <p>The assessment of effects from the Scheme on biodiversity has not identified effects which are considered likely to be significant. However, during operation of the Scheme, essential mitigation in relation to important biodiversity receptors would include the management and monitoring of habitat creation and enhancement measures. Further details are provided within Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), with a full LEMP secured through DCO Requirement in agreement with statutory consultees.</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.</p>
Local community	Not to use Winnall Moors land. To make a green bridge. To stop destroying precious habitat for our wildlife	Y	The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals. The Applicant continues to engage with landowners directly affected by the Scheme using clear statutory procedures, to understand the effects of the Scheme on their land interest. Specific mitigation solutions or compensation will be agreed on a case by case basis as appropriate, in line with the compensation code for compulsory purchase.
Local community	Not causing any impact on the environment and biodiversity of the area such as compulsory purchase of any part of Winnall Moors nature reserve, which is already a vital flood defence for Winchester. I would prefer to see the millions of pounds being spent going towards a greener economy and protecting and enhancing the nature of the area than creating an opportunity to encourage more road users to not seek alternatives to driving.	Y	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity is set out in Chapter 8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme. The assessment of effects from the Scheme on biodiversity has not identified effects which are considered likely to be significant. Specifically, the Applicant has considered the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.
Local community	You should consider minimizing impact on the Nature reserve, and think about creating green bridges for wildlife.	Y	
Local community	<p>The natural environment needs to be considered. Our flora and fauna is taking a hammering and mitigations must be put in place to minimise long term disturbance to wildlife. Pre work-start surveys should be taken to establish wildlife populations in the construction zone and movement of small mammals to a safe habitat should be undertaken as required.</p> <p>Any lost flora should be replaced and the loss of valuable habitat at Winnall Moors must be avoided at all costs.</p> <p>The construction of a Nature Bridge or Nature Underpass should be made a priority to help repair damage done to habitat pathways and links by the Twyford Down cutting.</p> <p>This is also a good opportunity to erect a noise screen on the Northbound side of the M3 between junction 11 Winchester South and junction 9. This would help lessen the incessant traffic noise which blights South Winchester and surrounding areas.</p>	Y	<p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.
Local community	<p>Bring back biodiversity Bring noise cancelling infrastructure surrounding the motorway</p>	N	<p>An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity is set out in Chapter 8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme. The assessment of effects from the Scheme on biodiversity has not identified effects which are considered likely to be significant.</p> <p>The Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including areas of chalk grassland.</p>
Local community	Increase the package of habitat improvements to achieve net gain. Ensure the environmental impact is further minimised.	Y	The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.
Local community	<p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme and the historical severance of the landscape.</p> <p>The Mitigation Design Plan contains very little detail on the mitigation and focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, I urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and net gain, aiming for at least 20% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>As part of this, I would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done.</p> <p>The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. I want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>I want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature's recovery in modern transport development.</p>	Y	<p>Habitat provision set out on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of areas of chalk grassland, species rich grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Appendix 8.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) assesses that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Scheme would provide a net increase of approximately 9.6 ha of chalk grassland, which is appropriate to the local area. The protection and enhancement of this habitat is a key theme within the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i> (adopted July 2019) and has been a key theme within consultation responses from stakeholders. However, the use of this habitat type suppresses the overall result of the metric, due to risk factors associated with this habitat type. For example, if 'other neutral grassland' was provided in place of chalk grassland then the overall biodiversity net gain score for the Scheme would change from +4.14% to +14.93%. This demonstrates that the Scheme can comfortably deliver over 10% biodiversity net gain. However, whilst a change from chalk grassland to other neutral grassland would</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>be technically feasible, given the wider benefits, chalk grassland has been taken forward as being most appropriate habitat for the Scheme.</p> <p>Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p>
Local community	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In order to achieve the Government's carbon reduction targets we need to be curbing road transport and not encouraging it. It has been proven that increasing road capacity is only ever a temporary measure in reducing congestion and indeed often results in extra congestion at other pinch points on the road network. We should instead be looking for options that remove traffic from the junction. 2. This is a major construction project that will have a significant impact on the surrounding countryside and the flora and fauna that rely on it. Preserving our natural environment is more important than creating more roads. Our natural environment is important to our mental health and wellbeing and plays a vital role in countering climate change and the extreme weather events that occur as a result. 	N	<p>An assessment of the potential impacts during the construction of the Scheme on landscape, biodiversity and human health is set out in Chapters 7, 8, and 12 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme. Further details about the mitigation measures to be implemented during construction are outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p>
Local community	<p>More information is needed on temporary and permanent impacts arising from the proposals, including in terms of noise impacts and noise mitigation. Additional noise reduction measures could beneficially be adopted as part of the scheme to reduce existing noise impacts on Kings Worthy from the combination of the M3, A33 and A34.</p> <p>It is not clear from the consultation material whether there are direct impacts (in terms of temporary diversion of closures of PROW) during the construction period. There is a very well used network of footpaths within the local area, including passing underneath the A33 and A34 from the Itchen Valley and Kings Worthy to Winchester and it is not clear if these will all remain open (even if temporarily locally diverted) during construction - they should be.</p> <p>It is not clear if there are any direct impacts in terms of loss of habitats associated with Winnall Moors during construction.</p>	Y	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. This specifically included consideration of the impacts of all stages of the Scheme on the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve. Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and will not be affected. However as the reserve covers part of the River Itchen SSSI it has therefore been assessed alongside the SSSI. No significant effects are reported following the implementation of mitigation measures.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p>
Local community	<p>Concerned about :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased noise - day and night 	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. This specifically included consideration of the impacts of all stages of the Scheme on skylarks and yellowhammers.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased pollution • Negative Impact on health and well being • Lack of effective mitigation actions regarding noise and pollution • Impact on wildlife eg. Skylarks and yellowhammers along the South Downs way - impacted by infill and construction, loss of habitat, fracturing habitats <p>Therefore, if this plan goes ahead mitigation plans need to be much more effective than those planned and their effectiveness needs to be monitored and where needed extended, changed.</p>		<p>Construction of the Scheme would result in temporary loss of habitats used by small number of notable breeding birds, including yellowhammer and skylark. The temporary loss of habitat during the construction phase would be offset by the improvement of habitats for farmland birds to the east of the M3, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) new habitats within the Application Boundary to be created such as the chalk grassland east of the M3 and the species-rich grassland between the M3 and A34, would be managed for the benefit of wildlife as set out in Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). These habitats would provide additional nesting and feeding opportunities for both breeding birds (including yellowhammer and skylark), and wintering birds.</p> <p>The initial loss of foraging habitats is likely to result in a short-term temporary minor adverse impact to birds of local importance, resulting in a 'Slight' adverse effect which is not significant. In the medium-term, once new habitats have been created and are managed appropriately, impacts through habitat gains would result in a minor beneficial impact to birds of local importance, resulting in a 'Slight' beneficial effect which is not significant. 'Slight' has been chosen over 'Neutral' due to direct habitat loss incurred.</p> <p>Birds using retained habitat within the Application Boundary may be temporarily disturbed through noise or visual disturbance. The modelling demonstrates that levels of construction noise would vary throughout the construction period, with noise levels during some construction phases being above the existing baseline, and in others being below the existing baseline. It shows that at 69dB, existing baseline noise levels are relatively high). Therefore birds currently present on this stretch of the River Itchen are likely to be habituated to high noise levels, and occasional increases to 79dB are unlikely to result in changes to bird activity. Visual disturbance may also be an issue, however this is likely to impact only a limited number of bird species such as skylark. Much of the retained habitat is already adjacent to existing highway with existing high background levels of disturbance. Measures are included in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) to ensure there would be no disturbance.</p> <p>Potential impacts to breeding birds through direct mortality would be avoided through the working methods set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3), which restrict vegetation clearance activities to outside of the breeding bird season where possible, and would provide protection for birds and their nests throughout the construction period.</p> <p>Following implementation of the outlined mitigation there would be no change to birds of Local importance from disturbance or mortality. As such, potential disturbance or mortality effects are 'Neutral', and not significant.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure.			
Local community	<p>The scheme currently affects the integrity of a number of designated sites including the River Itchen SAC. Limited mitigation has been proposed. The scheme has a whole could be more environmentally ambitious. The scheme should be looking to achieve the 25 year plan net gain target, with a minimum of 20percent net gain for this scheme. At the moment this does not seem to be the case.</p> <p>The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. I want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>I want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature's recovery in modern transport development.</p>	N	<p>An assessment of potential effects to the River Itchen SAC is set out in the HRA. Following incorporation of committed mitigation measures, no significant effects to the integrity of the River Itchen SAC have been identified. Natural England and the Environment agency have been consulted on the assessment.</p> <p>The scheme design includes substantial provision of habitats of ecological value which are appropriate to the local area, including chalk grassland and woodland, with the aim of maximising biodiversity outputs from the Scheme in accordance with National Highways performance targets.</p> <p>A green bridge does not form part of the current scheme.</p>
Local community	If traffic moves more freely, there will be a reduction in emissions. The impact to flora and fauna will be devastating in the short term but may be beneficial in the long term.	N	Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. The assessment concluded that there would be no significant effects on biodiversity.
Local community	Having read a blog and viewing plans, I don't believe you have thought about the wildlife and the impact it will have on our children's Earth.	N	The scheme design includes substantial provision of habitats of ecological value which are appropriate to the local area, including chalk grassland and woodland, with the aim of maximising biodiversity outputs from the Scheme in accordance with National Highways performance targets.
Local community	Clearly you are not considering wildlife as the proposed works will cause a lot of damage to habitats and is taking place where wildlife exists and thrives!	N	
Local community	You are reducing the amount of space for wildlife.	N	
Local community	Building through natural and protected areas or close to them to impact wildlife.	N	
Local community	Too much wildlife already gone and this will compound it.	N	
Local community	I think it's really important to minimise impact on flora and fauna in the area. Please take every step you can to do this. I also think it's really important to plant appropriate trees, shrubs and wildflowers – please work with the Hampshire and IOW Wildlife Trust and other local stakeholders to do this.	N	The Scheme has been designed to limit or avoid, as far as possible, adverse effects on biodiversity. Mitigation measures are outlined in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , the Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
Local community	Please ensure there is consideration of the value of existing flora and fauna to the junction and ensure this will be maintained in future plans.	N	Habitat provision set out on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of areas of chalk grassland, species rich grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with various stakeholders throughout the development of the Scheme, including Natural England, Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust and South Downs National Park Authority,</p>
Local community	There must be as much planting and retention of vegetation as possible to minimise the impact on biodiversity and climate change	N	<p>Due to the lifespan of the proposals, the Scheme design considers potential change from future climate change, including designing in appropriate water attenuation features for extreme events, specifying durable materials, and including a diverse soft landscape species for resilience.</p> <p>There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape. The landscape strategy includes the use of native species of local provenance, to reflect the character of the local landscape, however the selected species mix will be as diverse as reasonably practicable to ensure resilience against potential future diseases and climate change whilst providing functional habitat for wildlife present in the local area. Opportunity for maximising biodiversity benefit has also been provided for with the use of scrub planting throughout the Scheme and species rich grasslands (including chalk grassland).</p> <p>The Scheme would result in an increase of wooded areas once the mitigation has effectively established and is approaching its early maturity stage and functioning as a woodland. The proposals show retention of existing vegetation where possible and a range of enhancement planting is proposed. Further detail of planting proposals is provided within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). At the detailed design stage, the planting specifications and tree mix would be explored to assess options according to the potential to maximise the carbon sequestration benefits of landscape features.</p>
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.	N	<p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity are set out in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The mitigation hierarchy has been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design, e.g. informing alignment to avoid sensitive receptors where possible In areas where avoidance is not possible, measures have been</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	The damage made by the M3 widening at Twyford down has never been fully addressed. This proposal will add further damage to the area at a time when we should be making every effort to improve wildlife diversity, rather than continue to destroy it. Specifically the loss of wild habitat in this area of the South Downs National Park including the plans to compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The plans also will ruin connections between the nature reserve and the surround ecology.	N	<p>included to prevent or reduce potentially significant negative effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate negative effects have also been included, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p> <p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies.</p>
Local community	Nowhere near enough consideration has been given to the damaging effect on local wildlife and biodiversity and how to mitigate against it. The more isolated natural havens become the more likely that species will die off. We cannot afford to lose any more of our biodiversity if we are to protect sufficient pollinators to ensure our food crops do not fail in the future.	N	<p>The assessment of effects from the Scheme on biodiversity has not identified effects which are considered likely to be significant. However, during operation of the Scheme, essential mitigation in relation to important biodiversity receptors would include the management and monitoring of habitat creation and enhancement measures. Further details are provided within Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), with a full LEMP secured through DCO Requirement in agreement with statutory consultees.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.</p>
Local community	Clipping the side of Winnall Moors is just an appalling plan. Home to deer, swans, sparrow hawks, water voles, otters and myriad other species - any further destruction of habitat is wilfully going against any environmental credentials we are clinging on to by our fingernails	Y	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. This specifically included consideration of the impacts of all stages of the Scheme on the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve. The reserve covers part of the River Itchen SSSI and has therefore been assessed alongside the SSSI. No significant effects are reported following the implementation of mitigation measures.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary.</p>
Local community	Not sure that this scheme is now required due to different ways of working post Covid. The extended area used for the junction, and disruption to fields will cause issues with wildlife. The increase of electric vehicles will reduce	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. No significant effects are reported following the implementation of mitigation measures.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	pollution and noise anyway... it would be a better use of tax payer money to invest in charging points and extending EV subsidies.		Currently potential pandemic impacts on travel demand and behaviour have not been considered. Low and high traffic growth tests have been undertaken as part of the economic assessment in line with Department for Transport guidance and are reported in Section 5 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) .
Local community	You don't really address the fundamental problems of increased noise and pollution and potential damage to wildlife and the countryside as a whole.	N	The effects of the Scheme in relation to air quality, biodiversity and noise (during both construction and operation) are assessed and reported upon in Chapters 5, 8 and 11 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.
Local community	There does not appear to be anything planned to link the biodiversity areas . Nor how the soil movement will affect the areas from which it is taken. This is a missed opportunity bearing in mind it is the gateway to the SDNP. I will leave the detail to those who have a greater knowledge than I do.	N	Green bridges and living walls are not direct proposed in the Scheme with the aim of linking ecology corridors as there are no instances of new severance.
Local community	<p>More information is needed on temporary and permanent impacts arising from the proposals, including in terms of noise impacts and noise mitigation. Additional noise reduction measures could beneficially be adopted as part of the scheme to reduce existing noise impacts on Kings Worthy from the combination of the M3, A33 and A34.</p> <p>It is not clear from the consultation material whether there are direct impacts (in terms of temporary diversion of closures of PROW) during the construction period. There is a very well used network of footpaths within the local area, including passing underneath the A33 and A34 from the Itchen Valley and Kings Worthy to Winchester and it is not clear if these will all remain open (even if temporarily locally diverted) during construction - they should be.</p> <p>It is not clear if there are any direct impacts in terms of loss of habitats associated with Winnall Moors during construction.</p> <p>It is not possible to currently conclude on the extent to which the proposals comply with the relevant National Policy Statement.</p>	N	Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. This specifically included consideration of the impacts of all stages of the Scheme on the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve. The reserve covers part of the River Itchen SSSI and has therefore been assessed alongside the SSSI. No significant effects are reported following the implementation of mitigation measures.
Local community	<p>In order to achieve the Government's carbon reduction targets we need to be curbing road transport and not encouraging it. It has been proven that increasing road capacity is only ever a temporary measure in reducing congestion and indeed often results in extra congestion at other pinch points on the road network. We should instead be looking for options that remove traffic from the junction.</p> <p>This is a major construction project that will have a significant impact on the surrounding countryside and the flora and fauna that rely on it. Preserving our natural environment is more important than creating more</p>	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on landscape, biodiversity and human health is set out in Chapters 7, 8, and 12 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme. Further details about the mitigation measures to be implemented are outlined in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) , Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	roads. Our natural environment is important to our mental health and wellbeing and plays a vital role in countering climate change and the extreme weather events that occur as a result.		
Local community	The creation of the M3 cut through Twyford Down, the area has only just started to recover. This has left a scar on St Catherine's hill (nature reserve/SSSI). This will be compounded by new work, and irrecoverably destroy area which is very special for biodiversity/flora/fauna. You are also wanting to apply a compulsory purchase order to part of Winnall moors nature reserve!	N	This comment is noted by the Applicant.
Local community	You are vastly increasing the footprint of the junction and destroying much-loved areas around the river Itchen and on the edge of the National Park. Trying to establish new habitats in no way makes up for this destruction.	N	This comment is noted by the Applicant.
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	I can't see how local flooding risks or air pollution or noise pollution or ecological impacts or habitat loss or wildlife survival will be protected, any loss of habitat that affects the life of our wildlife is unforgivable and should not happen.	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on air quality, biodiversity, noise and local flooding is set out in Chapters 5, 8, 11 and 13 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.
Local community	Keep as much of the existing growth as possible to minimise impact on existing nesting and habitat sites	N	Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. The assessment concluded that there would be no significant effects on biodiversity.
Local community	It doesn't prevent wildlife damage that can never return	N	
Local community	It is not enough to create new habitats when you have destroyed the present ones and probably caused irreversible harm.	N	
Local community	Consider the ecological damage.	N	
Local community	It's impossible to compensate for the loss of nature, wildlife and habitat that result from building even more roads.	N	
Local community	Fundamentally, the work is unnecessary. This is a climate crisis and the last thing the government should be doing is encouraging car and road usage. Any destruction of plants, animals and their habitats is not worth the cost. How are you going to stop the increasingly wide roads killing more wildlife. Are you going to invest money in wildlife bridges this time as would be desperately needed if you get your way	N	The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme. An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on landscape and biodiversity is set out in Chapters 7 and 8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme. Further detail on the mitigation proposed is provided within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) .
Local community	The current proposals are completely inadequate regarding mitigation of the damage to the natural environment. There is no adequate plan to provide connectivity in the landscape for the wildlife whose habitat will be severed by the	N	The PEIR was a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. Subsequently, the design has been altered, particularly to the eastern side of

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>construction of junction 9. Significantly more could be done to create large scale habitat for wildlife, on-site and off-site. A green bridge should be installed across the M3 connecting the wildlife in both sides of the motorway.</p>		<p>the Scheme where the Application Boundary has been amended and deposition areas have been removed.</p> <p>Mitigation measures incorporated into the design of the Scheme are reported as embedded mitigation in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Essential mitigation is outlined within the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p>
Local community	<p>Road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government ‘Dasgupta Review’ says, ‘Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).’ It would make no sense for the M3 to be severed at Junction 9, cutting off communities and transport links. In the same way, we can no longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to pressures.</p> <p>Highways England must now deal with the legacy of damage from previous schemes and ensure that there is real and tangible net gain for nature. Nothing short of major investment in nature’s recovery is now acceptable.</p>	Y	<p>The National Policy Statement for National Networks is the primary planning document against which the Scheme is assessed by the Secretary of State in deciding whether to grant a Development Consent Order. An assessment of the Scheme against the requirements of the National Policy Statement for National Networks is set out in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2). The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) also includes an assessment of the Scheme against other relevant national and local planning policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a biodiversity assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p>
Local community	My view is to shelf the idea entirely in favour of sustaining wildlife and helping towards global warming.	N	The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	The plans are extensive for the size of the scheme and look like they will contribute to enhancing the biodiversity of the entire site.	N	This comment has been noted by the Applicant.
Local community	Do not want any more disturbance to the habitat.	N	This comment has been noted by the Applicant.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>The biggest problem with these junctions and roads is the barriers it produces for cyclists, pedestrians and wildlife. I wholly don't support the expansion of the junction but any improvements should include dedicated cycle and walking and wildlife corridors. This could only be done with tunnels and bridges.</p>	Y	<p>New areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape during operation. Much of the additional woodland and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for wildlife in a north-south direction. Please refer to Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p>
Local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shockingly weak to mitigating, you can not shrink SSSI / nature reserves into smaller & smaller areas an expect no impact. - Mitigation should also allow for environmental recovery from initial M3 expansion. - Needs to be more habitat creation - Need to be a green bridge to connect people back to the South Downs national park from Winchester. 	Y	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts on SSSIs and species within the study area as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme. Following the inclusion of mitigation measures set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), potential impacts from construction activities would result in no change or negligible impacts to the River Itchen SSSI. St Catherine's Hill SSSI is located approximately 500m south of the Scheme and therefore no direct or indirect impacts on the SSSI are anticipated during the construction phase due to the distance and physical separation. No significant effects on SSSIs within the study area are predicted as a result of the Scheme's operation.</p> <p>The environmental mitigation has been designed to respond to the specific impacts of the Scheme. Principally this focuses on large scale terrestrial habitat creation, which will deliver an overall net gain in biodiversity. In addition, Figure 2.3 Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) shows further mitigation measures such as wildlife fencing, along with provision of habitats for specific species.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme</p>
Local community	<p>I am delighted that Boris Johnson committed to '30 at 30' ie a 30% increase in biodiversity by 2030 and also to carbon reduction targets for the UK. These policies are completely incompatible with road upgrades such as the Junction 9 works on the M3.</p>	Y	<p>The objection to the Scheme in principle is noted.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement for National Networks is the primary planning document against which the Scheme is assessed by the Secretary of State in deciding whether to grant a Development Consent Order. An assessment of the</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Furthermore, the A34 is at full capacity and already has a high accident rate. Pushing more volumes of traffic onto this road is simply unsafe.</p> <p>I would like to register my objection to these works going ahead, as we need to focus on stopping climate change and the collapse of the ecology on our country.</p>		<p>Scheme against the requirements of the National Policy Statement for National Networks is set out in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2). The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) also includes an assessment of the Scheme against other relevant national and local planning policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. It is calculated that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity, refer to the assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity based on the assumptions by providing chalk grassland and hedgerow units.</p>
Local community	Once an area of land has been removed you cannot truly mitigate for its loss. Even if you replace road space elsewhere with green space, you are not replacing like with like and the original habitat is changed for ever.	N	This comment has been noted by the Applicant.
Local community	Your plans are extremely inadequate and focusses mainly on on-site enhancement. there is no consideration of the historical damage already done which needs restoration. There is inadequate consideration of larger habitat creation and restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas both onsite and off-site. The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. Highways England needs to look beyond mitigation and consider compensation for previous damage as well. I support a proposal for a green bridge across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature's recovery in modern transport development.	Y	<p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity are set out in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The mitigation hierarchy has been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design, e.g. informing alignment to avoid sensitive receptors where possible In areas where avoidance is not possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant negative effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate negative effects have also been included, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p> <p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies.</p> <p>The assessment of effects from the Scheme on biodiversity has not identified effects which are considered likely to be significant. However, during operation of the Scheme, essential mitigation in relation to important biodiversity receptors would include the management and monitoring of habitat creation and enhancement measures. Further details are provided within Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), with a full LEMP secured through DCO Requirement in agreement with statutory consultees.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>Additional information is needed on the noise, PROW and direct habitat impacts associated with the scheme. It is not possible to determine if the environmental mitigation is adequate or appropriate currently, nor the extent to which the proposals comply with the relevant National Policy Statement.</p>	N	<p>An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity, noise and PROW is set out in Chapters 8, 11 and 12 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme. Further detail on the mitigation proposed is provided within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p> <p>Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p>
Local community	<p>The woefully poor proposals for reducing environmental impacts do nothing to tackle the nature & climate crisis we are in, with a focus on on-site measures and no understanding or ambition of the environmental contribution that could be made.</p> <p>I would want to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • large scale habitat restoration and creation at a landscape scale, including a green bridge to restore ecological connectivity across the M3, chalk grassland re-creation in the Chilcomb Valley to reconnect Deacon Hill & Magdalen Hill Down, • wetland extensions and expansions for Winnall Moors and the River Itchen, to improve ecological function and ecosystem services including 	Y	<p>The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by local habitats and species. The assessment of these is provided within the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and has contributed to the design narrative set out in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9). The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including extensive chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>flood prevention downstream in Winchester, instead of the proposal to destroy parts of the SSSI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> large scale creation of woodland, natural regeneration and hedgerows to improve ecological connectivity for woodland and scrub species, not amenity plantings 		<p>Due to the lifespan of the proposals, the Scheme design considers potential change from future climate change, including designing in appropriate water attenuation features for extreme events, specifying durable materials, and including a diverse soft landscape species for resilience. There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape. The landscape strategy includes the use of native species of local provenance, to reflect the character of the local landscape, however the selected species mix will be as diverse as reasonably practicable to ensure resilience against potential future diseases and climate change whilst providing functional habitat for wildlife present in the local area. Opportunity for maximising biodiversity benefit has also been provided for with the use of scrub planting throughout the Scheme and species rich grasslands (including chalk grassland).</p> <p>At the detailed design stage, the planting specifications and tree mix would be explored to assess options according to the potential to maximise the carbon sequestration benefits of landscape features.</p>
Local community	<p>Concerned about the construction impact of the works on biodiversity, such as “skylarks and yellow hammers, birds, butterflies and plants”, and the use of “good agricultural land” for the spoil deposition areas. I do not agree that the environmental impact of the Scheme is justified and believe the benefits do not outweigh the disadvantages. The landscape plans do not cover the whole area affected – for instance any plans for embankments or planting beside the M3 Highcliffe/ Petersfield Road, South Downs Way pedestrian bridge.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed.</p> <p>Potential construction impacts to biodiversity are assessed within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). No significant effects are reported following the implementation of mitigation measures described in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Since statutory consultation, all three of the soil deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme and therefore drainage in this area will not be required. Site arisings are proposed to be used in the landscaping proposals through more sympathetic ground reprofiling.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) sets out the planning policy context and assesses the Scheme against policy requirements, including an assessment of the overall planning balance. The Applicant considers that the benefits of the Scheme significantly outweigh any harm predicted. As required by Section 104(7) of the Planning Act 2008, the benefits of the Scheme must be weighed against any adverse impacts identified in the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) demonstrates that any unavoidable adverse environmental effects which may remain following mitigation are outweighed by the public benefit that will accrue as a result of the Scheme and the Government’s commitment to upgrading the SRN. and, for the purposes of Section 104(7) of the Planning Act 2008, that any adverse impacts would not outweigh the benefits of the Scheme. The Scheme complies with the NPS NN and accords with all other relevant</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>and important matters which need to be taken into consideration, including the adopted development plan for the local area and the NPPF.</p> <p>The Applicant has removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas has resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced potential impacts on tranquillity (both visual and acoustic intrusion) within the South Downs National Park and results in the need to affect less 'best and most versatile' (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included for land within the Application Boundary.</p>
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	Bee and pollinator native plants. Highways for nature, reduce road kill	N	The Applicant acknowledges this view.
Local community	Road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government 'Dasgupta Review' says, 'Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).' It would make no sense for the M3 to be severed at Junction 9, cutting off communities and transport links. In the same way, we can no longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to pressures. Highways England must now deal with the legacy of damage from previous schemes and ensure that there is real and tangible net gain for nature. Nothing short of major investment in nature's recovery is now acceptable.	N	<p>The National Policy Statement for National Networks is the primary planning document against which the Scheme is assessed by the Secretary of State in deciding whether to grant a Development Consent Order. An assessment of the Scheme against the requirements of the National Policy Statement for National Networks is set out in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2). The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) also includes an assessment of the Scheme against other relevant national and local planning policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a biodiversity assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	It's not enough to replace what will be lost, and does not correct what we lost when the M3 was built. Attention needs to be on correcting historic habitat destruction as well as preventing more preventable loss of our environment.	N	This comment is noted by the Applicant.
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.	Y	<p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity are set out in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The mitigation hierarchy has been embedded within the assessment process, whereby the design has sought to avoid adverse impacts in the first instance through an iterative approach to design, e.g. informing alignment to avoid sensitive receptors where possible. In areas where avoidance is not possible, measures have been included to prevent or reduce potentially significant negative effects. As a last resort, measures to compensate negative effects have also been included, e.g. habitat creation to offset impacts associated with habitat loss and fragmentation where these cannot be avoided.</p>
Local community	Far more could be done to benefit wildlife, and counter the damage done to the natural environment by this scheme.	Y	<p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies.</p> <p>The assessment of effects from the Scheme on biodiversity has not identified effects which are considered likely to be significant. However, during operation of the Scheme, essential mitigation in relation to important biodiversity receptors would include the management and monitoring of habitat creation and enhancement measures. Further details are provided within Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), with a full LEMP secured through DCO Requirement in agreement with statutory consultees.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.</p>
Local community	Green bridges both aesthetically pleasing and ecologically beneficial could be used to mitigate the environmental damage. Re-planting of trees and hedgerows	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	to keep Winchester and the South Downs a place of natural beauty and carbon efficiency.		New areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape during operation. Much of the additional woodland and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for wildlife in a north-south direction. Please refer to Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) .
Local community	Needs more attention to wildlife regeneration, increased biodiversity, noise cancelling infrastructure around the motorway	N	
Local community	Wild flowers, mix of native trees, green bridges across the road	N	Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.
Local community	Your landscape proposals are inadequate in the face of the damage you are doing to the wildlife spaces around Winchester	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. I want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Needs to be more aware of conservation & protecting the environment. This is SSI, nature reserve, AONB you are talking about building on. There are rare plants in abundance, kingfishers, insect life all which help with the biodiversity. The rivers/streams are chalk alluvial rivers (which are 'a priority area for habitat under UK biodiversity action plan') there are 200 globally of which 85% are UK & a number in Hampshire. The area also has wetlands/water meadows & grassland - all host to flowers & invertebrates, birds & animals. Squeezing the SSI/nature reserves into smaller spaces & building more roads doesn't help. Demolishing ancient downs/grassland/wetlands/woodlands take many years (lifetimes to recover), planting a few sympathetic trees/ plants are not the solution when you have impacted things like chalk streams/rivers. Needs more footpaths joining areas together for local residents (the area should not just be a road junction & growing). Give local people access to the space without driving miles round Winchester. I remember as a resident, being easier to drive round Winchester via the motorway than walk into the city!!!!	N	An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES assess the likely significant effects on designated sites such as the SAC / SSSI and the South Downs National Park with mitigation developed through consultation with statutory consultees. Mitigation measures proposed to reduce likely significant effects are also included in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . The Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including extensive areas of chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes
Local community	Bunds seem to have been designed for convenience not for benefit of residents or wildlife.	N	The Applicant notes this. Areas of chalk grassland to be created using suitable seed mixes of local provenance. Chalk grassland would be created over exposed chalk substrate, or chalk that has been liberated during construction work, with little or no topsoil to enable a nutrient-poor substrate suitable for chalk grassland. The habitat

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>creation would also provide connectivity between existing areas of chalk grassland in the wider landscape.</p> <p>Highway cuttings and embankments include provision of species rich grasslands. These grassland areas will be low nutrient, with little or no topsoil, to ensure a diverse sward develops. Whilst unlikely to be true chalk grasslands like those proposed to the east of the M3, due to the underlying geology these species rich grasslands are likely to have characteristics of chalk grassland.</p>
Local community	<p>The landscape proposals will impact massively on the Itchen and its floodplain and will disturb wildlife to a massive degree. The proposed footpath to Long Walk is a positive proposal but outweighed massively by the rest of the Scheme.</p>	N	<p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) illustrates the proposed landscape design. The design includes habitats of ecological value which are appropriate to the local area, including chalk grassland and woodland, with the aim of maximising biodiversity outputs from the Scheme in accordance with National Highways performance targets. Stakeholders including South Downs National Park Authority have been consulted on the design of the habitat compensation and enhancement package to make certain it is appropriate to the surrounding landscape and habitats, and future climatic conditions.</p>
Local community	<p>Suggestions that should the Scheme be accepted the following measures should be strengthened: Can the impact on Winnall Moors be avoided altogether ? Can we have a 'green bridge' ? Can you reduce the number of 'spoil' sites ? Please don't put a spoil site next to the South Downs Way</p>	Y	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. This specifically included consideration of the impacts of all stages of the Scheme on the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve. The reserve covers part of the River Itchen SSSI and has therefore been assessed alongside the SSSI. No significant effects are reported following the implementation of mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
Local community	I didn't really notice landscape proposals - mixed habitat with native trees, flora and small rain catchment areas would help our wildlife.	N	Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) provides details of the landscaping proposals for the Scheme.
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			
Local community	There is no mention of enabling a wildlife corridor to span the M3. That would be a great improvement.	N	Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.
F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.			
Local community	Use the spoil to create new habitats or better still, don't create the spoil at all. The river Itchen will be spoiled if you go ahead with these plans	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
Local community	The impact on existing natural sites should be as low as possible to minimise impact on existing vegetation and animal life. Time of year is also important. Spring would not be a good time for noise and disruption	Y	
Local community	The impact on existing natural sites should be as low as possible to minimise impact on existing vegetation and animal life. Time of year is also important. Spring would not be a good time for noise and disruption	Y	
Local community	As per previous comments, all sounds a little up in the air on this one and how this will blend into the landscape, be good from an ecological point of view	Y	
Local community	It is unfortunate you have not quantified how much soil needs to be displaced. I would want it to be publicly known before any permission is granted. But you have earmarked three locations suggesting a large amount which will have a devastating impact on wildlife in those areas in the south downs national park. This project is unnecessary	Y	
Local community	You seem to envisage the chalk from the construction being used for agricultural land. Why have you ignored the proposals to use it for wildlife gain? The chalk can be used to create new habitats, to help make up for the loss of some of the chalk downland areas particularly in the 1990s developments. The chalk could be used to help recover some of the land also taken earlier for the sewage farm on St Catherine's Hill. You have opportunities for doing some good - why do you ignore them?	Y	
Local community	Spare soil will be temporary disruption only; agricultural or wildlife habitat will grow back within a couple of years.	Y	
F.4: Please let us know the reasons for your response to question F3 and any other views about the locations we've identified			

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Should landscape the area thoroughly after completion to maximise the benefit to the biodiversity	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.	Y	<p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity and the water environment are set in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies. Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p>
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	I am disagreeing as you are not saying what damage is being done to wildlife/SSSIs etc and what you will do about it before hand.	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction of the Scheme on biodiversity, and presents committed measures to avoid or mitigate impacts. The assessment identifies a number of adverse and beneficial impacts to biodiversity receptors, however in all cases the residual effects are not significant.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) illustrates the proposed landscape design. The design includes habitats of ecological value which are appropriate to the local area, including chalk grassland and woodland, with the aim of maximising biodiversity outputs from the Scheme in accordance with National Highways performance targets. Stakeholders including South Downs National Park Authority have been consulted on the design of the</p>
Local community	Fed up with beautiful areas and wildlife killed mucked about unnecessarily	N	
Local community	Further damage to wildlife and the environment	N	
Local community	None of these are required and will all damage biodiversity	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			habitat compensation and enhancement package to make certain it is appropriate to the surrounding landscape and habitats, and future climatic conditions.
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports.	Y	<p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity and the water environment are set in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies. Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p>
Local community	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Central compound I have no view on. 2. J9 compound I wholeheartedly agree with the location. 3. A33/A34 compound appears to be in an area where drainage occurs as well as wildlife habitats though I may be wrong about its actual location. 4. Northern compound is not marked on the plans so I'm going with strongly disagree until you point it out. 	N	<p>The small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) is also required to help construct the Scheme. This compound location would be used to for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities.</p> <p>A range of measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to avoid and reduce potential effects. Essential mitigation measures are outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3). As the design develops towards construction phase, mitigation would be refined and included within the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (siEMP), which would be secured through a DCO requirement. The EMPs would be drafted in consultation with statutory bodies, and regular contact would be had with these parties through the subsequent detailed design and delivery (construction) phases.</p> <p>A comprehensive package of pollution prevention measures would be provided to avoid accidental pollution events during construction, with particular regard to the River Itchen. Measures would include source control, settlement tanks, silt fencing, and dust suppression. Furthermore, the Applicant will aim to locate construction compounds outside areas at risk of flooding where possible.</p> <p>Fencing of adjacent designated areas and retained important habitat to protect the area/habitat would be installed to avoid accidental damage and avoid incidental species mortality. Easton Down SINC is located within the Application Boundary but would be fenced and protected throughout the construction phase. Measures would</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>also be provided to avoid entrapment of animals during construction, such as covering excavations at night or where this is not feasible providing escape ramps.</p> <p>An Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) would be present on site during key periods of the construction phase. The ECoW would be required to make certain that all committed mitigation measures are adhered to.</p>
General commentary			
Local community	Road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government ‘Dasgupta Review’ says, ‘Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).’ It would make no sense for the M3 to be severed at Junction 9, cutting off communities and transport links. In the same way, we can no longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to pressures. Highways England must now deal with the legacy of damage from previous schemes and ensure that there is real and tangible net gain for nature. Nothing short of major investment in nature’s recovery is now acceptable.	N	<p>The National Policy Statement for National Networks is the primary planning document against which the Scheme is assessed by the Secretary of State in deciding whether to grant a Development Consent Order. An assessment of the Scheme against the requirements of the National Policy Statement for National Networks is set out in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2). The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) also includes an assessment of the Scheme against other relevant national and local planning policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that ‘embedded avoidance and mitigation measures’ for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a biodiversity assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p>
Local community	When it gets to a point that roads are more important than our wildlife then that is a sad day. We’ve done enough damage already.	N	The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.
Local community	The cut through of the South Downs will irreversibly destroy protected wildlife habitats and scar the natural landscape - I very strongly object to it	N	
Local community	Just don’t it’s not needed as wildlife in danger already	N	
Local community	Reducing congestion = reducing car use. It's the only way. This is a climate and biodiversity crises.	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	I have major concerns about the wildlife this scheme will destroy.	N	Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. Following the implementation of mitigation, the assessment concluded, that in all cases, the residual effects predicted are not significant.
Local community	Alternative options must be considered for the sake of the rich and abundant habitats that this plan will disrupt and destroy.	N	The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Please refer to Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) for further details.
Local community	<p>The Winchester Movement strategy work suggests that improvements to the capacity of and flow through this junction will have a positive impact on the city's traffic issues, air pollution, carbon footprint etc. I remain unconvinced, because in many cases, the issues are caused by accidents on the M3 or A34 outside the proposed plan area. I do not see any data in the consultation report to show expected movements, % of non polluting vehicles by 2035, etc in the papers. This leads to build up of traffic which is avoided by going through Winchester instead. Unless these plans reduce accidents on the feeder trunk roads (the M3 and A34,) the traffic build ups will still occur, all too often as traffic levels are returning to pre pandemic levels.</p> <p>These are my specific points for your consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The layout is better for local people using the A33 who were worried about crossing heavy traffic, but it now means that all local users will have to use the new junction every time (which wasn't the case in the previous design). This may lead to congestion so it has not served our needs as well as we would hope. The north exit from the A33 on to the M3 north brings faster traffic movements closer to the communities that I represent- hence potentially noisier, which is unacceptable. 2. The positioning of the soil deposits has been done to suit HE/landowners. It is a missed opportunity to mitigate the noise of the road in operation all along the route from south to north. (see also point 12) Princes Mead has concerns about the setting of the listed building too. There is no assessment of flood risk when these soil heaps are in place. 3. The omission of the cycle route to Kings Worthy when it was so clearly described in the first proposal is a failure in this design. It is a need that is clearly described in the WCC/HCC Infrastructure Funding Statement (previously the R123 list) which I have already sent to the design/project team. I believe it is a duty to consider the needs of Non Motorised Users to be taken into account in any NSIP scheme, so this omission is disappointing. 	N	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments and sets out its response to the matters relating to biodiversity below. Other matters raised in this response are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p> <p><i>Responding to point 11:</i></p> <p>During operation of the Scheme, essential mitigation in relation to important biodiversity receptors would include the management and monitoring of habitat creation and enhancement measures, including the drainage system which has been designed to enhance biodiversity. Further details are provided within Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), with a full LEMP secured through a DCO Requirement in agreement with statutory consultees.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>4. The lack of traffic lights may be ok initially, but inevitably, there will be a need to control traffic flows in years ahead. Please include electricity schemes to enable traffic lights to be fitted later.</p> <p>5. Failure to show signage and gantries in the scheme means that we cannot tell what views these will present to local people, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area. Already, the traffic lights of the junction can be seen from miles away in my division, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area, and cross motorway gantries can be viewed from Martyr Worthy in the national park.</p> <p>6. If this country is to embrace walking and cycling for local commuting use, then the 3m wide cycle routes are inadequate to pass and should be wider. This includes actually on the roundabout where at one point, the walk/cycle way is alongside the main road. The Winnall area will continue to provide employment opportunities as well as retail etc. Other larger lorries go into the city from this junction. The paths created should not be shared for walkers and cyclists on planned bridleway that connect and to the NCN 23 where cyclists can be riding faster than is safe for walkers sharing the same surface (all should be at least to LTN1/20).</p> <p>7. Impact on Cart and Horses junction traffic going onto the A33 from the B3047</p> <p>a. The design has no traffic breaks in traffic moving north on the A33 from Junction 9. Currently, there are traffic breaks (traffic lights create this) which create gaps in traffic to allow people to exit from the Cart and Horses junction, allowing it to function. This is particularly important at peak times when traffic entering and leaving Winchester is heavy on both routes. The new arrangement may create congestion, reduce safety and even more confusion at this junction. (It is also an opportunity to improve the gateway into the National Park at this point.)</p> <p>b. The road layout of the A33 is changing, with one lane in each direction, and a bike lane coming into/through the junction. Currently there are sections of two lanes for filtering etc. These changes will impact on the junction itself which will need redesign to ensure it is safe, congestion doesn't occur and ideally actually improves for traffic going south (Morning Basingstoke traffic into Winchester), and Worthys /Winchester traffic going north and south at all times of day, but particularly at peak times, and traffic from the B3047 east going north.</p> <p>8. The project statement states that one aim is to reduce Spitfire Link congestion, which severely impacts drivers there. There is no evidence in the project plan that the team have provided that shows how the new design will reduce congestion. At present, large traffic accelerates from a stop slower than smaller vehicles which results in no gaps for Spitfire Link traffic. There is no evidence provided that this will improve, because although much of the heavy traffic will be on the through road, not all of it</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>will take that route; daytime traffic in particular, includes a considerable amount of large and small vehicles into Winnall.</p> <p>9. The levels on the project plans are difficult to follow, and I asked HCC to seek more traffic data, and full levels plan to see the implications for views, noise, pollutants fall out.</p> <p>10. The drive through video is poor, and difficult to follow : I requested an improved version but was told this was impossible.</p> <p>11. There is a considerable amount of biodiversity work to be considered: which includes interconnectivity between areas being 'managed' for biodiversity. I am leaving this to the experts at WCC, HCC and to SDNPA, but I do have concerns about the long term management of the water areas, set within the road system.</p> <p>12. The DEFRA 2016 noise map showed that improvement to noise mitigation were desirable at points through Winchester and for the A34 at the Headbourne Worthy site. A noise reference along Willis Waye is included in your scheme. Anything worse, even by a slight margin would be unacceptable in planning terms 'for the enjoyment of the property' and other properties affected in this way. Since Willis Waye was built, a considerable number of properties have been built in this area, alongside the A34 margins and I am seeking noise defence for these residents. Original tree planting is unsatisfactory: acoustic fencing is necessary here to mitigate noise.</p> <p>13. I must also express my regret that an 'open air' event wasn't organised for this consultation. With many other events taking place, this was a missed opportunity to engage the public face to face.</p>		
Local community	<p>Overall we are in favour of improving the junction to reduce congestion and enhance the national road network connectivity in our area. We hope this will also make it safer for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians in the local area especially where the B3047, A33, A34 and M3 interchanges are concerned. However, we do have concerns about the impact the works will have on traffic flow, congestion, landscape and biodiversity in and around the Winnall junction and especially along the Itchen valley to the north and east of the motorway.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the effects on designations, habitats and species during construction and operation of the Scheme. The assessment identified a number of residual adverse and beneficial effects to biodiversity receptors predominantly during construction (as by operation effects would have been mitigated) including, European Designated Sites (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation), other statutory designated areas (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest), non-statutory designated areas, habitats, badgers, bats, hazel dormouse, otter, water vole, birds (breeding and over-wintering), reptiles, freshwater fish, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates and notable plants. Effects predicted were as a result of habitat loss and gain, fragmentation of populations / habitats, disturbance, habitat degradation, and species mortality. However, in all cases the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation during the construction and operation of the Scheme effects were predicted not significant.</p>
Local community	<p>The road scheme is not appropriate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it will destroy and fragment important protected habitats for wildlife which is rapidly declining (State of Nature reports, RSPB) • building roads induces: 	Y	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. traffic (SACTRA reports) b. CO2 emissions and noxious pollutants • it contravenes government targets to reduce climate change and public efforts to deal with the climate emergency • it contravenes cycling and walking strategies and need for investment in public transport • it contravenes need for an integrated transport policy • it contravenes government's 25-year Environment Plan (government earlier manifesto to leave the environment in a better place than the one in which they found it) • it contravenes the SDNP nature plan where its efforts for nature's recovery would be an interconnected 'nature network' • it contravenes people's need for green spaces and landscapes for health, recreation and visual upliftment 		<p>Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>In response to point 1:</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the effects on designations, habitats and species during construction and operation of the Scheme. The assessment identified a number of residual adverse and beneficial effects to biodiversity receptors predominantly during construction (as by operation effects would have been mitigated) including, European Designated Sites (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation), other statutory designated areas (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest), non-statutory designated areas, habitats, badgers, bats, hazel dormouse, otter, water vole, birds (breeding and over-wintering), reptiles, freshwater fish, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates and notable plants. Effects predicted were as a result of habitat loss and gain, fragmentation of populations / habitats, disturbance, habitat degradation, and species mortality. However, in all cases the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation during the construction and operation of the Scheme effects were predicted not significant.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity (+2.57%) and a predicted net gain in hedgerow units (+35.28%).</p> <p>In response to point 6:</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. It is calculated that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity, refer to the assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity based on the assumptions by providing chalk grassland and hedgerow units.</p> <p>In response to point 7:</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and the National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) set out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy. The Applicant has had regard to the South Downs Local Plan (2019) and has developed the Scheme design in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority.</p> <p>The Scheme constitutes major development within a National Park, and therefore strong justification for the project is required. The Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) demonstrates the rationale for the Scheme and the designs sensitive approach to the South Downs National Park, and how it has positively responded to the special qualities of the designation. Of particular note the Scheme increases opportunities for the public to access and enjoy by positively responding to severance issues caused by the existing M3.</p> <p>The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes.</p>
Local community	I want to very strongly oppose the proposed M3/J9 plan. Headbourne Worthy village is already compromised on the sound aspect, but retains some of its old charm. However, the proposed plans would make it like a rat run. Not only that, but from the looks of things the wildlife and the landscape would be harmed in the process. I appreciate the need but think a better way needs to be found.	N	The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted.
Local community	<p>In general we are in favour of improving the junction configuration to create free-flow traffic from the A34 to the M3 and vice versa. More importantly, we support the separation of local traffic and the strategic road network around the junction with the creation of a separate link road. This will make driving to Winnall from Itchen Abbas a safer and more accessible journey. However, there are areas of the proposals we have specific concerns about. Our feedback is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction compound Number 4 would inevitably add construction traffic to the likely traffic management routes through the construction site, namely down the A34. There are no other sensible options to build either off highway haul roads or use local lanes to avoid the A34 with this construction traffic (narrow railway underbridge on Down Farm Lane, local villages not 	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the support of the Scheme in principle and the range of views expressed.</p> <p><i>Response to point 2:</i></p> <p>An assessment of potential effects to the River Itchen SAC/SSSI, including risk of pollution during construction phase, are set out in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 7.5) along with committed mitigation measures. No significant effects to the River Itchen SAC/SSSI have been identified. Natural England and the Environment agency have been consulted on the assessments and proposed mitigation measures.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>appropriate for HGVs and LGVs). This location seems unnecessary given the scale of other potential construction compounds in the vicinity. We recommend this compound Number 4 is dropped from the plans. If it is retained, we would expect to see in the DCO application/examination a detailed assessment and findings based upon how this site had been selected. This should include detailed traffic modelling results for the construction period to demonstrate minimal ill-effect from other traffic to local surrounding roads from the addition of construction vehicles leading to and from compound Number 4 and the Junction 9 site. Adding construction vehicles from this remote location up the A34, which is highly likely to be congested during extended periods of the construction phase, would compound delays on this already busy section of A34 and risk sending traffic heading south along the A34 on rat-runs using either the city of Winchester or local village roads in the Itchen Valley. This is avoidable with better choice of onsite or existing compound choice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction compound Number 3 is a poor choice of construction compound given the immediate proximity to the sensitive River Itchen. This ground form slopes towards the river giving direct pathway from a proposed construction compound to the internationally designated river. This would likely be a very challenging location to confirm through the DCO application/examination on Habitat Regulations Assessment grounds alone. This site should be dropped from the plans and all efforts be made to distance the construction sites from River Itchen wherever practicable. • We are surprised there is no mention of using the existing R&W materials compound site situated right next to Junction 9 between the M3 SB Onslip and the Spitfire spur road. This site is run by an established Highways England contractor; it is full of potential engineering fill material that will have come from elsewhere on the strategic road network over recent years; and, now that very 'recycled' fill material is piled to its current height the plant, other machinery and lighting used in that compound is a visual eyesore on the edge of the South Downs National Park. It would be bordering on disingenuous for Highways England not to look at the opportunities this compound offers both in terms of construction compound site location (instead of compound Number 3 or 4) and the reuse of fill material borne from years of 'recycling' from other Highways England schemes. Again, as in my point 1/ I would expect to see full assessment and reasoned findings in the DCO application, as to what the selection criteria against using this location with the potential use of the engineering fill material within, all of which is quite literally already on site. 		<p><i>Response to point 4:</i></p> <p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Scheme assessed within the ES (Document Reference 6.1) includes a number of engineering design measures that have been designed to avoid or reduce significant adverse environmental effects arising, where practicable. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Reuse of earth arisings to facilitate construction of the Scheme where possible to minimise fill material being needed to be brought on to site or taken offsite 2) Reuse of excess earth arisings to facilitate landscape mitigation within the Application Boundary 3) Design of the new bridge over the River Itchen to be a clear span structure with abutments set back from the river channel 4) Use of underpasses where possible rather than bridges to reduce visual impact of the Scheme 5) Use of low noise road surface finishing where new roads surfaces are to be laid 6) Non-intrusive temporary construction measures within the River Itchen to facilitate cleaning of an existing headwall, and installation of two new headwalls to serve the operational drainage strategy 7) Retention of existing pavements where possible to provide efficiencies and reduce the need for construction of new pavements 8) The drainage strategy has been designed to reduce the opportunity for pollutants from road drainage to be discharged to the sensitive chalk aquifer by restricting infiltration of captured drainage water until after pollutants have been removed 9) The concurrent works to install new drainage outfalls and the new bridge over the River Itchen, resulting in reduced duration for associated PRow closures 10) Use of warm rolled asphalt for installation of road surfacing, not hot rolled asphalt (resulting in reduced carbon emissions and energy requirements) <p>Further mitigation measures are contained within the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the constrained location of the proposed development site between the historic city of Winchester and the South Downs National Park and over the River Itchen, construction mitigation would have to be extremely well planned out, with best practice mitigation strategies and pollution prevention controls in place. This scrutiny over the construction phase should extend to design and logistics and include maximising off-site prefabrication of as much infrastructure as possible, delivering to site for installation in a quick and controlled manner. For example, the deck for the new footbridge over the River Itchen should be prefabricated offsite and dropped into place overnight from the adjacent A34 NB carriageway once pier footings have been installed. The underpass taking the A34 SB under the M3 could be built in square shape box sections and slid into place on rails. New junction infrastructure on Junction 9 itself ought to be prefabricated as far as possible and the onsite build be on as accelerated a timeline as possible to improve potential impacts on traffic movements during the construction phase. Prefabrication offsite would enable greater control of materials transfer and storage (reducing the potential for pollution incident) in the constrained development location between Winchester and the South Downs National Park, while having the potential to improve construction times for the overall project. With the construction site being on two significant highway routes (being the A34 and M3), there is ideal opportunity to bring in large elements of prefabricated infrastructure onsite, using appropriate abnormal indivisible load protocols, without need to go through local towns and villages. Re. landscaping, topsoil ought not be used where swathes of chalk grassland are intended. It should be made clear to landscaping contractors through means of detailed soil management plans, environmental masterplans and landscape design secured through the DCO that chalk grassland requires in part denudated substrate free of nutrients. Good case study here is the Weymouth Relief Road in Dorset where swathes of wildflowers complement the highway inclusion in the local landscape and has resulted in greatly reduced maintenance regimes. There is plenty of local expertise in this area with Butterfly Conservation (who manage the excellent Magdalen Hill Down butterfly reserve in line of sight of the M3 Junction 9 proposals), Hampshire and IOW Wildlife Trust, the Bumblebee Conservation Trust and the very local Wild Valley Verges group all in the county and who can advise appropriate design and management. Topsoil is a precious commercial resource nowadays and could be used agriculturally in the vicinity. 		<p><i>Response to point 5:</i></p> <p>It is expected that the following Environmental Control Plans will be prepared/finalised, as appropriate, for the Scheme as part of the Environmental Management Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Plan (LEMP) – sets out how landscape and ecological mitigation will be implemented. An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) can be found at Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) 2) Soil Management Plan – sets out measures to ensure protection, conservation and reinstatement of soil material, its physical and chemical properties and functional capacity for agricultural use. A draft can be found at Appendix C of the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) 3) Soil Resources Plan – sets out the areas and type of soil to be stripped, haul routes, the methods to be used, and the location, type and management of each soil stockpile to help protect and enhance soil resources on site. This plan will be prepared by the Principal Contractor during the detailed design stage and included within the siEMP <p>Further details are provided in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p><i>Response to point 6:</i></p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. It is calculated that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity, refer to the assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity based on the assumptions by providing chalk grassland and hedgerow units.</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been included as part of the application to deliver any mitigation required, including proposed management and monitoring. A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan will be secured through a DCO requirement.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With Biodiversity net gain for DCO consented schemes now in proposed amendments to the Environment Bill, all proposed biodiversity habitats created towards the end of construction should be maintained in line with an appropriate Handover Environmental Management Plan in perpetuity, if not by Highways England then by a suitable local agent who could acquire the areas in concern. This would secure real environmental legacy for the area. • I could not find any detail about operational lighting proposals in the consultation material. I would expect highway lighting to be minimal unless absolutely required for safety. This view is to contribute to the dark night skies over South Downs National Park. • It is not easy to see from the indicative general arrangement plans whether the proposed M3 Junction 9 improvements scheme goes as far north up the A33 as the 'Cart and Horses junction'. There is a most fantastic opportunity here for collaboration between Hampshire County Council, Winchester City Council and Highways England to incorporate the long needed upgrade of this awful staggered junction between the B3047 and A33 (which has seen so many road traffic accidents over many years) into the wider proposals, while Tier 1 contractors are on site. More detail on this would be welcome if it is being considered – from a local's perspective it certainly should be. 		<p><i>Response to point 6:</i></p> <p>Relevant biodiversity legislation is covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. It is calculated that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity, refer to the assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity based on the assumptions by providing chalk grassland and hedgerow units.</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been included as part of the application to deliver the mitigation, including proposed measures for management and monitoring including success criteria for proposed landscape elements. A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan will be secured through a DCO requirement.</p>
Butterfly Conservation	<p>Butterfly Conservation is the UK-wide charity devoted to saving butterflies, moths and their habitats, with over 40,000 members. The work of the organisation is spread throughout the country, and we hold significant datasets on butterflies and moths and their whereabouts. This information has been gathered over the past 50 years and this can provide an important historical context for the present occurrence and distribution of species.</p> <p>We recognise and share the concerns raised by a number of conservation organisations about the adverse impact on nature conservation assets that</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the views expressed.</p> <p>The Scheme aims to create new areas of chalk grassland on lower slopes of the South Downs National Park open downland slopes, and adjacent to new woodland and scrub areas on cutting and embankment slopes throughout the Application Boundary. The creation of chalk grassland would provide habitats for a range of species including priority species of invertebrates and birds. As discussed during consultation with Butterfly Conservation, the seed mix used would include dark mullein <i>Verbascum nigrum</i>, the larval foodplant of the striped lychnis moth.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>would result from implementation of the scheme proposals. Our 'Butterflies for the New Millennium' database shows that 27 of the UK's butterfly species have been recorded in the immediate area of this proposed development. The moth fauna here will be even richer.</p> <p>Should any such development go ahead, we believe there must be strong and irrefutable biodiversity net gain through the creation of substantial areas of chalk grassland habitat which must be of long-term benefit for the conservation of butterflies, moths and other wildlife and for people. However, in specifying below the potential opportunities for habitat creation from this scheme, this does not indicate Butterfly Conservation is registering support for the current scheme.</p> <p>Our Building Sites for Butterflies Programme Manager at Butterfly Conservation, has already given a presentation to the Stantec project team involved in scheme design, where he has highlighted the similarities in what could be achieved in terms of habitat creation on the soft estate around the scheme, with those he achieved as part of the A354 Weymouth Relief Road in Dorset, 2009-2011. We believe there are significant opportunities for the scheme to create habitat for a number of the species listed on the attached list of priority species, and in particular the following butterflies: Adonis Blue, Chalk Hill Blue, Small Blue, Grizzled Skipper, and Dingy Skipper; and the Striped Lychnis moth. Dr Sterling has already highlighted these species directly to the team, and the plants on which these species depend which can easily be incorporated into the seedmix to be sown on the soft estate. If implemented in a similar manner to that achieved on the Weymouth scheme we have confidence in successful outcomes for these species</p> <p>In event the scheme receives its Development Consent Order, Butterfly Conservation would be pleased to continue working with the design and implementation teams to secure the habitat enhancements. Butterfly Conservation also owns and manages the nearby Magdalen Hill Down nature reserve and we would in principle be happy to work with the implementation team to see if we can provide wildflower seeds from the reserve as a source of very local provenance for the scheme.</p> <p>We welcome the change in policy by UK Government in the light of the Dasgupta review into the economics of biodiversity to ensure that nationally significant infrastructure projects deliver 10% biodiversity net gain</p> <p>We consider that by following the Highways England's Major Project Instruction on Low Nutrient Grasslands (MPI-85-102020, October 2020) wherever feasible throughout the soft estate of the scheme, will ensure that as far as chalk grassland is concerned, there would likely be considerable net gain in this habitat to the benefit of butterflies and moths.</p>		<p>In addition to chalk grassland, new areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife. Much of the additional woodland and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for wildlife in a north-south direction. Proposed features are outlined in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. It is calculated that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity, refer to the assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity based on the assumptions by providing chalk grassland and hedgerow units. Legislation is covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current Scheme programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
<p>South Downs Network</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>The South Downs Network objects to the proposed M3 Junction 9 Development in its present form.</p> <p>Executive Summary: Move over to Sustainable Transport</p> <p>We respectfully suggest that this £180+ million road scheme should be referred back to be replaced by a sustainable transport version that will help us meet our climate change commitments, providing better bus services, bus and rail infrastructure, integrated green cycle and walking routes, safe crossing for active travel, green (car free) bridges, safer paths for access to schools and access to rail stations.</p> <p>Secretary of State for Transport guidance</p> <p>We would take this opportunity to remind Highways England of the words used by the Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps when launching the Government's 'Decarbonising Transport: Setting the Challenge,' said in the foreword that: "public transport and active travel will be the natural first choice for our daily activities" and that "We will use our cars less and be able to rely on a convenient, cost-effective and coherent public transport network".</p> <p>More roads - more traffic</p> <p>More roads equals more traffic - when a new road is built, new traffic will divert onto it. Many people may make new trips they would not otherwise make just because of new roads. This well-known and long-established effect is known as 'induced traffic'</p> <p>Increase of emissions and global warming gases</p> <p>The Highways England proposal will increase CO2 emissions by attracting more cars onto the roads! Highways England's own report admits a significant increase in carbon emissions as a result of the project - some 534,628 tonnes of CO2 for user emissions. This doesn't include the emissions from the construction which doesn't seem to be reported on.</p> <p>How are we going to meet the Government's commitment to net zero emissions in less than 30 years with road schemes like this? Highways England say the project will be completed in 2026 so the timeline is even shorter at less than 25 years to achieve net zero! Wouldn't it be better to cancel the project and spend the £180 million on sustainable transport solutions?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges South Downs Network's objection to the Scheme. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>Response in relation to the PEIR:</p> <p>The PEIR was a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time.</p> <p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations') and in consultation with the relevant local planning authorities and statutory environmental bodies, including Natural England. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Specifically, Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the effects on designations, habitats and species during construction and operation of the Scheme and has been developed in consultation with stakeholders including Natural England. The assessment identified a number of residual adverse and beneficial effects to biodiversity receptors predominantly during construction (as by operation effects would have been mitigated) including, European Designated Sites (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation), other statutory designated areas (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest), non-statutory designated areas, habitats, badgers, bats, hazel dormouse, otter, water vole, birds (breeding and over-wintering), reptiles, freshwater fish, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates and notable plants. Effects predicted were as a result of habitat loss and gain, fragmentation of populations / habitats, disturbance, habitat degradation, and species mortality. However, in all cases the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation during the construction and operation of the Scheme effects were predicted not significant.</p> <p>Response in relation to SDNPA Nature Investment Areas:</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment. As noted above, Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the effects on designations, habitats and species of the Scheme. The chapter concludes that, in all cases, the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation during the construction and operation of the Scheme effects were predicted not significant.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>In 2020 transport accounted for 29.8% of all CO2 emissions. The majority is from road transport! How can Highways England advance a road scheme that will actively increase CO2 emissions?</p> <p>It is likely that there will still be 40 million petrol and diesel cars and vans on the roads in 2030 pulse diesel HGVs!</p> <p>The UK's new climate target to cut our emissions by 78% by 2035 was passed into law in June 2021 - the Highways England plan is out of step with this. The proposal does not include a landscape strategy. Road developments are not excluded from the UK's legally adopted climate commitment. The UK Government has a commitment to tackle climate change.</p> <p>Nature</p> <p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation Design Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that this design plan consists of just one page! We are concerned that there is no landscape strategy or detailed plan. The Mitigation Design Plan contains simply focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, we urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and biodiversity net gain. As part of this, we would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done. The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. We want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</p> <p>Whilst the actual road design plan seems to be very firm there seems to be a lack of commitment by Highways England to the environment, an EIA and a landscape and biodiversity/habitats plan. Words such as 'ongoing' and "is being developed" keep cropping up. One gets the impression that the natural world is not important to Highways England.</p> <p>We are concerned that Highways England seemed to be avoiding a commitment to the production of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). In Para 1.5.4 of the PEIR Highways England says "It should be noted</p>		<p>In addition, the scheme will provide extensive areas of new chalk grassland within the SDNP, providing habitat for locally important species, and connecting existing areas of chalk grassland.</p> <p>Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.</p> <p>Response in relation to previous environmental damage:</p> <p>The Applicant has received several comments in relation to the impacts on the Twyford Down. The suggestions put forward by consultees are not within the scope of this application and have therefore not been considered.</p> <p>This DCO application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Response in relation to compulsory purchase of land:</p> <p>The Applicant continues to engage with landowners directly affected by the Scheme using clear statutory procedures, to understand the effects of the Scheme on their land interest. Specific mitigation solutions or compensation will be agreed on a case by case basis as appropriate, in line with the compensation code for compulsory purchase.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to a green bridge:</i></p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design. New areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape. Much of the additional woodland and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for wildlife in a north-south direction. See Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details.</p> <p>The provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>that at this stage the information is preliminary. An iterative process of scheme development and EIA is ongoing”. Surely a draft EIA should be available for public consultation now, and not be delayed until the DCO application? Indeed there seems to be a fudging of the commitment even at that stage to the production of an EIA. Highways England says “The final EIA work will be reported in the ES.”</p> <p>Indeed further fudging of commitment to environmental assessment is contained in the response to Natural England's submission of 9 November 2020. They highlighted that the impact of emissions to designated ecological sites is required. Highways England response was "Ongoing EIA work will include the assessment of the impacts of emissions from traffic on designated habitats."</p> <p>Avoiding say yes to Natural England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England said “The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies.” Highways England said “ongoing EIA work is to be reported.” • Natural England said they would welcome the opportunity to comment on the landscape, biodiversity and access enhancement plan. Highways England responded “A biodiversity and landscaping mitigation package is being developed.” But when? • Natural England advised that “the potential impact of the proposal upon features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for habitat creation/enhancement should be included within this assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance on such matters.” Highways England responded ""The Biodiversity chapter of the ES will identify all potential impacts on identified biodiversity features"" Further fudging." <p>SDNPA Nature Investment Areas</p> <p>The road site is where the South Downs National Park has identified one of its 12 nature investment areas. These nature recovery areas are part of a hub of an interconnected ‘nature network.’ The Highways England intrusion flies in the face of nature recovery and will destroy and fragment important protected habitats. This scheme affects the local nature reserve which is home to rare and notable wildlife, and a SSSI site.</p> <p>Previous environmental damage</p> <p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust’s nature reserve at</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>St Catherine's Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally. "</p> <p>SSSI and Special Area of Conservation</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network.</p> <p>Government Environmental Policy</p> <p>Highways England need to take on board Government policy on the environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government's Final Report of the Independent Review on the Economics of Biodiversity led by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta. Amongst other things he says "Human demands on nature must be curbed • We say - road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government 'Dasgupta Review' says, 'Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).' We should no longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to urbanisation pressures. • Also please bear in mind the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this scheme. <p>Green Bridge</p> <p>We support the Hampshire and IoW Wildlife Trust's proposal for a green bridge to the National Park which would reunite wildlife habitats that became disconnected by the 1990s M3 construction.</p> <p>We want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>standing as a clear commitment to nature’s recovery despite modern transport development.</p> <p>Spoil</p> <p>The Highways England report says “We have not yet completed our junction design, so we do not know exactly how much material may need to be placed in these areas, or whether we will need all three areas”. Surely after at least two and a half years of preparation such civil engineering detail should be known? The amount of spoil will affect the landscape design. This should be known now; before Highways England applies for a Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>2019 consultation</p> <p>We have serious concerns about the previous stages of public consultations.</p> <p>Highways England says “There was a high level of support for the Proposed Scheme”. “We received 526 responses to our consultation”. Other than a few meaningless and valueless paragraphs the Public Consultation Summary Report does not provide any substantive information on exactly what those 526 respondents said. What organisations responded and what did they say? How many of the 526 comments were from individual members of the public. How many were car, commercial and HGV vehicle owners/drivers? Did horse riding, walking and cycling groups respond? Indeed were they invited to respond?</p> <p>References are made to ‘stakeholders.’ It is understood they were invited to workshops to give their input. Exactly who were they? and how were they selected? We hope it wasn't a question of selecting the appropriate stakeholders so that it assisted in giving the right answer to suit Highways England.</p> <p>Walking and Cycling Proposals Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that there is little substance to walking and cycling provision. The plan just consists of one page. There seems to be very little reference to provision for horse riders.</p> <p>Walkers, cyclists and horse riders to be put in a ‘subway’! Underground? Highways England say “On both sides of the motorway, the existing walking and cycling route links both parts of Easton Lane, which would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders will be improved with a widened 3m route, which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway...”</p> <p>This is unacceptable. This proposal is fraught with all sorts of problems. Who is going to police the subway to ensure the safety of users? Who will maintain it</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>and how will it be lit? Will there be security cameras? Will there be traffic separation to ensure safety of different users such as horse riders and cyclists?</p> <p>Instead of hiding these active travel users away below ground highways England should provide a green bridge out in the fresh air above the pollution from the motorway style road.</p> <p>In any event Highways England should ensure that cycle provision is compliant with Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20 Published last year by the Government.</p> <p>Highways England must take account of latest Government policy</p> <p>The business case for this project should be rewritten taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Gov policy paper - A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment (pub Jan 2018) • DfT's policy paper - Decarbonising transport: setting the challenge (pub March 2020) • UK Gov policy paper: Gear change: a bold vision for cycling and walking • UK Gov policy paper: Bus Back Better: national bus strategy for England 		

K.2.G Material assets and waste

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	How you will reduce traffic. How you will reduce the number of road journeys. How you will dramatically reduce vehicle emissions and overall road pollution, including litter. How you will protect and progressively enhance the environment. How you will use sustainable materials and avoid fossil-derived tars etc.	N	A Materials Management Plan (MMP) will be prepared and developed by the Principal Contractor. The MMP will set out how the materials associated with the Scheme will be procured, handled and managed in the most efficient and sustainable manner and to ensure the cut / fill balance remains balanced. A draft Materials Management Plan (MMP) (see Appendix F of the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3)) has been prepared as part of the DCO application.
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure			
Local community	Just stopping the environmental pollution and waste in queuing traffic will be a big environmental win.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.

K.2.H Noise and vibration

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	<p>I understand that you like to reduce congestion with all of it's negative effects. However, extending this junction will increase the traffic which will cause further congestion elsewhere. Increased traffic will increase noise and air pollution and increase green house gas emissions. Furthermore, it will lead to massive disruptions of traffic during the building phase that will effect Winchester and Badger Farm Road. Badger Farm Road is already very busy and cycling is very dangerous. For this expense it would be much better to do following alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase capacity on railways and electrify towards Oxford and consider reopening the Watercress line between Arlesford and Winchester 2. Help people to use buses instead of their cars by building a bus network similar to CPRE's proposal, every village should have half hourly bus service to Winchester and or train stations 3. Build cycle ways along all high traffic roads, the M3 and especially this junction is much used for short distance travel too 	N	<p>The effects of the Scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed based on the forecast traffic flows using the road and the proximity of nearby residential properties.</p> <p>Construction noise and vibration from the Scheme is anticipated to have a small to neutral effect at some existing receptors (e.g. residential properties and commercial buildings). With the inclusion of mitigation outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3), some residential areas located close to the Scheme will experience short-term significant and non-significant adverse effects from demolition and construction noise and vibration. Noise arising from night-time diversions are not anticipated to be significant.</p> <p>During operation short-term (the year the new junction opens) significant beneficial effects are anticipated at two residential properties and 44 other properties during the daytime. In the long-term (15 years after opening), these effects are not considered significant, as the impact in the long-term is negligible.</p>
Local community	<p>Congestion and more importantly the impact this will have on open space and noise and pollution levels</p>	N	<p>During operation short-term significant adverse effects are anticipated at 20 residential properties during the daytime. These residential properties are anticipated to experience an increase in traffic flows on the surrounding road network, as a result of the Scheme. In the long-term, these effects are not considered significant, as the impact in the long-term is negligible.</p>
Local community	<p>Congestion does occur at the junction, but purely at peak times. You should optimise the existing infrastructure by encouraging certain traffic at off-peak times. Most congestion occurs on the southbound carriageway of the A34 heading to the M3. There is also a lack of enforcement of driving standards which cause accidents - people going through red lights and ignoring the junction boxes.</p> <p>Once traffic has accessed the M3 southbound, further congestion also occurs (probably more frequently) at junctions 10-11 and 12-13 - your modelling will have provided evidence of this.</p> <p>Your proposals are unlikely to reduce congestion at peak times, but simply to move it to another part of the network during busy times. Presumably there is no intention to further destroy the area south of Winchester for motorway widening - which means you are always going to be constrained by merging traffic from a two-lane motorway and a two-lane A road into the capacity of a two-lane stretch of motorway south of junction 9.</p> <p>Your proposals does not really address the root cause - you will still be merging the 4 lanes from the A34 and M3 into the 3 and then 2 of the southbound M3.</p> <p>From my local knowledge congestion occurs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At peak times when people are traveling to work 	N	<p>This is reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes the use of cuttings, earth embankments and the use of low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The Applicant has produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>2. Because of holiday traffic in the summer heading to Bournemouth and the New Forest</p> <p>For (1) surely we should be encouraging modal shift - local commuter car journeys should not be facilitated at public expense when we are attempting to reduce pollution and work to Net Zero. We should focus on encouraging walking and cycling by providing safe infrastructure at a fraction of the cost and encouraging public transport use..</p> <p>For (2) holiday traffic on busy weekend is essentially stop-start all the way down to the coast on busy weekend - again you are simply moving the problem further south.</p> <p>I cannot see how this will reduce noise - is it not an established fact that road 'improvements' such as this actually result in increases in journeys?</p> <p>Connections from the M3 to the A33 appear to miss the main incident hotspot - local residents have been campaigning for years for junction improvements at the Cart and Horses turn in Kings Worthy where there have been a number of fatalities - this doesn't appear to be in scope.</p> <p>The changes you propose will take another large amount of our local environment and cover it in concrete. It will become an even less usable area for pedestrians and cyclists. The fact that you are putting pedestrians and cyclists in what appears to be a length subway shows how little priority is given to active travel - I never use subways even in daylight in town centres as they are intimidating places.</p> <p>I'm not sure why I have participated in this consultation - no doubt the decisions have been made and local residents are unlikely to have their voices considered against the well-funded and extremely vocal freight and motoring lobbies which are skewing the debate.</p>		
Local community	Your brochure promised improvements to reduce noise pollution but we now understand these are not being done. It is unacceptable to worsen the noise pollution in Kingsworthy which is already significant, reasonable adjustments should be made.	N	The 2021 Consultation Brochure detailed the reasons for improving Junction 9 of the M3 and included the Applicant's aspiration of improving the environment, where possible, "by reducing the number of households affected by noise". The Applicant has undertaken a noise assessment and the findings are presented in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The assessment concludes that properties in Kings Worthy are not anticipated to be adversely affected by noise, having regard to mitigation proposed such as the provision of low noise road surfacing, during the operation of the Scheme (see Figures 11.19 to 11.22 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, additional noise mitigation in the form of noise barriers is not considered necessary.
Local community	Worried about the increase in traffic noise if a suitable road surface isn't laid.	N	The majority of the existing carriageway within the Application Boundary consists of a low noise road surfacing. Where carriageway within the Application Boundary is

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			not affected it is intended that the existing road finish would be retained. Where carriageway is to be affected and a new road finish implemented, it would consist of a low noise finish to reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the Scheme.
Local community	Even though a stated aim of this project is “Improve the environment, where possible, by reducing the number of households affected by noise...” there is nothing being done to reduce noise pollution which is currently being experienced by local residents as there are no noise reduction measures in place anywhere along the roads affected, particularly the A34. If this is a stated aim of the project as a local resident I’m broadly supportive of the scheme but I would expect to see noise measures put in place as part of the scheme to deal with the large number of households severely affected by noise pollution from these roads as a quid pro quo for locals.	N	<p>An operational noise assessment has been undertaken and the findings are presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Figures 11.19 to 11.22 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2). These figures indicate that, along the areas of the A34 and A33 considered within the scope of the assessment, no adverse noise change as a result of the Scheme’s operation is anticipated to occur.</p> <p>The Scheme objectives include consideration to reduce the number of households adversely affected by noise. Furthermore, to comply with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the Scheme must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; • Mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and • Contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effect management and control of noise, where possible. <p>Based on the findings, properties within Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy are not anticipated to be adversely affected by noise, having regard to mitigation proposed such as the provision of low noise road surfacing, from the Scheme and therefore noise mitigation in the form of noise barriers are not considered necessary.</p>
Local community	Although the changes to the A33 route improve safety concerns for those who were concerned about crossing traffic at 70mph, the new plan forces everyone going southbound to use the new junction, rather than pass under it. This is regrettable since the aim was to reduce traffic actually on the junction. There is little about implication of noise, pollutants on the changes.	N	The noise assessment presented in within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the A33 route.
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	Noise control Cycle access to Easton	N	Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface
Local community	Bring back biodiversity Bring noise cancelling infrastructure surrounding the motorway	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Stop this project and spend the money to help local people with noise barriers , better walking and cycling infrastructure. Please revert back to the plans for cycling and pedestrian connections between King's Worthy and Winnall in the previous plan and better integration of the NCN 23	N	Influence (RSI) of -3.5dB. No further mitigation, such as noise barriers, is not considered necessary. The Applicant has also produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. Construction mitigation includes ensuring machinery is switched off when not in use, not permitting radios on site and no idling of machinery. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1) .
Local community	It is highly disappointing that you have not even followed the promises given 2 years ago to include the building of cycle links between Winchester and Easton as well as Winnall and Kings Worthy. Why did you avoid working together with main local stakeholders like Cycle Winchester? The only work needed on this junction is to build barriers for noise and air pollution as well as building a proper cycle link to Easton.	N	
Local community	There should be a focus on provision for cycling and equestrian infrastructure. New / widened carriageways should be discouraged and focus also be made on noise and pollution barriers .	N	
Local community	Main concerns relate to potential habitat loss and noise .	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. The effects of the Scheme on noise are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.
Local community	Noise reduction measures along affected roads, particularly A34.	N	An operational noise assessment has been undertaken and the findings are presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Figures 11.19 to 11.22 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) . These figures indicate that, along the areas of the A34 considered within the scope of the assessment, no adverse noise change as a result of the Scheme's operation is anticipated to occur. No additional noise mitigation in the form of noise barriers is not considered necessary.
Local community	Residents are already affected by noise pollution from the M3, A34 and A33. The new plans fail to reduce (or even a commitment to not worsen levels). This must be addressed.	N	A noise and vibration assessment has been undertaken and is presented in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The assessment considered noise effects during both the construction and operation of the Scheme and vibration effects during construction.
Local community	Environmental impact on local residents specifically and especially noise pollution.	N	The effects of the Scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed based on the forecast traffic flows using the road and the proximity of nearby residential properties.
Local community	Noise from traffic	N	Construction noise and vibration from the Scheme is anticipated to have a small to neutral effect at existing receptors (e.g. residential properties and commercial buildings). However, some residential areas located close to the Scheme are likely to experience temporary significant effects from demolition and construction noise and vibration. Although this is without implementing mitigation outlined in the fiEMP
Local community	More information is needed on temporary and permanent impacts arising from the proposals, including in terms of noise impacts and noise mitigation. Additional noise reduction measures could beneficially be adopted as part of the scheme to reduce existing noise impacts on Kings Worthy from the combination of the M3, A33 and A34.	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>It is not clear from the consultation material whether there are direct impacts (in terms of temporary diversion of closures of PROW) during the construction period. There is a very well used network of footpaths within the local area, including passing underneath the A33 and A34 from the Itchen Valley and Kings Worthy to Winchester and it is not clear if these will all remain open (even if temporarily locally diverted) during construction - they should be.</p> <p>It is not clear if there are any direct impacts in terms of loss of habitats associated with Winnall Moors during construction.</p>		<p>(Document Reference 7.3) which would reduce significant effects identified. Noise arising from night-time diversions are not anticipated to be significant.</p> <p>During operation short-term (the year the new junction opens) significant beneficial effects are anticipated at two residential properties and 44 other properties during the daytime. In the long-term (15 years after opening), these effects are not considered significant, as the impact in the long-term is negligible.</p> <p>During operation short-term significant adverse effects are anticipated at 20 residential properties during the daytime. These residential properties are anticipated to experience an increase in traffic flows on the surrounding road network, as a result of the Scheme. In the long-term, these effects are not considered significant, as the impact in the long-term is negligible.</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The Applicant has produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
Local community	<p>You should abandon plans for new and wider carriageways and focus solely on constructing noise and pollution barriers, and on improving walking, cycling, and equestrian infrastructure to ensure the junction is no longer a barrier of any sort. In particular plans for cycling and pedestrian connections between King's Worthy and Winnall should revert to the previous plan, and more work needs to be done on the NCN 23 proposals. Effective noise and pollution barriers are needed especially to reduce conditions on footpaths and in housing to acceptable levels along the Itchen Valley to the north and south of the site at all points where the M3 and A34 are on embankments.</p>	N	<p>Noise impacts are reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of -3.5dB.</p>
Local community	<p>The natural environment needs to be considered. Our flora and fauna is taking a hammering and mitigations must be put in place to minimise long term disturbance to wildlife. Pre work-start surveys should be taken to establish wildlife populations in the construction zone and movement of small mammals to a safe habitat should be undertaken as required.</p> <p>Any lost flora should be replaced and the loss of valuable habitat at Winnall Moors must be avoided at all costs.</p> <p>The construction of a Nature Bridge or Nature Underpass should be made a priority to help repair damage done to habitat pathways and links by the Twyford Down cutting.</p>	N	<p>An operational noise assessment has been undertaken and the findings are presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). During operation short-term (the year the new junction opens) significant beneficial effects are anticipated at two residential properties and 44 other properties during the daytime. In the long-term (15 years after opening), these effects are not considered significant, as the impact in the long-term is negligible.</p> <p>During operation short-term significant adverse effects are anticipated at 20 residential properties during the daytime. These residential properties are anticipated to experience an increase in traffic flows on the surrounding road network, as a result of the Scheme. In the long-term, these effects are not considered significant, as the impact in the long-term is negligible.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>This is also a good opportunity to erect a noise screen on the Northbound side of the M3 between junction 11 Winchester South and junction 9. This would help lessen the incessant traffic noise which blights South Winchester and surrounding areas.</p>		<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The Applicant has produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
Local community	<p>If improvements are to be made consideration must be given to noise and pollution. It is not acceptable that noise levels may increase albeit by small margins. If the improvements are going to be made the aim should also to reduce noise and pollution levels by a) speed limit of 50mph on new link roads, b) noise reducing surface to road, c) proper sound insulation screens to either side of roads from new junction to North of Kings Worthy.</p>	N	<p>The effects of the Scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p> <p>To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of -3.5dB.</p> <p>The Applicant has also produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. Construction mitigation includes ensuring machinery is switched off when not in use, not permitting radios on site and no idling of machinery. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p> <p>No further mitigation, such as noise barriers, is not considered necessary.</p> <p>With regard to speed limits, the Applicant has submitted Speed Limits Plans (Document Reference 2.9) as part of this DCO application to show the proposed speed limits. Speed limits of 30 mph to 70 mph are proposed on new link roads.</p>
Local community	<p>Concerned about :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased noise - day and night • Increased pollution • Negative Impact on health and well being • Lack of effective mitigation actions regarding noise and pollution • Impact on wildlife eg. Skylarks and yellowhammers along the South Downs way - impacted by infill and construction, loss of habitat, fracturing habitats 	N	<p>A construction noise and vibration impact assessment has been undertaken at representative receptors and is reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This includes any proposed night-time working and takes into account the likely durations in determining significant effects. The Applicant has produced an fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed and monitored. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p> <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) also provides details of the operational noise impact undertaken at representative receptors and takes into account day-time and night-time noise levels. To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the scheme, low noise road surfaces</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Therefore if this plan goes ahead mitigation plans need to be much more effective than those planned and their effectiveness needs to be monitored and where needed extended, changed.</p>		<p>are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme design where new roads surfaces are to be laid.</p>
Local community	Noise problems for residents of Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy	N	<p>An operational noise assessment has been undertaken and the findings are presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Figures 11.19 to 11.22 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2). These figures indicate that, along the areas of the A34 and A33 considered within the scope of the assessment, no adverse noise change as a result of the Scheme's operation is anticipated to occur.</p> <p>The Scheme objectives include consideration to reduce the number of households adversely affected by noise. Furthermore, to comply with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the Scheme must:</p> <p>Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; Mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and Contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effect management and control of noise, where possible.</p> <p>Based on the findings, properties within Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy are not anticipated to be adversely affected by noise, having regard to mitigation proposed such as the provision of low noise road surfacing, from the Scheme.</p>
Local community	Please put sound shielding in place near housing and schools and try to minimise the over-night work.	N	<p>A construction noise and vibration impact assessment has been undertaken at representative receptors and is reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This includes any proposed night-time working and takes into account the likely durations in determining significant effects. The Applicant has produced an fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed and monitored. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
Local community	<p>The noise and pollution impact to residents living next to the M3 between the Southdowns footbridge across the M3 that lies between Jnc 10 and Junction 9. Residential properties exist close to the motorway cutting and experience continual loud noise and air pollution as vehicles accelerate up the incline on the northbound section of the carriageway. Air pollution monitoring should be established close to the bridge where the Alresford Road crosses the M3 (Spitfire Bridge) and also a comprehensive sound protection barrier and noise monitoring installed along the footpath that runs on the west side of the M3 cutting between Southdowns footbridge, passed Chalk Way up</p>	N	<p>An operational noise assessment has been undertaken and the findings are presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The study area incorporates properties within 600 m of the red line boundary and has considered noise change as a result of the Scheme at these receptors.</p> <p>During operation, short-term and long-term (the year the new junction opens) significant effects as a result of the Scheme are not anticipated at properties between Alresford Road and Junction 9 from traffic on the M3.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	to the Spitfire Bridge. This barrier would deflect the constant noise which is exacerbated by vehicles applying power to climb the incline of the M3 in this area, worse in wet weather too. speed traps would deter loud motorbikes racing between motorway junctions 9 and 10 and also along the spitfire link road which is a continual issue particularly at weekends.		
Local community	<p>Impact on local residents during construction, noise, light, disruption to local roads, paths, properties and businesses.</p> <p>I am concerned about the amount of construction traffic that may use the lower end of Long Walk to access Northern Soil Dump. Long Walk is narrow and steep and unsuitable for heavy traffic. Using this route will also have an impact on Footpaths 20 and 21 and Restricted Byway 19. Preferred locations for spoil dump would be Central and Southern.</p> <p>Would there be scope for further infill in the field adjacent to the new path from Easton Lane to Long Walk, or an increase in the size of the bund?</p>	N	<p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p> <p>Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and PRow's are assessed in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). Specifically, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the effects of the Scheme in relation to noise.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced an fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed and monitored. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure			
Local community	Concerned about the impact the Scheme might have on the Fulling Mill through noise.	N	<p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The assessment of effects on noise and vibration during construction and operation of the Scheme is reported within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The assessment indicates neutral effects at Fulling Mill.</p>
Local community	Not much consideration to noise and air pollution to residents between Junction 10 and Junction 9 in relation to mitigating these issues to resident for nearly 5 years of construction works and post implementation use.	N	<p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>The assessment of effects on noise and vibration during construction and operation of the Scheme is reported within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) also recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p>
Local community	<p>Lack of effective mitigation actions and unconvincing baseline data.</p> <p>The adverse impact of the existing M3 in terms of noise along Petersfield Road is considerable and has got considerably worse over the last 10 years - where noise from lorries and traffic at night is dire! No effective mitigating actions have been taken to address this impact (no sound barriers, no planting, road resurfacing provided a very short term slight improvement) so I have serious reservations about your plans that will deliver a 25% + increase in traffic and do not believe your comments that there will be no significant increase in noise and pollution! The reality is there are no clear mitigating actions and no promise to monitor the effectiveness of any mitigating actions.</p> <p>Sound barriers/ pollution mitigation measures should be put along the Winchester side of the M3 between the pedestrian bridge/South Downs Way and the Alresford Road B3404 bridge in any case and especially if this scheme goes ahead given the significant traffic increase you anticipate.</p> <p>We should not be considering a scheme that increases traffic volume to this extent - we should be looking at alternatives.</p>	N	<p>The assessment of noise and vibration during construction and operation of the Scheme was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of DMRB LA 111 Noise and Vibration (National Highways, 2020) and is reported within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The assessment was discussed with key stakeholders.</p> <p>During operation, short-term and long-term (the year the new junction opens) significant effects as a result of the Scheme are not anticipated at properties between Alresford Road and Junction 9 from traffic on the M3.</p> <p>To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the Scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new road surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of ~3.5dB. Based on the findings reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), further mitigation in the form of noise barriers is not required for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has also produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. Construction mitigation includes ensuring machinery is switched off when not in use, not permitting radios on site and no idling of machinery. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
Local community	<p>You don't really address the fundamental problems of increased noise and pollution and potential damage to wildlife and the countryside as a whole.</p>	N	<p>The effects of the Scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>You are "accepting" worsening noise pollution in Kingsworthy from the A34 which is not acceptable.</p>	N	<p>An operational noise assessment has been undertaken and the findings are presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Figures 11.19 to 11.22 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2). These figures indicate that, along the areas of the A34 and A33 considered within the scope of the assessment, no adverse noise change as a result of the Scheme's operation is anticipated to occur.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>The Scheme objectives include consideration to reduce the number of households adversely affected by noise. Furthermore, to comply with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the Scheme must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; • Mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and • Contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effect management and control of noise, where possible. <p>Based on the findings, properties within Kings Worthy are not anticipated to be adversely affected by noise, having regard to mitigation proposed such as the provision of low noise road surfacing, from the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>The dismissal of concerns over noise pollution are not acceptable. I am dismayed that there is no plan to reduce noise pollution on the A34 below Three Maids Hill. Noise has increased massively during our time here. As it stands, noise will increase along the A34 and nearer Junction 9 due to increased speeds. As a minimum, the A34 should be resurfaced below Three Maids Hill and noise barriers installed along the section bordering Headbourne Worthy.</p>	N	<p>An operational noise assessment has been undertaken and the findings are presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The operational noise study area also includes areas within 50m of other road links within the modelled road traffic network, which have the potential to experience a change of more than 1dB in the opening year. The following roads are 600m or more away from the Scheme and are identified to have a noise change of more than 1dB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reduction of 1.7dB along the westbound of the A31 between Chilcomb Roundabout and Bar End Roundabout • A reduction of 1.3dB along the southbound slip road of the A34 to the roundabout with the A272 and Christmas Hill • An increase of 1.4dB along the northbound slip road of the A34 to the Three Maids Hill Roundabout • A decrease of 1.5dB along the B3047 between Martyr Worthy and Itchen Abbas <p>Further assessment of the impacts associated with change in noise levels on the slip roads off the A34 to the A272/Christmas Hill and Three Maids Hill Roundabout has not been included within the assessment as there are no noise sensitive receptors within 50m of the link and this location is more than 600 m from the red line boundary of the Scheme.</p> <p>To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the Scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new road surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of ~3.5dB.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	The report seems to suggest that noise levels are acceptable and will continue to be so post the work, this is simply not true. If a stated aim is to improve the number of households affected by noise then there should be measures which do that, not just looking if the current situation will be significantly worse.	N	The effects of the Scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed based on the forecast traffic flows using the road and the proximity of nearby residential properties.
Local community	<p>More information is needed on temporary and permanent impacts arising from the proposals, including in terms of noise impacts and noise mitigation. Additional noise reduction measures could beneficially be adopted as part of the scheme to reduce existing noise impacts on Kings Worthy from the combination of the M3, A33 and A34.</p> <p>It is not clear from the consultation material whether there are direct impacts (in terms of temporary diversion of closures of PROW) during the construction period. There is a very well used network of footpaths within the local area, including passing underneath the A33 and A34 from the Itchen Valley and Kings Worthy to Winchester and it is not clear if these will all remain open (even if temporarily locally diverted) during construction - they should be.</p> <p>It is not clear if there are any direct impacts in terms of loss of habitats associated with Winnall Moors during construction.</p> <p>It is not possible to currently conclude on the extent to which the proposals comply with the relevant National Policy Statement.</p>	N	<p>Construction noise and vibration from the Scheme is anticipated to have a small to neutral effect at some existing receptors (e.g. residential properties and commercial buildings). With the inclusion of mitigation outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3), some residential areas located close to the Scheme are likely to experience short-term significant and non-significant adverse effects, from demolition and construction noise and vibration.</p> <p>During operation short-term (the year the new junction opens) significant beneficial effects are anticipated at two residential and 44 other properties during the daytime. In the long-term (15 years after opening), these effects are not considered significant, as the impact in the long-term is negligible..</p> <p>During operation, short-term significant adverse effects are anticipated at 20 residential properties during the daytime. These residential properties are anticipated to experience an increase in traffic flows on the surrounding road network, as a result of the Scheme. In the long-term, these effects are not considered significant, as the impact in the long-term is negligible.</p> <p>This is reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes the use of earth embankments and low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The Applicant has produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
Local community	<p>In the Highways England public consultation brochure, panel 6 lists reasons for making changes to J9. Among the aims for the scheme it includes <i>"Improve the environment, where possible, by reducing the number of households affected by noise, improving air quality and achieving the best we can for the diversity of local plants and animals."</i></p> <p>But - no indication is given as to how traffic noise from the A34 and M3 around J9, once the scheme is completed and operational, would be managed.</p> <p>I have read suggestions somewhere that a noise-reducing road surface would be used but, apart from this, I can find no indications in Highways England publicity material as to how road noise from the proposed scheme would be dealt with. Where are the plans for noise reduction?</p>	N	<p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The assessment of effects on noise and vibration during the operation of the Scheme is reported within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the Scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new road surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of ~3.5dB. Based on the findings reported</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>It seems likely that the speed of traffic through J9 (at least the A34 element) will be significantly faster than at present. Vehicles travelling faster produce much more wind and tyre noise than slow-moving vehicles.</p> <p>Background traffic noise from the A34 and M3 can be heard from long distances up, down, and across the Itchen Valley. Neither Avington nor Abbotts Barton appear to be noise measurement receptor sites for the environmental surveys conducted. It seems likely that these (and other) residential areas would not score highly in terms of noise from the J9 area as measured in decibels. Despite that, background traffic noise emitted from the A34 and M3 is still intrusive.</p> <p>If plans to deal with traffic noise actually exist in these latest proposals for the J9 rebuilding then they are so well hidden that I can't find them.</p> <p>Noise reduction should be treated seriously and feature much more prominently in any plan to redevelop J9.</p>		<p>in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), further mitigation in the form of noise barriers is not required for the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>No mitigation for noise pollution. Noise pollution is already a serious problem from the A34, M3 and A33. The new plans do not adequately address this; indeed it seems the noise levels may get worse and insufficient analysis and/or mitigation has been proposed.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The Scheme design includes low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid.</p> <p>The Applicant has also produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. Construction mitigation includes ensuring machinery is switched off when not in use, not permitting radios on site and no idling of machinery. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	<p>I can't see how local flooding risks or air pollution or noise pollution or ecological impacts or habitat loss or wildlife survival will be protected, any loss of habitat that affects the life of our wildlife is unforgivable and should not happen.</p>	N	<p>An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on air quality, biodiversity, noise and local flooding is set out in Chapters 5, 8, 11 and 13 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>Additional information is needed on the noise, PROW and direct habitat impacts associated with the scheme. It is not possible to determine if the environmental mitigation is adequate or appropriate currently, nor the extent to which the proposals comply with the relevant National Policy Statement.</p>	N	<p>The Scheme objectives include consideration to reduce the number of households adversely affected by noise. Furthermore, to comply with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the Scheme must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development;

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and Contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effect management and control of noise, where possible. <p>The effects of the Scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) are assessed and reported upon in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p> <p>Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p>
Local community	There are no noise reduction measures.	N	Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The Scheme design includes low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid.
Local community	Not considering noise mitigation measures as were first proposed.	N	The Applicant has also produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. Construction mitigation includes ensuring machinery is switched off when not in use, not permitting radios on site and no idling of machinery. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1) .
Local community	Accepting that works will only increase noise and pollution by small amounts is NOT addressing the problem. Any improvements must not just be for the motorist but also for those whose lives are going to be directly affected. First the by pass then the M3 now this, what is next. This is not progress in any sense of the word and planners MUST think about not only those who will both benefit but also those whose lives will be changed.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this view.
Local community	Not enough noise barrier protection for people living along Quarry Road, Chalk Ridge and those bordering the M3 cutting on the eastern edge parallel to the Spitfire link road.	N	This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.
			The assessment of effects on noise and vibration during construction and operation of the Scheme is reported within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>mitigate adverse noise effects. To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the Scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new road surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of ~3.5dB. Based on the findings reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), further mitigation in the form of noise barriers is not required for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has also produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. Construction mitigation includes ensuring machinery is switched off when not in use, not permitting radios on site and no idling of machinery. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
<p>D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them</p>			
Local community	Needs more attention to wildlife regeneration, increased biodiversity and noise cancelling infrastructure around the motorway.	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The Scheme design includes low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid.</p>
Local community	You go nowhere near far enough. It is possible to reduce noise and pollution as previously mentioned. Your proposals are a bog standard scheme to try and make it all look and sound acceptable when the reality is very different.	N	<p>The Applicant has also produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. Construction mitigation includes ensuring machinery is switched off when not in use, not permitting radios on site and no idling of machinery. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
Local community	There is no way of disguising the fact that this scheme will fill a whole fold in the landscape with tarmac, ugliness, noise and pollution. There will be little landscape left for planting.	N	<p>The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on air quality, noise and the landscape is set out in Chapters 5, 11 and 7 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included. The earthwork strategy has been informed by the unique topography of the wider environment to ensure solutions as sympathetic to local character, whilst maximising benefits, such as visual and noise screening, and opportunity for creation of chalk grassland. Further detail is provided in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	This is in part of the south downs and includes areas of SSSI and the river Itchen. Laying tarmac over green land so it will be possible to increase traffic and noise/emission pollution will only adversely affect these. The construction period particularly.	N	An assessment of noise and vibration on biodiversity is presented in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The assessment covers potential impacts associated with disturbance from construction-related noise on bats, otter resting places and commuting routes, water voles, breeding and wintering birds, and freshwater fish. This chapter concludes that during construction the effects to foraging and commuting bats, otters, water voles, breeding and wintering birds and freshwater fish are not significant.
Local community	As many trees as possible as they mitigate noise and sink CO2 and other gasses.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this view.
Local community	Further information is needed on the final proposals for cut and fill , the areas proposed for the deposition of surplus material, and the extent and details of proposed noise and other fencing and lighting.	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on noise is set out in Chapters 11 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			
Local community	I don't understand why the access to cyclists and horse-riders has been so drastically curtailed - can only assume this is a simple oversight. The 'new footpath Easton lane to long walk' connects with a bridleway (wrongly labelled as a footpath in your documents) on to Easton village and it makes no sense for this not to be available as a bridleway. The other new footway route along the scenic A34 seems to offer marginal benefit to pedestrians (who can already use Nun's Walk) while it could be a very useful link to Kings Worthy for cyclists who are otherwise limited to Worthy Road, which has high volumes of traffic and an inadequate shared pavement provision for cyclists. All of these routes will be mired with noise pollution and fumes, making it hard to imagine that they will be attractive for walkers.	N	Noise impacts are reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes the use of low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid.
Local community	The footpaths along the side of the motorway and slip roads will be horrific to use. Have the planners ever walked a mile along a path that runs next to a motorway or busy A road? It's noisy and isolating.	N	
Local community	Horrendous. The existing junction causes noise and air pollution for miles around, who wants footways and cycleways parallel to even more roads?	N	
Local community	Earlier plans included bridleway & cycle path routes to Kings Worthy and Long Walk. The Kings Worthy is clearly a strategically important cycle route and downgrading it to a footpath seems an inexplicable idea and a waste of an obvious opportunity to provide routes between Kings Worthy and Winnall, and from there to leisure facilities at Bar End where the alternatives are very hostile. The Kings Worthy to Winnall route would be a valuable travel route for cycles but noisy as a leisure walk and too long to be much used as a route to	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>walk as a means of travel. The downgrading of the footpath to bridleway is a wasted opportunity for a valuable leisure facility (for off-road cyclists as well as horses) with a minimal saving.</p>		
Local community	<p>1) The proposed new footpath between Easton Lane and Long Walk, across the shoulder of Easton Down (east side of M3) is a welcome addition to the footpath network in the vicinity of J9 - an area I have walked frequently over many years.</p> <p>Although no public footpath currently exists on this line, I have walked most of the suggested footpath route. From this experience it is clear the new path would be subject to significant traffic noise coming from the adjacent M3, A34, and associated slip roads. Such noise intrusion on this path would be unavoidable - whatever mitigation measures were put in place - but, despite the likely noise levels, the path is still one I would use and value during recreational walks in the area.</p> <p>I welcome this proposed eastern path.</p> <p>From the plans, it seems this path would be largely screened by earthworks and vegetation from the M3 and A34. While this is an understandable design feature, such screening would also block views west across the Itchen valley for people using the path. On some of the more elevated sections of this path I would welcome walkers having the benefit of distant views west across the Itchen valley, even if this meant reduced screening from the roads below. My experience is that walks with an open aspect are much more enjoyable than paths which are completely screened. Please arrange for some open views to the west along the elevated sections of this path.</p> <p>Also, my preference for this eastern footpath would be for it to be reserved for pedestrians only. There is already an existing suitable paved alternative route available for cyclists via Easton Lane and Long Walk. Horses using footpaths inevitably damage the path surface, to the detriment of pedestrians. Also, I have rarely if ever seen horses being ridden in the vicinity of J9 - and there is no pre-existing network of bridleways in the J9 area that would be enhanced by this path being designated as a bridleway. Please keep this proposed eastern path as a footpath only.</p> <p>2) The proposed new footway route on the west side of the M3 / A34, between Tesco's roundabout (Easton Lane) and Kings Worthy, would provide a useful and worthwhile link making effective use of the abandoned stretch of northbound A33 carriageway. However, it is</p>	Y	<p>The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions. The proposed route has been designed as a 1:20 gradient route to promote access for all and its position would provide an attractive opportunity for users to connect between Easton Lane and Long Walk and promotes access to the South Downs National Park. The proposed earthwork strategy and woodland planting on the valley slopes west of the proposed chalk grassland would also aid visual and noise screening of the M3 corridor from areas of the South Downs National Park.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>difficult to see why this route is not proposed as a shared footpath and cycleway.</p> <p>The western route is one which cyclists from the north and west sides of Winchester would find very useful for reaching the eastern side of the town (especially the retail and employment areas of Winnall) without having to use the congested central town area. I would like to see this western route constructed as a shared cycle/pedestrian route.</p> <p>3) Also, as a footnote to both these proposed new routes for people travelling through the area other than by vehicle - could they be given official names? Naming paths helps identify them and raise public awareness - the local parish councils could undoubtedly suggest suitable and appropriate names if approached.</p>		
Local community	<p>Steps taken are nominal and nowhere near sufficient. Footpaths along the Itchen Valley will have to contend with a new layer of noise pollution and fumes without substantial sound and pollution barriers. Failure to retain the proposal for a cycle route between King's Worthy and Winnall, and poor design of the revised NCN23 are deeply disappointing given the budget for this project. The walking route from King's Worthy will be horrifically dominated by speeding traffic and should be diverted away from the roads wherever possible e.g. by using the road to the west of Homebase. Footpath interconnections between the new path and the existing footpath network are poor and dysfunctional. Concessions to the horse-riding community should not have been abandoned.</p>	N	<p>Noise impacts are reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes the use of low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid.</p>
Local community	<p>Why have you abandoned the previous proposals for a cycle way between Kingsworthy to and Winnall? It was probably the only good things on the whole proposal. The proposed footpath route is so close to the traffic that it will be unpleasant, noisy, pollute the air, and thus it's not a useful amenity at all. The M3 should be destroyed. If not, it should be or put into a tunnel to prevent its noise and pollution affecting people who travel in more planet-friendly ways.</p>	Y	<p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a 3m wide combined footway and cycleway.</p> <p>Noise impacts are reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes the use of low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid.</p>
F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.			
Local community	<p>The impact on existing natural sites should be as low as possible to minimise impact on existing vegetation and animal life. Time of year is also important. Spring would not be a good time for noise and disruption</p>	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result</p>
Local community	<p>Its not a big issue for me but if required it should be used for noise abatement first and foremost.</p>	Y	
Local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Soil bunds could be used for proactive noise mitigation, not merely to raise levels. 	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Soil spoils affect settings of rights of way, listed building (Princes Mead school) Soil spoil by St Swithuns risks covering archaeological remains of Morn Hill camp Soil spoil could provide opportunity for obscuring gantry views etc. <p>It is difficult to see the implications for flooding in future years, and to see long views as I couldn't find these on the consultation website, except through the drive through.</p>		<p>the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and noise intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>A construction noise and vibration impact assessment has been undertaken at representative receptors and is reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Applicant has produced an fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed and monitored. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
Local community	As for previous question I don't trust you and the only logical place is to use excess Earth to help build up sides of roads to act as further sound barriers. Better still why not cut and cover all the roads affected this returning the land to a natural state without the expense of a tunnel?	Y	
F.4: Please let us know the reasons for your response to question F3 and any other views about the locations we've identified			
Local community	Minimize distance it's transported, reduce impact of slow, noisy, smelly, carbon emitting transport	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and noise intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>Generally, a construction noise and vibration impact assessment has been undertaken at representative receptors and is reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This includes any proposed night-time working and takes into account the likely durations in determining significant effects. The Applicant has produced an fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed and monitored. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	As mentioned previously, the northern construction compound on Christmas Hill does seem a bit distant from the works, and I am a bit	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, further work was undertaken by the Applicant to consider the potential impacts of the options for the main construction compound, of which one of the options was the northern construction compound at

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>concerned it might bring noise/dust/congestion into that area (i.e. it will create more problems than it solves).</p>		<p>Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation). This further work was predominately in relation to carbon emissions given the heightened focus on climate change. The assessment predicted CO₂ emissions over the construction period associated with travelling to the site from the main construction compound locations of 0.6 tonnes with the central construction compound (presented as number 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation) compared with 135 tonnes of CO₂ with the northern construction compound. The lesser distance also reduces congestion on the surrounding local road network and the local communities. As a result, northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides further details.</p> <p>Generally, a construction noise and vibration impact assessment has been undertaken at representative receptors and is reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This includes any proposed night-time working and takes into account the likely durations in determining significant effects. The Applicant has produced an fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed and monitored. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
Local community	<p>There is insufficient detailed information on potential compound 3 to be able to understand the potential impact arising from its use. It is located in an area where there could be potentially significant noise, landscape and visual and other impacts arising from its use. Further detailed information on the detailed proposals for the pound are needed, including uses, proposed hours of operation, visual screening, fencing, noise mitigation, lighting and other measures to be able to provide conclusive comments.</p>	N	<p>The construction of the Scheme would require a small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities. Details of the other construction compounds required to construct the Scheme can be found Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) provide details on the proposed construction working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme.</p> <p>Working hours would be restricted to the following core hours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07.00 to 19.00 Monday to Friday • 07.00 to 13.30 Saturday • No Sunday working

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>Works outside of the core working hours are likely to be required in certain circumstances and would be carried out following consultation with Winchester City Council.</p> <p>The temporary compounds would also be subject to surface water drainage measures to avoid significant environmental effects. Such measures would include (refer to the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) for further details):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reducing the amount of topsoil stripping where possible and soil stockpiles would be located as far from watercourses as practicable 2. Use of silt fences 3. Plant and wheel washing and haul road damping in designated areas 4. Plant to be re-fuelled in designated locations at a safe distance from water courses and good practise to be in place with relation to pollution prevention (adequate bunding, storage etc) 5. Spill kits are to be positioned at strategic locations on site and thorough training provided for staff to ensure a rapid and effective response to any pollution incidents that occur on site 6. Use of an Ecological Clerk of Works / Environmental Manager, along with toolbox talks and training to promote contractor awareness of pollution risks <p>The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited. Works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p> <p>A construction noise and vibration impact assessment has been undertaken at representative receptors and is reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This includes assessing key construction noise and vibration activities, such as compound clearance and construction and construction compound operation. Details of the construction plant used in the assessment are presented in Appendix 11.1 (Construction Activities in Noise and Vibration Assessment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The number of plant items, type of equipment and working locations have been based on information provided by the Principal Contractor and based on equipment requirements from other similar schemes. The Applicant has produced an fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed and monitored. The commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
Local community	<p>Concerns regarding light, noise and security with the location of Compound Number 1. Could the compound be hidden within the valley and behind the existing tree line? The plan looks as though it could extend outside of this in a northerly direction in which case it will be seen from properties along Easton Lane and it also looks as though existing trees may be removed which would seem unnecessary.</p>	Y	<p>The main construction compound would be to the immediate east of Junction 9 (presented as number 1 in the 2021 statutory consultation). Activities within this compound would include plant storage, car parking, fuel and water storage, 'skills school', staff welfare facilities, waste segregation areas and a wheel wash. The area would also be used for material storage, a tree and hedging nursery area and material processing (earthworks and pavements) and storage of topsoil. Details of the other construction compounds required to construct the Scheme can be found Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The Applicant has reduced the impact of the central construction compound by reducing its footprint and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant has reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area of the tree line.</p> <p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) provide details on the proposed construction working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme.</p> <p>Working hours would be restricted to the following core hours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07.00 to 19.00 Monday to Friday • 07.00 to 13.30 Saturday • No Sunday working <p>Works outside of the core working hours are likely to be required in certain circumstances and would be carried out following consultation with Winchester City Council.</p> <p>It is anticipated that standard temporary fencing for the main construction compound would be used to screen and secure compound locations. This would reduce visual intrusion, assist in noise attenuation and ensure public safety.</p> <p>The temporary compounds would also be subject to surface water drainage measures to avoid significant environmental effects. Such measures would include (refer to the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) for further details):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reducing the amount of topsoil stripping where possible and soil stockpiles would be located as far from watercourses as practicable

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Use of silt fences 3. Plant and wheel washing and haul road damping in designated areas 4. Plant to be re-fuelled in designated locations at a safe distance from water courses and good practise to be in place with relation to pollution prevention (adequate bunding, storage etc) 5. Spill kits are to be positioned at strategic locations on site and thorough training provided for staff to ensure a rapid and effective response to any pollution incidents that occur on site 6. Use of an Ecological Clerk of Works / Environmental Manager, along with toolbox talks and training to promote contractor awareness of pollution risks <p>The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited. Works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p> <p>Construction noise and vibration from the Scheme is anticipated to have a small to neutral effect at existing receptors (e.g. residential properties and commercial buildings). However, some residential areas located close to the Scheme are likely to experience temporary significant effects from demolition and construction noise and vibration. Although this is without implementing mitigation outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which would reduce significant effects identified. Noise arising from night-time diversions are not anticipated to be significant.</p>
General commentary			
Local community	Your not doing enough to actually meet your aim of improving the environment for locals, particularly noise. Local residents need to live through the disruption and increased traffic after the scheme completes. Much more should be done to improve local residents lives as currently it doesn't feel that you are doing everything "where possible" to do so.	N	<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of -3.5dB.</p> <p>The Applicant has also produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. Construction mitigation includes ensuring machinery is switched off when not in use, not permitting radios on site and no idling of machinery. The</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1) .
Local community	<p>The A33 scheme takes a different route than in the first scheme, but it doesn't take into account the effect of the new traffic and road layout on the workings of the junction at the B3047 and A33 (Cart and Horses junction) I flag this up as the new plan has some jeopardy: I have safety concerns, and traffic flows concerns. Despite the introduction to this consultation, I can see nothing within it to reduce the congestion on Spitfire Link. The congestion often has up to 1km of queue which is unacceptable. The solution to traffic flows on this junction must include improvements which reduce congestion from the Spitfire Link at least in line with other routes onto the junction. It is the principle way that traffic travelling from the A3, A31 reach the A34 and M3, as well as for local traffic.</p> <p>There is nothing asking opinion of noise in this consultation. I'd like to see noise reduction along the full length of the scheme, including on the 'old parts' of the A34 going north from the junction being created up to Three Maids Hill.</p>	N	<p>Noise impacts are reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of -3.5dB. The Scheme objectives include consideration to reduce the number of households adversely affected by noise. Furthermore, to comply with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the Scheme must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; • Mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and • Contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effect management and control of noise, where possible.
Local community	<p>A scheme of this nature requires a huge amount of effort and planning. I understand that the aim is to reduce congestion at the Winnall roundabout and A34 but... whenever we attempt to solve one problem it shifts the problem somewhere else and is inevitably at the expense of someone, nature, the environment. The M3 at Winchester solved the congestion at the Hockley traffic lights, this led to noise, pollution, impact on our natural environment and inevitably congestion somewhere else - at the Winnall roundabout and A34.</p> <p>Your scheme will solve the Congestion on the A34 but - at the expense of increased noise, traffic, pollution, lowering of quality of life for those who live near the scheme, and no doubt lead to congestion elsewhere (M3/M27 junction etc)</p> <p>It would be good to interrupt this cycle and not accept increasing volume of traffic, lorries and cars as the solution. It really is time we acted on climate , environment and health concerns. It's time to be creative and come up with alternative solutions to more lanes, more cars, more lorries! What about freight trains, lorry lanes, local suppliers etc? Rant over!</p>	N	<p>Noise impacts are reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of -3.5dB.</p> <p>The Scheme objectives include consideration to reduce the number of households adversely affected by noise. Furthermore, to comply with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the Scheme must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; • Mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and • Contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effect management and control of noise, where possible.
Local community	<p>Please reassess the need for the scheme against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduced traffic post Covid - increased pollution from increased traffic - increased local noise from faster traffic 	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	- use of public funds which may be better suited to increasing green opportunities		
Local community	More emphasis needs to be made to mitigate the noise from increased road traffic and faster speeds for those living next to the motorway on the western side of the cutting between Chalk Ridge to the south and Tesco's at Junction 9. All road surfaces used should be of the latest type to minimise road noise from the M3 and connecting roads and sufficient drainage to avoid build up of water in torrential rain, which again generates considerable noise. Regular air pollution monitoring should take place and provided to residents at routine intervals to ensure they remain at safe levels for residents in the area.	N	Noise impacts are reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new roads surfaces are to be laid..The majority of the existing carriageway within the Application Boundary consists of a low noise road surfacing. Where carriageway within the Application Boundary is not affected it is intended that the existing road finish would be retained. Where carriageway is to be affected and a new road finish implemented, it would consist of a low noise finish to reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the Scheme. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of -3.5dB.
Local community	Would it be possible to place noise reducing fences on both sections of the A34 as it goes through Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy from where it currently splits from the A33 (River Itchen area) to where it crosses Springvale Road?	N	<p>An operational noise assessment has been undertaken and the findings are presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Figures 11.19 to 11.22 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2). These figures indicate that, along the areas of the A34 and A33 considered within the scope of the assessment, no adverse noise change as a result of the Scheme's operation is anticipated to occur.</p> <p>The Scheme objectives include consideration to reduce the number of households adversely affected by noise. Furthermore, to comply with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the Scheme must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; • Mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and • Contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effect management and control of noise, where possible. <p>Based on the findings, along the areas of the A34 and A33 considered within the scope of the assessment, are not anticipated to be adversely affected by noise, having regard to mitigation proposed such as the provision of low noise road surfacing, from the Scheme. Noise reducing fencing is not considered necessary.</p>
Local community	The Winchester Movement strategy work suggests that improvements to the capacity of and flow through this junction will have a positive impact on the city's traffic issues, air pollution, carbon footprint etc. I remain unconvinced, because in many cases, the issues are caused by accidents on the M3 or A34 outside the proposed plan area. I do not see any data in the consultation report to show expected movements, % of non polluting vehicles by 2035, etc in the papers.	N	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments and sets out its response to the matters relating to noise below. Other matters raised in this response are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p> <p>Response to point 9:</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>This leads to build up of traffic which is avoided by going through Winchester instead. Unless these plans reduce accidents on the feeder trunk roads (the M3 and A34,) the traffic build ups will still occur, all too often as traffic levels are returning to pre pandemic levels.</p> <p>These are my specific points for your consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The layout is better for local people using the A33 who were worried about crossing heavy traffic, but it now means that all local users will have to use the new junction every time (which wasn't the case in the previous design). This may lead to congestion so it has not served our needs as well as we would hope. The north exit from the A33 on to the M3 north brings faster traffic movements closer to the communities that I represent- hence potentially noisier, which is unacceptable. 2. The positioning of the soil deposits has been done to suit HE/landowners. It is a missed opportunity to mitigate the noise of the road in operation all along the route from south to north. (see also point 12) Princes Mead has concerns about the setting of the listed building too. There is no assessment of flood risk when these soil heaps are in place. 3. The omission of the cycle route to Kings Worthy when it was so clearly described in the first proposal is a failure in this design. It is a need that is clearly described in the WCC/HCC Infrastructure Funding Statement (previously the R123 list) which I have already sent to the design/project team. I believe it is a duty to consider the needs of Non Motorised Users to be taken into account in any NSIP scheme, so this omission is disappointing. 4. The lack of traffic lights may be ok initially, but inevitably, there will be a need to control traffic flows in years ahead. Please include electricity schemes to enable traffic lights to be fitted later. 5. Failure to show signage and gantries in the scheme means that we cannot tell what views these will present to local people, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area. Already, the traffic lights of the junction can be seen from miles away in my division, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area, and cross motorway gantries can be viewed from Martyr Worthy in the national park. 6. If this country is to embrace walking and cycling for local commuting use, then the 3m wide cycle routes are inadequate to pass and should be wider. This includes actually on the roundabout where at one point, the walk/cycle way is alongside the main road. The Winnall area will continue to provide employment opportunities as well as retail etc. Other larger lorries go into the city from this junction. The paths created should not be shared for walkers and cyclists on planned bridleway that connect and to the NCN 23 where cyclists can be riding faster than is safe for walkers sharing the same surface (all should be at least to LTN1/20). 		<p>The Applicant acknowledges this. The effects of the Scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed based on the forecast traffic flows using the road and the proximity of nearby residential properties and is presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES.</p> <p>Response to point 12:</p> <p>The results of the operational noise assessment are presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES. The findings indicate that, along the areas of the A34 and A33 considered, no adverse noise change as a result of the scheme is anticipated to occur.</p> <p>The scheme objectives include consideration to reduce the number of households adversely affected by noise. Furthermore, to comply with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the scheme must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; • Mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; • Contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effect management and control of noise, where possible. <p>Based on the findings, the properties in Kings Worthy are not anticipated to be adversely affected by noise from the Scheme. In addition, this section of the A34 is not within the scope of the DCO application and therefore noise mitigation in the form of noise barriers were not considered necessary within the ES.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>7. Impact on Cart and Horses junction traffic going onto the A33 from the B3047</p> <p>a. The design has no traffic breaks in traffic moving north on the A33 from Junction 9. Currently, there are traffic breaks (traffic lights create this) which create gaps in traffic to allow people to exit from the Cart and Horses junction, allowing it to function. This is particularly important at peak times when traffic entering and leaving Winchester is heavy on both routes. The new arrangement may create congestion, reduce safety and even more confusion at this junction. (It is also an opportunity to improve the gateway into the National Park at this point.)</p> <p>b. The road layout of the A33 is changing, with one lane in each direction, and a bike lane coming into/through the junction. Currently there are sections of two lanes for filtering etc. These changes will impact on the junction itself which will need redesign to ensure it is safe, congestion doesn't occur and ideally actually improves for traffic going south (Morning Basingstoke traffic into Winchester), and Worthys /Winchester traffic going north and south at all times of day, but particularly at peak times, and traffic from the B3047 east going north.</p> <p>8. The project statement states that one aim is to reduce Spitfire Link congestion, which severely impacts drivers there. There is no evidence in the project plan that the team have provided that shows how the new design will reduce congestion. At present, large traffic accelerates from a stop slower than smaller vehicles which results in no gaps for Spitfire Link traffic. There is no evidence provided that this will improve, because although much of the heavy traffic will be on the through road, not all of it will take that route; daytime traffic in particular, includes a considerable amount of large and small vehicles into Winnall.</p> <p>9. The levels on the project plans are difficult to follow, and I asked HCC to seek more traffic data, and full levels plan to see the implications for views, noise, pollutants fall out.</p> <p>10. The drive through video is poor, and difficult to follow : I requested an improved version but was told this was impossible.</p> <p>11. There is a considerable amount of biodiversity work to be considered: which includes interconnectivity between areas being 'managed' for biodiversity. I am leaving this to the experts at WCC, HCC and to SDNPA, but I do have concerns about the long term management of the water areas, set within the road system.</p> <p>12. The DEFRA 2016 noise map showed that improvement to noise mitigation were desirable at points through Winchester and for the A34 at the Headbourne Worthy site. A noise reference along Willis Waye is included in your scheme. Anything worse, even by a slight margin would be unacceptable in planning terms 'for the enjoyment of the property' and other properties affected in this way. Since</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Willis Waye was built, a considerable number of properties have been built in this area, alongside the A34 margins and I am seeking noise defence for these residents. Original tree planting is unsatisfactory: acoustic fencing is necessary here to mitigate noise.</p> <p>13. I must also express my regret that an 'open air' event wasn't organised for this consultation. With many other events taking place, this was a missed opportunity to engage the public face to face.</p>		
Local community	Request for a sound barrier for the M3 to limit the noise.	N	The results of the operational noise assessment are presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES . To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new roads surfaces are to be laid. No additional mitigation, such as the use of sound barriers, is proposed or required during operation.
Local community	<p>Footpaths and cycle ways</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The original Itchen Way from the Fulling Mill into Winnall and the Nun's Walk (Allan King Way) into Winchester from St Mary's Church to the King Alfred should be preserved or improved. Both these original paths are important for local walkers and offer more attractive routes than the proposed new paths as they follow the course of river tributaries and also pass through protected wildlife areas. 2. The new footpath following the existing northbound A33 of does not appear to offer much amenity. Such a path on a narrow strip of land between two fast moving carriageways does not seem very attractive for walkers. The plan suggests that for at least 300 metres of the path the distance between the northbound and southbound carriageways is less than 30 metres. If this path is installed it would be better if it was made into a cycleway to offer local cyclists a traffic free route into Winchester and the shopping area at Winnall. For walkers it would appear a better option would be to link to the Itchen Way where it crosses the Itchen. 3. A generally better alternative for local amenity would be to run the northbound and southbound A34 adjacent to each other along the original Northbound route and put a footpath/cycleway along the old Southbound route away from the fast moving carriageways. 4. The new path proposed on the east side of the M3 does not appear to be of much benefit for local walkers. It appears it would be elevated on the side of the hill, but recessed into the hillside. As such, it would mainly offer views over the motorways or no views. It is not clear what local demands this path meets. It would be better to save the cost of this and spend more to achieve a better arrangement for walkers and cyclists on the western side where higher utilisation can be expected. <p>Noise Pollution</p>	N	<p>The effects of the Scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed based on the forecast traffic flows using the road and the proximity of nearby residential properties.</p> <p>Construction noise and vibration from the Scheme is anticipated to have a small to neutral effect at some existing receptors (e.g. residential properties and commercial buildings). With the inclusion of mitigation outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3), some residential areas located close to the Scheme will experience short-term significant and non-significant adverse effects, from demolition and construction noise and vibration. In the long-term, these effects are not significant.</p> <p>During operation, short-term (the year the new junction opens) significant beneficial effects are anticipated at two residential and 44 other properties during the daytime. Indirect effects are due to reduced traffic flows along the B3047. Direct effects are due to the conversion of the slip road from the A34 to the A33 into a public footpath. In the long-term (15 years after opening), these effects are not considered significant, as the impact in the long-term is negligible.</p> <p>During operation, short-term significant adverse effects are anticipated at 20 residential properties during the daytime. These residential properties are anticipated to experience an increase in traffic flows on the surrounding road network, as a result of the Scheme. In the long-term, these effects are not considered significant, as the impact in the long-term is negligible.</p> <p>This is reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes the use of earth embankments and low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The Applicant has produced a fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise pollution coming from the A34 on the east of Kings Worthy (e.g Three Maids Hill) has increased significantly in over recent years. With increased traffic flows, and higher speeds, steps should be taken to mitigate the increased noise pollution on this section of the A34. • The sections of road forming the new junctions with the M3 are on higher ground and much closer to the village of Kings Worthy. Noise mitigation steps should be taken here to manage the increased noise pollution that will result. <p>Disruption</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local residents are very concerned about the level of inconvenience and disruption this project will bring to the area. The journey from Kings Worthy to the south side of Winchester (e.g. Bar End) is already difficult and can be expected to be much worse while these works are being carried out. There are only two southbound routes out of Kings Worthy, via J9 or via the Worthy Road and through the City. Since the recent Covid restrictions were introduced the traffic flow around the City's one way system has been further restricted by the closure of Hyde Street and lane narrowing on North Walls. This means all southbound traffic going through the City is routed past the "Albion" junction close to the railway station. There are now major hold-ups as a result. As an example the journey from Kings Worthy to the new Sports and Leisure Centre at Bar End (less than 3 miles in a straight line) can approach half an hour at busy times. Therefore, it will be essential to re-open Hyde Street and restore a proper traffic flow around the Winchester one-way system before J9 works commence in order to avoid effectively cutting off Kings Worthy residents at busy times. 		<p>commitments set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) are secured through a requirement in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1).</p>
Local community	<p>I found it very hard to understand how the roads will be routed as there was very little if any local landmarks marked on the plans eg Tesco at Junction 9 and the Cart & Horses at Kings Worthy for example- this would have helped enormously in understanding the scale and routing of the proposals plus their locations etc</p> <p>One thing we currently have as a problem is the sound of the motorway AND/or the A34 in North Winchester - from Kings Worthy all the way into Abbots Barton and other Northerly parts of Winchester.</p> <p>We have a consistently loud background noise in Abbots Barton especially in winter when the trees have no leaves and the atmosphere is very wet and humid however even in the summer when the windows have to be left open to sleep comfortably the sound can almost appear deafening which given the distance seems highly strange, although a temperature inversion may account for some of this</p>	N	<p>Noise impacts are reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of -3.5dB.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>We would very much welcome some investigation into this distractingly loud acoustic intrusion into our otherwise quiet existences so that this can be designed out of any part of the scheme in the future.</p> <p>As part of the works please can you ensure all tarmac is the low sound type and also could you please ensure the A34 ALL of the way up the hill out of Junction 9 also has a new layer of this sound attenuating tarmac.</p> <p>On another note I am unsure if your scheme will be affecting the A33 road where it connects to London Road leaving Winchester at the Cart and Horses pub. If it does or if any offsite contributions are required in the scheme this dangerous junction where many vehicle accidents take place desperately needs a roundabout to slow traffic and ensure everyone knows how to 'read' this overly complicated junction as it stands today</p>		
Local community	<p>Traffic flows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed routing of the M3 and A34 appears to offer the opportunity of improved the traffic flows from M3 to A34 and from A34 to M3, with less risk of congestion. The proposed routing of the A33 between the Cart & Horses junction and Winnall is improved compared to the previous proposal. The arrangement appears to offer a clearer route from Kings Worthy to Winnall and avoids joining the A34 and the queues that build up towards Jct 9 currently. This promises to make this route potentially easier to access the amenities just off junction 9. It also may offer a better option for people to access the new Sports & Leisure park, than driving through Winchester. If these assumptions prove correct this may reduce traffic flow along the Worthys Road and lower pressure at peak times on the City Rd junction in Winchester – we hope. Referring to the A33 link to Jct 9, with one of the current lanes becoming a path, there will be changes to the A33 and how it flows through to the Cart & Horses junction. In addition, the new arrangement for accessing the M3 from Jct 9 will likely attract some proportion of drivers from areas such as Harestock, Kings Barton and Weeke, who will see the route through to the Cart & Horses Junction as the quickest route. This will add pressure on this junction which is a well-known trouble spot where priorities are ambiguous to many. The A33 junction with the London Rd/B3047 aka Cart & Horses junction, should be addressed within the overall scheme. <p>Cycling and walking</p>	N	<p>Noise impacts are reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. To reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the scheme, low noise road surfaces are proposed to be embedded as part of the Scheme where new roads surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of -3.5dB.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>1. I welcome that National Cycle route 23 will continue to be in place. This route is an important route for cyclists in Winchester to head east and for people who cycle to work from the east into Winchester. Steps should be taken to ensure that this route remains open and free from mud etc during construction.</p> <p>2. It is disappointing to see that the “path” between the Cart & Horses junction and Winnall has been downgraded to a walking only path from what was a shared cycle/walking path in the previous proposal . The route proposed between the north & south bound carriageways of the A34 would be quite intimidating. Proximity to some traffic is inevitable, but better options are available, with zero or very marginal change in costs:</p> <p>a. The path should be designated as a shared walking and cycle path. I’d have no objections to it being a bridleway, but I’d be surprised to see the horse riding community using it as such. The route is likely to be used by people using it to get between the Worthys & Winnall, and perhaps beyond, rather than as a nice leisurely walk. In addition to providing access to Winnall for people in the Worthys, this could link to other paths - current & future – to give a cycle route to the new Sports & Leisure complex. This route would be flatter than cycling along the Worthy Road.</p> <p>b. Routing – This shared path should be routed to minimise the proximity to the fastest traffic. The current routing of the path does the opposite. I can envisage two possible better routings:</p> <p>i. A path that runs alongside the north-bound A34 on the south side of the road, to join in with Nuns Walk. Nuns walk could be upgraded to a shared cycle path / footpath from the point where they join, into the Worthys. The Nuns walk route could be extended alongside the A34 all the way until this path meets the London Road in Headbourne Worthy. This would be a welcome improvement in amenity to residents in Headbourne Worthy</p> <p>ii. The shared path could be designed into to follow the same route between Winnall and the Cart & Horses Junction as the A33. This would use the same under-passes as the road.</p> <p>There are pro’s and con’s to each of these two options, but both options are better than the route proposed”.</p> <p>Noise mitigation</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>A reduction in the frequency of major congestion between the A34 and the M3 at junction 9 will be welcomed by many from well beyond the Worthys and indeed for many in the Worthys. It is reasonable to anticipate that, on average, there will be an increase in road noise generated. One of the “benefits” of the Southbound A34 being jammed is that traffic speed is much reduced which reduces the noise levels which are intrusive for many who live in Headbourne Worthy and Kings Worthy either side of the A34. I’d particularly highlight residents of Willis Waye and The Dell, but there are plenty of others for whom noise levels are intense. The scheme plan should make clear what measure are being put in place to limit the noise levels to ensure that they do not increase and preferably that they decrease by at least 3dB – preferably more. I believe there are noise survey sensors in place in several back gardens in some houses in Willis Waye. The environmental services team at Winchester City council could provide details and data.</p> <p>Environmental concerns</p> <p>The webinars on this were scheduled for while I was on holiday, so I have been unable to get enough insight into these areas to make well informed comments. But it is clear that this project would be a major undertaking in a fragile environmental area. In addition, the volume of material used will have an associated impact in terms of CO2 and other emissions. It is critical that any impact is mitigated and that an “environmental” business case analogous to a financial business case is conducted.</p> <p>Consultation with public</p> <p>While I understand the approach chosen was done so to be able to navigate the restrictions placed on all of us by the Covid Pandemic, the On-Line consultation process is quite different to that which people are used to before, as exemplified by the consultation in Tubbs Hall, Kings Worthy for the previous iteration of the proposed junction. The Online process has some advantages for some people, but it could be onerous for many. Indeed, I was unable to attend any of the briefings on the mitigations of the environmental impact for example. Many people are unfamiliar with “online” meetings and many more still are not familiar enough to be able to get as much insight from the Online resources as they would from an “in person” consultation. Given that we have a significant easing of the Covid rules from 19th July 21, I strongly recommend that to ensure better stakeholder engagement, that a series of in person consultations be added into the process. While clearly, this will take time, it will pay back in terms of stakeholder engagement.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Upper Itchen Valley Society	<p>We welcome the modifications to the original proposals which redesign the roads giving access to the valley to join the B3047. The creation of a new footpath between Church Lane, Easton, and Easton Lane at Junction 9 and the redesign of the national cycleway crossing there are also welcome. The cycleway is also a footpath and <u>pedestrians should have a stepped route short-cutting the graded cycling loop through the roundabout area.</u></p> <p>We are concerned by the proposal to export waste soil from the development area into the valley. Insufficient information has been provided at this stage about the need for this or the form it would take, the duration of soil storage, the controls intended to avoid adversely affecting local hydrology, water quality, flora and fauna. One of the proposed sites is a large area of the side of Easton Down above the Itchen. There is no indication in the consultation document of the likelihood that this site or either of the other two, or whether all three of the large areas identified will be used. That said, the side of Easton Down is not, in our view, a suitable soil storage area due to the direct impact-pathway to the River Itchen. <u>We feel there is not sufficient information for us to adequately feedback on this matter fully. We would welcome further engagement before the DCO application is submitted, in sufficient time that our views may be given regard within the scheme proposals.</u></p> <p>At this stage we would emphasise the sensitivity of these sites within the National Park, and their visibility from footpaths and viewing points. We question the need to export soil waste at all instead of identifying sites in the part of the valley already compromised by dense highway development. For the short term we point out that during any disposal works the noise and disruption may be unacceptable to people living in Abbots Worthy and Easton as well as the pupils and staff at the two local schools potentially affected. <u>In particular we seek assurance that any transport of waste will take place on routes directly between the works and any disposal sites and will not use the narrow local road network.</u></p> <p>For the longer term there are indications in the consultation material that waste several metres in depth may be deposited and we object to any landscaping which detracts from the appearance of the rolling landscape or which risks depositing soil in the river Itchen and its tributaries.</p> <p>Ironically the disturbed chalkland around the M3 and Junction 9 are particularly diverse in plants and shrubs when compared to the farmed land around them and <u>we encourage you to manage the works in a way that will recreate and enhance this diversity after completion.</u> As a Society we applaud local efforts to maintain wild verges throughout the Itchen valley. Long established local programmes such as the excellent Wild Valley Verges promote the establishment of low nutrient wildflower verges through initial seeding and</p>	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and noise intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>altered maintenance. Highways England have also taken similar approaches, for example the Weymouth Relief Road in Dorset, where established wildflower swathes reportedly require little to no maintenance cutting and provide an incredible visual display and great biodiversity net gain for pollinators and insectivores. A similar approach to the legacy landscaping around the M3 Junction 9 restoration post-construction would fit with local landscape character and be very welcome. <u>Planting around the proposed new ponds should similarly reflect their downland setting.</u></p>		

K.2.I Population and human health

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	<p>Previous concerns regarding access to Kings Worthy from the Junction 9 roundabout have been considered. It is difficult to see the impact in context of the surrounding businesses and housing. I can't fully accept the design until we can see the new junction as an overlay to a map or actual image rather than design mock-up.</p> <p>Concerned that this junction expansion may not be needed in the post-Covid world with more people working flexibly i.e. from home, which should reduce the overall traffic meaning less delays and believe there are cheaper and quicker changes that could be made while the traffic volumes are reassessed - one of the main issues is with M3 northbound backing up is due to the A34 / A33 off slip. If the A34 remained dual carriageway with a right hand off-slip rather than a filter lane, that would ease the flow with traffic not needing to merge into one lane.</p>	N	<p>The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure EIA Regulations 2017. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment, resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) identified potential impacts from construction and operation of the Scheme that could impact surrounding businesses and housing. These included: permanent loss of land, changes in attribute such as noise environment, temporary diversions which may influence accessibility during construction, or permanent improvements to key routes during operation.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse effects on these receptors, including avoiding the need to demolish residential and commercial properties and maintaining access where possible, through the provision of alternative route or diversion during construction.</p> <p>Temporary adverse effects were identified for surrounding businesses during the construction phase on the Winnall Industrial Estate, including CEMEX, the Tesco Extra and Kier Highways, as journey time reliability and access may be impacted as a result of construction activities. This will be managed as much as possible through the outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8).</p> <p>Adverse impacts were identified on the one residential property within the Application Boundary as a result of land required during construction. Properties within the wider study area may experience indirect effects, such (e.g. change in environmental attribute such as noise) during construction, it is anticipated that these impacts would be temporary in nature. Management and mitigation measures are set out in the outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>During operation, the Winnall Industrial Estate is anticipated to experience beneficial effects as the journey times will be shorter for those accessing the site via the M3 Junction 9. Housing within the wider study area may experience indirect impacts such as amenity effects. These are described in Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual), and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Congestion and more importantly the impact this will have on open space and noise and pollution levels	N	Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on population and human health, resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. The assessment considers the impacts on open/green space.
Local community	<p>In order to achieve the Government's carbon reduction targets we need to be curbing road transport and not encouraging it. It has been proven that increasing road capacity is only ever a temporary measure in reducing congestion and indeed often results in extra congestion at other pinch points on the road network. We should instead be looking for options that remove traffic from the junction.</p> <p>This is a major construction project that will have a significant impact on the surrounding countryside and the flora and fauna that rely on it. Preserving our natural environment is more important than creating more roads. Our natural environment is important to our mental health and wellbeing and plays a vital role in countering climate change and the extreme weather events that occur as a result.</p>	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on landscape, biodiversity and human health is set out in Chapters 7, 8, and 12 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	<p>Concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased noise - day and night • Increased pollution • Negative Impact on health and well being • Lack of effective mitigation actions regarding noise and pollution • Impact on wildlife eg. Skylarks and yellowhammers along the South Downs way - impacted by infill and construction, loss of habitat, fracturing habitats <p>Therefore if this plan goes ahead mitigation plans need to be much more effective than those planned and their effectiveness needs to be monitored and where needed extended, changed.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the Scheme on population and human health.</p> <p>The assessment identified potential impacts from construction and operation of the Scheme that could impact human health. These included: changes in air quality, noise and vibration, and visual amenity, disturbance and stress caused by construction activity, changes to accessibility to open space or facilities and services, changes in physical activity levels and social cohesion.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse effects on human health. Mitigation measures included maintaining access where possible, including through provision of alternative route or diversion during construction, managing traffic to reduce disruption, and implementation of good practice to control dust emissions and noise and vibration impacts.</p> <p>During construction, the majority of the health outcomes on the identified health determinants were identified as neutral, with the exception of negative outcomes anticipated for ambient noise environment within two wards (St Bartholomew and St Michaels) in which the Scheme is located.</p>
Local community	You are predicting an increase in vehicle emissions just at a time when we should be reducing emissions. History shows us Highways England predictions are too conservative with numbers of cars and emissions increasing at a greater rate and so there is every reason to suggest your numbers are not big	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>enough. Greater vehicle use will outstrip conversion to EVs for many years to come.</p> <p>There is not enough information on pollution levels with data from the middle of the lanes and particulate matter which will increase no matter what fuel is used in vehicles.</p> <p>Health impacts of higher pollution levels will mean high costs in other parts of society. Where is this recognised?</p>		<p>During operation, there are a range of positive and neutral effects identified on all health determinants. No negative health outcomes were identified.</p>
Local community	<p>If there are opportunities to create new space for the Chilcomb sports ground in the new proposals (using the field adjacent to the A31 to dump spoil) the local football club and children would really benefit. Relative to the cost of the junction improvements the financial implication of this proposal would be very small.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals.</p>
Local community	<p>In order to achieve the Government's carbon reduction targets we need to be curbing road transport and not encouraging it. It has been proven that increasing road capacity is only ever a temporary measure in reducing congestion and indeed often results in extra congestion at other pinch points on the road network. We should instead be looking for options that remove traffic from the junction.</p> <p>This is a major construction project that will have a significant impact on the surrounding countryside and the flora and fauna that rely on it. Preserving our natural environment is more important than creating more roads. Our natural environment is important to our mental health and wellbeing and plays a vital role in countering climate change and the extreme weather events that occur as a result.</p>	N	<p>An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on human health is set out in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p>
<p>D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure</p>			
Local community	<p>The preliminary environmental reports appear weak and much work remains to be done to fill in the gaps before the final Environmental Impact Assessment. Research so far has been minimal. No pollution measurements are shown between the carriageways on M3 and A34 and health impacts on road users have been ignored. There have not yet been any attempts to project air quality or greenhouse gas data beyond the planned 2026 opening year. The modest anticipated traffic growth in 2026 will undoubtedly be outstripped in subsequent</p>	N	<p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the proposal on the environment. This includes details of the environmental mitigation and management such as Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3). The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Document Reference 6.1), with Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) and Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) reporting the likely</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>years. The 3,100 tonnes CO2 increase in traffic emissions identified in para 14.9.4 in 2026 could be an overly modest estimate, but even so it is an increase in CO2 we cannot afford to let happen. The rate of increase in traffic will be greater than the rate of decarbonisation of vehicles, so it is likely that emissions will continue to rise.</p> <p>Clear long-term year-by-year data on estimated traffic growth are lacking. Without this there can be no justification for para 5.4.16: <i>“It is not considered necessary to also quantify air quality impacts at the design year of 2046 as the decrease in pollutant emissions (from traffic and other sources) in the interim period results in 2026 representing the worst case due to higher background concentrations and emissions.”</i> PM pollution for example is rarely referred to, but will grow continually after 2026. Some of the data given in Appendix 2.1 part 2 are ridiculous e.g. 3 vehicles per day on Morestead Road in 2026, or the doubling of traffic on Easton Lane towards its north-eastern end compared with its south-western end. There is no data on the impact on Garnier Road or Springvale Road.</p> <p>In proportion as road vehicles undergo battery-electrification there will be a growing demand for electricity. Electricity demand for road transport will have to compete with electrification of domestic heating and industry. Energy will be in short supply if we stop using fossil fuels. This could have two equally undesirable results. Either there will be a shortage of energy, or there will be an unplanned continued use of fossil fuels. Private transport will be a relatively unproductive way of using up the inevitably limited supplies of clean energy. At some point we will have to discourage the use of private transport, and there is no satisfactory technology yet for the decarbonisation of heavy freight road transport. The most robust solutions to this dilemma would be to make fuller use of walking, cycling and public transport and to transfer bulk heavy freight to rail. These developments will make these proposals redundant. A full analysis of how decarbonisation of the energy supply is likely to affect transport policy should be included in the PEIR.</p>		<p>significant effects of the Scheme on air quality, population and health, and climate, respectively.</p> <p>CO_{2e} emissions have been calculated for the construction and operation of the Scheme, based on the PAS 2080 (BSI, 2016) lifecycle stages and scopes, and are reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>During operation, the main source of emissions is from ‘end-users’ i.e. traffic. Green House Gases (GHGs) emitted from operational energy use (i.e. subway lighting, CCTV, VMS and traffic signalling) would contribute a relatively small amount to the overall operational carbon emissions. Based on the transport model for the Scheme, in 2027, end-user and operational energy is anticipated to emit,217,562 tCO_{2e} annually and by 2042 this is anticipated to reduce to 2,500,142 tCO_{2e} annually. When compared to the baseline, net emissions from traffic and operational energy use are anticipated to result in 2,782 tCO_{2e} annually and by 2042, 2,302 tCO_{2e} annually. Section 14.5 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) outlines the assumptions and limitations to the assessment and that a conservative approach to calculating GHG emissions has been undertaken.</p> <p>The incorporation of active travel routes would encourage more sustainable, low carbon modes of transport, reducing emissions associated with private vehicles. The Scheme also includes tree and woodland planting which would provide minor carbon sequestration benefits once the maturity stage has been reached.</p> <p>Technological changes, including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the banning of the sale of petrol and diesel cars by 2030, and the decarbonisation of the National Grid, is anticipated to continue to reduce the GHG emissions associated with the Scheme over time.</p> <p>In comparison to the UK carbon budget, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK’s 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK’s 5th and 6th carbon budget. It is considered that the increase in emissions as a result of the Scheme would not have a material impact on the ability of UK Government to meet its carbon budgets, therefore in accordance with the DMRB, there would be no significant effect.</p> <p>Furthermore, in response to there <i>“not being any attempts to project air quality or greenhouse gas data beyond the planed 2026 opening year”</i>, it is not considered necessary to quantify air quality impacts at the design year of 2047 as the decrease in pollutant emissions (from traffic and other sources) in the interim period, result in 2027 representing the worst case due to higher background concentrations (of NOx and to a lesser degree PM₁₀) and traffic related emissions (of NOx). This is considered standard practice and in accordance with paragraph 2.89 of the DMRB LA105.</p>

D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Environment and its importance to human health is being ignored.	N	The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure EIA Regulations 2017. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment, resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the Scheme on population and human health and sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse effects on human health.
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			
Local community	Very important to maintain and ideally enhance amenity value of local area for all through these works.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.			
Local community	This land could be returned to outside space for the public /rewilding rather than agriculture.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	If there are opportunities to create new space for the Chilcomb sports ground in the new proposals (using the field adjacent to the A31 to dump spoil) the local football club and children would really benefit.	Y	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals.
General commentary			
Local community	The road scheme is not appropriate on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it will destroy and fragment important protected habitats for wildlife which is rapidly declining (State of Nature reports, RSPB) building roads induces: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> traffic (SACTRA reports) CO2 emissions and noxious pollutants it contravenes government targets to reduce climate change and public efforts to deal with the climate emergency it contravenes cycling and walking strategies and need for investment in public transport 	Y	Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the Scheme on population and human health. The assessment identified potential impacts from construction and operation of the Scheme that could impact human health. These included: changes in air quality, noise and vibration, and visual amenity, disturbance and stress caused by construction activity, changes to accessibility to open space or facilities and services, changes in physical activity levels and social cohesion. Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse effects on human health. Mitigation measures included maintaining access where possible, including through provision of alternative route or diversion during construction,

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it contravenes need for an integrated transport policy • it contravenes government's 25-year Environment Plan (government earlier manifesto to leave the environment in a better place than the one in which they found it) • it contravenes the SDNP nature plan where its efforts for nature's recovery would be an interconnected 'nature network' • it contravenes people's need for green spaces and landscapes for health, recreation and visual upliftment 		<p>managing traffic to reduce disruption, and implementation of good practice to control dust emissions and noise and vibration impacts.</p> <p>During operation, there are a range of positive and neutral effects identified on all health determinants. No negative health outcomes were identified.</p>

K.2.J Road drainage and the water environment

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	During construction there should be speed limits through the junction and clear signage for local traffic. What happens if there is flooding (A33 mainly)?	N	A Flood Risk Assessment (Document Reference 7.4) has been completed that assess all sources of flood risk. The works proposed within the floodplain are minimal and construction workers will be signed up to EA Flood Warning Service (detailed in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3)).
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure			
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.	N	Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides an assessment of the potential effects on water resources and concludes that no likely significant effects are expected from the Scheme. The Applicant has also considered the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (Document Reference 7.7) , which concludes: <i>"The Scheme does not result in a significant change away from baseline conditions for the overall WFD water bodies, and, as demonstrated, will not result in deterioration of the current WFD potential of the River Itchen, Nun's Walk Stream and Itchen Navigation Canal surface water bodies."</i>
Local community	I am particularly concerned about the construction work being close to the River Itchen near Easton and close to the water supply to some properties.	N	Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents the findings of the assessment of the construction and operation of the Scheme on road drainage and the water environment. The assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies outlined within the requirements of DMRB LA 113 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (National Highways, 2020) and discussed with key stakeholders, including the Environment Agency and Hampshire County Council (as Lead Local Flood Authority). A range of measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to avoid and reduce effects on surface water and groundwater bodies. These include installation of systems to trap silty and polluted water, preparation of incident response plans in case of any accidental spillages, locating construction compounds outside areas at risk of flooding where possible. These measures are detailed further in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that there would be no significant effects to water environment receptors from the construction of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	I can't see how local flooding risks or air pollution or noise pollution or ecological impacts or habitat loss or wildlife survival will be protected , any loss of habitat that affects the life of our wildlife is unforgivable and should not happen.	N	<p>The Applicant has prepared a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Document Reference 7.4) for the Scheme.</p> <p>In accordance with the fundamental objectives of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN) and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the FRA demonstrates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development is safe • The development does not increase flood risk • The development does not detrimentally affect third parties <p>The FRA (Document Reference 7.4) concludes that the proposed works and their mitigation measures will not result in increased flood risk to the nearby residents, and therefore there will be no detrimental impacts on third parties.</p>
Local community	It is frankly impossible to mitigate these massive effects on the countryside and nature, especially on the side of the River Itchen.	N	<p>Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides an assessment of the potential effects on water resources and concludes that no likely significant effects are expected from the Scheme. The Applicant has also considered the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (Document Reference 7.7), which concludes: <i>“The Scheme does not result in a significant change away from baseline conditions for the overall WFD water bodies, and, as demonstrated, will not result in deterioration of the current WFD potential of the River Itchen, Nun’s Walk Stream and Itchen Navigation Canal surface water bodies.”</i></p>
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	The landscape proposals will impact massively on the Itchen and its floodplain and will disturb wildlife to a massive degree. The proposed footpath to Long Walk is a positive proposal but outweighed massively by the rest of the scheme.	N	<p>The Applicant has prepared a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Document Reference 7.4) for the Scheme.</p> <p>The FRA confirms that the proposed development has minimal impact on the floodplain of the River Itchen and Nuns Walk Stream. The majority of works are located outside of the floodplain in Flood Zone 1. The proposed new crossing of the Itchen at Kingsworthy is located in the floodplain, however, a range of measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to avoid and reduce effects on surface water and groundwater bodies and biodiversity receptors. These measures are detailed further in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p>
F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.			

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Use the spoil to create new habitats or better still, don't create the spoil at all. The River Itchen will be spoiled if you go ahead with these plans	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and noise intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
Local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Soil bunds could be used for proactive noise mitigation, not merely to raise levels. Soil spoils affect settings of rights of way, listed building (Princes Mead school) Soil spoil by St Swithuns risks covering archaeological remains of Morn Hill camp Soil spoil could provide opportunity for obscuring gantry views etc. <p>It is difficult to see the implications for flooding in future years, and to see long views as I couldn't find these on the consultation website, except through the drive through.</p>	Y	
F.4: Please let us know the reasons for your response to question F3 and any other views about the locations we've identified			
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.	N	Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides an assessment of the potential effects on water resources and concludes that no likely significant effects are expected from the Scheme. The Applicant has also considered the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (Document Reference 7.7) , which concludes: <i>"The Scheme does not result in a significant change away from baseline conditions for the overall WFD water bodies, and, as demonstrated, will not result in deterioration of the current WFD potential of the River Itchen, Nun's Walk Stream and Itchen Navigation Canal surface water bodies."</i>
Local community	The risks to the fragile river Itchen chalk stream are too great by these massive works you propose at junction 9.	N	Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse effects on road drainage and the water environment. A range of measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to avoid and reduce effects on surface water and groundwater bodies. These include installation of systems to trap silty and polluted water, preparation of incident response plans in case of any accidental spillages, locating construction compounds outside areas at risk of flooding where possible. Further details are provided in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our	N	Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides an assessment of the potential effects on water resources and concludes that no likely significant effects are expected from the Scheme. The Applicant has also considered the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (Document Reference 7.7) , which concludes: <i>"The Scheme does not result in a</i>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.</p>		<p><i>significant change away from baseline conditions for the overall WFD water bodies, and, as demonstrated, will not result in deterioration of the current WFD potential of the River Itchen, Nun’s Walk Stream and Itchen Navigation Canal surface water bodies.”</i></p>
Local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central compound I have no view on. • Junction 9 compound I wholeheartedly agree with the location. • A33/A34 compound appears to be in an area where drainage occurs as well as wildlife habitats though I may be wrong about its actual location. • Northern compound is not marked on the plans so I’m going with strongly disagree until you point it out. 	N	<p><i>Response to point 3:</i></p> <p>The small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) is also required to help construct the Scheme. This compound location would be used to for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities.</p> <p>A range of measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to avoid and reduce potential effects. Essential mitigation measures are outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3). As the design develops towards construction phase, mitigation would be refined and included within the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (siEMP), which would be secured through a DCO requirement. The EMPs would be drafted in consultation with statutory bodies, and regular contact would be had with these parties through the subsequent detailed design and delivery (construction) phases.</p> <p>A comprehensive package of pollution prevention measures would be provided to avoid accidental pollution events during construction, with particular regard to the River Itchen. Measures would include source control, settlement tanks, silt fencing, and dust suppression. Furthermore, the Applicant will aim to locate construction compounds outside areas at risk of flooding where possible.</p> <p>Fencing of adjacent designated areas and retained important habitat to protect the area/habitat would be installed to avoid accidental damage and avoid incidental species mortality. Easton Down SINC is located within the Application Boundary but would be fenced and protected throughout the construction phase. Measures would also be provided to avoid entrapment of animals during construction, such as covering excavations at night or where this is not feasible providing escape ramps.</p> <p>An Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) would be present on site during key periods of the construction phase. The ECoW would be required to make certain that all committed mitigation measures are adhered to.</p> <p>The other matters raised in this response are addressed elsewhere in this appendix.</p>
General commentary			
Local community	More emphasis needs to be made to mitigate the noise from increased road traffic and faster speeds for those living next to the motorway on the western	N	Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>side of the cutting between Chalk Ridge to the south and Tesco's at Junction 9. All road surfaces used should be of the latest type to minimise road noise from the M3 and connecting roads and sufficient drainage to avoid build up of water in torrential rain, which again generates considerable noise. Regular air pollution monitoring should take place and provided to residents at routine intervals to ensure they remain at safe levels for residents in the area.</p>		<p>adverse effects on road drainage and the water environment. A Drainage Strategy Report (Appendix 13.1) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) outlines the proposed drainage strategy which has been designed in accordance with national and local guidance in consultation with the EA and Lead Local Flood Authority. The proposed drainage strategy has been designed to accommodate surface water runoff up to the 1 in 100 year plus climate change storm event and includes attenuation basins to store and then release water to the River Itchen at a controlled rate.</p> <p>A range of measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to avoid and reduce effects on surface water and groundwater bodies. These include installation of systems to trap silty and polluted water, preparation of incident response plans in case of any accidental spillages, locating construction compounds outside areas at risk of flooding where possible. Further details are provided in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p>
Local community	<p>The footpaths and cycleways need to be wide enough to accommodate both cyclists and walkers and well separated from the traffic. If net zero CO₂ is to be achieved then walking and cycling need to be made as attractive as possible.</p> <p>The plans for the spoil are not clear - topsoil is valuable and should not be simply piled up on the chalk downland. It is vital that the precious habitat of the River Itchen is not damaged by the construction work, or by run-off from the roads once built - bearing in mind the likely increase in periods of very heavy rainfall as the climate becomes more volatile.</p> <p>The construction work will need to be very carefully managed because the volume of traffic already going through this junction is high and disruption will cause major problems.</p> <p>Would the £175M be better spend on improving rail networks so that freight can travel by rail instead of by road - combined with charging freight for the CO₂ impact of its transport?</p> <p>While construction work is being undertaken the different bodies should cooperate to sort out for the dangerous Cart and Horses junction of the B3047 and the A33. The public, do not see why each body has to operate independently and take turns digging up the road, instead of doing it all on a sensible schedule.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse effects on road drainage and the water environment. A Drainage Strategy Report (Appendix 13.1) outlines the proposed drainage strategy which has been designed in accordance with national and local guidance in consultation with the EA and Lead Local Flood Authority. The proposed drainage strategy has been designed to accommodate surface water runoff up to the 1 in 100 year plus climate change storm event and includes attenuation basins to store and then release water to the River Itchen at a controlled rate.</p> <p>A range of measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to avoid and reduce effects on surface water and groundwater bodies. These include installation of systems to trap silty and polluted water, preparation of incident response plans in case of any accidental spillages, locating construction compounds outside areas at risk of flooding where possible. Further details are provided in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>The requirement for a design specific Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plan and Emergency Spill Response Plan is secured by the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p>

K.2.K Climate

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	<p>Although I acknowledge that congestion at the junction is problematic, I disagree with the general premise that increasing road capacity is a reasonable strategy in the midst of climate crisis, or one that in this particular instance is likely to produce the desired results when taking a long view. Widening of roads will ultimately serve to induce increased volumes of traffic in the medium to long term. The sums of money being spent on these works could have a profound and lasting impact if invested in public transport instead.</p> <p>That said, given that this project is apparently seen as a fait accompli, I'd like to focus on the earlier promises of enhanced access for cyclists and horses that have been severely compromised. This seems to add insult to injury for those of us who use active travel in the area and wish to see provision for this extended. I'm disheartened that the cynicism I heard from others with respect to these promises at earlier stages of development appears to have been well founded. I can only imagine that it was an oversight in what is understandably seen as a minor peripheral detail, and trust that this oversight at least can be rectified.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed relating to the need for the Scheme and those responses received raising concerns about climate change. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme and the National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which sets out how the Scheme complies with national policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase of emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Specifically, Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate. During operation, the main source of greenhouse gas emissions is from end-user traffic. However, with the incorporation of enhancement planting, active travel routes encouraging sustainable modes of transport and technological changes including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the Scheme is not anticipated to have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon reduction targets and therefore, there would be no significant effect.</p>
Local community	Need to consider our environment and climate change. To do anything to increase carbon emissions would be stupid and short-sighted. The plans will increase emissions hugely and as the city itself is already congested - issues relating to St George's St in particular, we don't need any more pollution in the area.	N	
Local community	<p>I understand that you like to reduce congestion with all of it's negative effects. However, extending this junction will increase the traffic which will cause further congestion elsewhere. Increased traffic will increase noise and air pollution and increase green house gas emissions. Furthermore, it will lead to massive disruptions of traffic during the building phase that will effect Winchester and Badger Farm Road. Badger Farm Road is already very busy and cycling is very dangerous. For this expense it would be much better to do following alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase capacity on railways and electrify towards Oxford and consider reopening the Watercress line between Arlesford and Winchester 2. Help people to use buses instead of their cars by building a bus network similar to CPRE's proposal, every village should have half hourly bus service to Winchester and or train stations 3. Build cycle ways along all high traffic roads, the M3 and especially this junction is much used for short distance travel too 	N	
Local community	We cannot see how expanding our roads network in any way at all can possibly be reconciled with HCC's declaration of a climate emergency. As all climate scientists, UNCC and our government's own advisers are totally agreed we must dramatically and urgently	N	The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>reduce our carbon emissions if we are to avoid serious and life threatening damage to our climate and environment - the ongoing serious heatwave on the west coast of north America is a reminder of what we have to look forward to if we do not drastically cut our emissions. It was proven decades ago that new road building simply results in more private car usage and ownership. What we therefore recommend is that the money that would be spent on this project be redirected to improving Hampshire's public transport network to get people out of their cars so that we don't need to make changes to road systems at all.</p>		<p>production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council.</p>
Local community	<p>Information about the scheme states that your aim is '<i>support economic growth – improving road capacity</i>'. Increasing road capacity means making room for more traffic meaning the increased capacity will fill up and lead to extra journeys ('induced traffic') and in turn lead to demands for still more capacity.</p> <p>This process of unending road building in an attempt to escape traffic jams must stop - first, because it does not work, second, because it creates more carbon emissions. Wales has recently frozen most road schemes because of climate change. The UK government is being urged to do the same. There are two legal actions in progress against its roads programme and the refusal of the Minister for Transport to revise the outdated NPSNN which takes no account of climate change.</p> <p>Some of the supposed improvements you put forward, such as a new link for a cycle path, could be actioned without the need to improve capacity at this junction.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase in emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Specifically, Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate. During operation, the main source of greenhouse gas emissions is from end-user traffic. However, with the incorporation of enhancement planting, active travel routes encouraging sustainable modes of transport and technological changes including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the Scheme is anticipated to comprise 0.002% of the 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the 5th and 6th carbon budget. It is considered that the increase in emissions as a result of the Scheme would not have a material impact on the ability of UK Government to meet its carbon budgets, therefore in accordance with the DMRB, there would be no significant effect.</p>
Local community	<p>I am delighted that Boris Johnson committed to '30 at 30' ie a 30% increase in biodiversity by 2030 and also to carbon reduction targets for the UK. These policies are completely incompatible with road upgrades such as the Junction 9 works on the M3. Furthermore, the A34 is at full capacity and already has a high accident rate. Pushing more volumes of traffic onto this road is simply unsafe. This money needs to go into public transport improvements and lower carbon ways of working ie working from home or in a virtual office. I would like to register my objection to these works going ahead, as we need to focus on stopping climate change and the collapse of the ecology on our country.</p>	N	
Local community	<p>In order to achieve the Government's carbon reduction targets we need to be curbing road transport and not encouraging it. It has been proven that increasing road capacity is only ever a temporary measure in reducing congestion and indeed often results in extra congestion at other pinch points on the road network. We should instead be looking for options that remove traffic from the junction.</p> <p>This is a major construction project that will have a significant impact on the surrounding countryside and the flora and fauna that rely on it. Preserving our natural environment is more important than creating more roads. Our natural environment is important to our mental health and wellbeing and plays a vital role in countering climate change and the extreme weather events that occur as a result.</p>	N	
Local community	<p>The M3 junction 9 has already damaged sensitive natural habitats around Winchester and continues to do so with the encouragement of car use. Increased use of our road infrastructure is contrary to the UK governments commitment to stopping climate change.</p>	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Your changes will promote the growth in road traffic at a time when we know we cannot afford to increase our carbon footprint. The plans are inconsistent with Government policies, commitments and objectives for addressing climate change. The changes will just move the choke points to other places.	N	
Local community	The planning to spend the vast budget suggested against the background of climate change facts with no data on impact on CO2 and NOX emissions, traffic flows is unacceptable. Winchester already suffers from 60% of its CO2 emissions from transport and 25% of those come from the M3. The outcome of having higher traffic speeds will be to increase CO2 emissions. In time, direct transport emissions will decline but not for a minimum 10 years as existing ICE vehicles are not phased out until 2030 and hybrid vehicles will be sold for at least 5 years with transport emissions still significantly above zero way beyond that. The Junction 9 scheme will make a bad situation even worse. Vague references to time uncertainty are insufficient to justify the sheer size of the works proposed. I travel through Junction 9 at least 4 times a week and do not find the delays unacceptable. The one issue that has some merit is queuing on the northbound M3 slip road. Southbound, I have never had a difficulty from the existing layout.	N	Impacts from emissions from vehicles (NOx) during the construction and operation of the Scheme has been taken into account in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . CO ₂ emissions associated with the Scheme are reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The Scheme is estimated to lead to an increase in CO ₂ emissions over a 60-year operational period. It is considered that the emissions from the scheme in isolation would not have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon budgets. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) , which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	The UK must reduce traffic movements in order to reduce traffic emissions of greenhouse gas in order to keep global heating below 2 degrees. Any increase in road capacity is immoral and dangerous. Evidence abounds that increasing road capacity and reducing congestion is a temporary fix which leads to yet more traffic filling up the extra capacity. To reduce congestion, we need investment in better buses, trains and cycle routes, and disincentives to car drivers.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed relating to the need for the Scheme and concerns about climate change. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme
Local community	All the evidence has demonstrated that expanding road capacity to deal with traffic just creates more traffic and does not solve the problem. With the threat of climate change we have a duty to reduce our carbon emissions for our country and the wider world. Expanding road capacity goes against reducing our carbon footprint. Investment and effort needs to put into travel systems other than the car.	N	
Local community	I agree with the views of WINACC. Don't want money spent expanding roads	N	The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted.
Local community	First and foremost consider how to reduce traffic, not to enable traffic flow. Forty years of studies have shown that road 'improvements' generate more and more traffic, and the climate and ecological emergency demands that we all drive less. I drive 5000 miles a year and am working on reducing that, how about you?????	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	Environmental impact should be considered as a first priority. Road improvements should not come at the expense of environmental issues particularly with regard to climate change and lost wildlife habitat.	N	An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the proposal on the environment. This includes details of the environmental mitigation and management such as Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) ,

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			with Chapters 8 and 14 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) reporting the likely significant effects of the Scheme on biodiversity and climate, respectively.
Local community	<p>We fully support your desire to reduce congestion at the junction. We believe that this should be done in a way that reduces, to a minimum, carbon emissions associated with construction and with the subsequent ways people use the facility. It has been established that widening roads inevitably increases traffic, and that after a honeymoon period congestion returns. This happened when the M3 replaced the Winchester bypass and will happen again. We must develop alternatives to obviate the need people feel to use the M3 and A34, and keep to a minimum both infrastructure construction emissions and operational emissions. Emissions will probably increase in proportion to the increase in carriageway area (50 to 100%) and it will be a disaster. We should be allocating the £175m budget to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrifying the complete railway freight route from Southampton the Midlands and North through Oxford to eliminate all intermodal HGV traffic • Improving the local railway service from Basingstoke to Portsmouth and Solent Area to reduce M3 commuting • Investing in high quality, high frequency bus services throughout Hampshire to reduce private car use and congestion • Developing good rail-served freight distribution centres throughout Hampshire to decarbonise and remove logistics distribution from the M3 and A34 and facilitate zero-carbon local delivery. • Expanding local infrastructure for walking and cycling to create modal shift in local transport that will free up vehicle access to the junction from Winchester and the surrounding area and obviate future expenditure on local access roads, when traffic volumes increase post 2026 on M3 and A34. <p>This will remove congestion from the junction and its approaches.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget period. The assessment is reported in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application, and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that carbon emissions will increase as a result of the Scheme. Paragraph 14.10.16 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) states that, when compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK's 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK's 5th and 6th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in isolation, would materially affect the UK's ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, in accordance with the DMRB LA 114 Climate methodology, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.</p>
Local community	I am keen for the UK to try to reach its climate commitment and it won't do it by expanding roads. If the aim is to reduce congestion, we know if you increase road capacity it will get filled by an increase in the number of vehicles on the road. This increases pollution (Carbon emissions and particulate) Even EVs will only reduce the carbon emissions from the point of travel not from generation. This does not include the substantial emissions due to construction. To sustainably reduce congestion can only be done by encouraging a modal shift to different forms of transport which also would be less polluting. The money pledged for this project (and others in the area) could be better spent on Buses, electrification of goods trains, cycling and walking.	Y	The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council.
Local community	I do not think you are considering the best interests of other road users such as cycling and walking in this plan. The plan is only about increasing the capacity for motorized traffic and not fit for purpose when we are in a climate crisis which is going to worsen. The plan does not fit in with the idea of meeting C zero targets in line with the Paris Agreement.	N	The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change,

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>We're facing a climate emergency, we must not be encouraging more cars on roads, emphasis should be on reducing traffic and promoting public transport surely?</p>	N	<p>including an assessment of the significance of any increase in emissions during construction and operation within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate.</p> <p>In relation to encouraging a modal shift to different forms of transport, a key objective of the Scheme is to improve provisions for walkers and cyclists. The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport (to help reduce individual car journeys over short distances) through the provision of high-quality accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes. The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded as part of the proposals. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An improvement to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23 • An additional footway, cycleway and horse riding route on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages • A new combined footpath and cyclepath for the western side of the Scheme to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. <p>In total, an additional 4.8km of public rights of way are to be provided as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>During operation, the main source of greenhouse gas emissions is from end-user traffic. However, with the incorporation of enhancement planting, active travel routes encouraging sustainable modes of transport and technological changes including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the Scheme is not anticipated to have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon reduction targets and therefore, there would be no significant effect.</p>
Local community	<p>While the consultation material is extensive, nowhere has the business case been made that the proposals are necessary or proportionate. It is likely that vehicles will indeed be able to speed through from M3 to A34 and vice versa ... but, er, so what ... the benefits are minimal, yet the costs - both to the taxpayer and environment are immense. You have not demonstrated a positive business case. For example the proposals claim there will be 'economic growth' ... but this is an unsubstantiated claim ... how will this growth accrue?</p> <p>The absence of a business case makes the negative impact on the environment even worse. To counter climate change we should be thinking how to manage the</p>	N	<p>The need and economic case for the Scheme, including the benefit to cost ration, is summarised in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1).</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>crisis ... not spend huge amounts of money making our environment worse; in principle you should be discouraging travel, not encouraging it.</p>		<p>through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations.</p>
Local community	<p>The effect on the North Downs Nature Reserve and CO2 emissions. We should be improving public transport, not encouraging people to use the roads more</p>	N	<p>CO_{2e} emissions are reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Paragraph 14.10.16 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) states that, when compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK's 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK's 5th and 6th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in isolation, would materially affect the UK's ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, in accordance with the DMRB LA 114 Climate methodology, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.</p> <p>The North Downs Nature Reserve is not within or in close proximity the Application Boundary and has therefore not been considered in the environmental assessments.</p>
<p>C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?</p>			
Local community	<p>Cement is a very big contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. No more cement, not more hard surface, no increasing capacity for cars.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment. The Scheme has been designed using PAS 2080:2016 Carbon management in Infrastructure (British Standards Institute (BSI), 2016) to manage and reduce embodied carbon and has been iteratively updated to refine and improve the proposals in relation to a range of design requirements and criteria, including the consideration of sustainability, material use and construction efficiency.</p>
Local community	<p>Climate change and the Covid pandemic, investment in public transport and prioritising cycling and walking over private vehicle traffic</p>	Y	<p>An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on climate is set out in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This includes detail about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p> <p>Currently the long-term impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on road traffic volumes, mode choice and travel patterns remain unclear. There is currently no evidence that there will be a substantial drop in traffic volumes on the road network in the long term. At present the Applicant is following DfT recommendation to use the current traffic growth forecasts.</p> <p>In relation to prioritising cycling and walking, a key objective of the Scheme is to improve provisions for walkers and cyclists. The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded as part of the proposals. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An improvement to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An additional footway, cycleway and horse riding route on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages A new combined footpath and cyclepath for the western side of the Scheme to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. <p>In total, an additional 4.8km of public rights of way are to be provided as part of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	Consider first and foremost the environmental impact. Private car numbers will have to be brought down to meet carbon targets. We don't need more roads which only encourage more traffic. Saving and improving green spaces is far more important than any road work can ever be.	N	An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the proposal on the environment. This includes details of the environmental mitigation and management such as Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , with Chapter 14 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) reporting the likely significant effects of the Scheme on climate.
Local community	Environment, Climate change Looking at reducing traffic, not increasing it	N	<p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that carbon emissions will increase as a result of the Scheme, however, the construction and operation phases of the Scheme, which fall within legislated carbon budget periods, will have an insignificant impact on the ability on the Government to meet its carbon budgets.</p>
Local community	Yes: what is the least environmental impact; and how best to meet our UK net zero carbon targets?	N	<p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) states that, when compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK's 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK's 5th and 6th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in isolation, would materially affect the UK's ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, in accordance with the DMRB LA114 Climate methodology, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	I strongly disagree with public spending on road widening and 'improvement' schemes, which will allow for and encourage greater road traffic, at a time of climate emergency when spending on local and national public transport is woeful. However many 'mitigations' and 'appeasements' are put in place, this move is in the wrong direction.	N	This objection has been acknowledged. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) , which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to achieve the Government's carbon reduction targets we need to be curbing road transport and not encouraging it. It has been proven that increasing road capacity is only ever a temporary measure in reducing congestion and indeed often results in extra congestion at other pinch points on the road network. We should instead be looking for options that remove traffic from the junction. • This is a major construction project that will have a significant impact on the surrounding countryside and the flora and fauna that rely on it. Preserving our natural environment is more important than creating more roads. Our natural environment is important to our mental health and wellbeing and plays a vital role in countering climate change and the extreme weather events that occur as a result. 	N	<p>The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors, including extreme weather events, in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate. During operation, the main source of greenhouse gas emissions is from end-user traffic. However, with the incorporation of enhancement planting, active travel routes encouraging sustainable modes of transport and technological changes including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the Scheme is not anticipated to have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon reduction targets and therefore, there would be no significant effect.</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on landscape, biodiversity and human health is set out in Chapters 7, 8, and 12 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p>
Local community	Cycling walking and the climate crisis	Y	<p>An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on climate is set out in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This includes detail about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.
Local community	Climate change!	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on climate is set out in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . This includes detail about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.
Local community	Whatever you say about wildlife and pollution, the proposals will have such impact on climate change that the rest is just empty words.	N	
Local community	There must be as much planting and retention of vegetation as possible to minimise the impact on biodiversity and climate change	N	Due to the lifespan of the proposals, the Scheme design considers potential change from future climate change, including designing in appropriate water attenuation features for extreme events, specifying durable materials, and including a diverse soft landscape species for resilience.
Local community	<p>I think all of the plans prioritise road use over our natural environment, nature and wildlife, in a climate emergency where floods, droughts, heatwaves and cold spells are likely to increase we NEED to pay more attention to nature than to just building.</p> <p>The plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. they give so many people happiness, it supports so much wildlife and OUR ecological systems, please don't compromise them.</p> <p>The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network, as well as potentially impacting the ability of Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust to manage the nature reserve. There MUST be a wildlife bridge to connect the two sides of the Downs over the M3, there does NOT need to be a new junction/roundabout or anything else.</p>	N	<p>There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape. The landscape strategy includes the use of native species of local provenance, to reflect the character of the local landscape, however the selected species mix will be as diverse as reasonably practicable to ensure resilience against potential future diseases and climate change whilst providing functional habitat for wildlife present in the local area. Opportunity for maximising biodiversity benefit has also been provided for with the use of scrub planting throughout the Scheme and species rich grasslands (including chalk grassland).</p> <p>The Scheme would result in an increase of wooded areas once the mitigation has effectively established and is approaching its early maturity stage and functioning as a woodland. The proposals show retention of existing vegetation where possible and a range of enhancement planting is proposed. Further detail of planting proposals is provided within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). At the detailed design stage, the planting specifications and tree mix would be explored to assess options according to the potential to maximise the carbon sequestration benefits of landscape features.</p> <p>The Scheme has been designed to withstand future events such an increase in precipitation and flooding as a result of climate change. The drainage design has been designed to allow for future climate change events and structural design has been designed in accordance with several UK and British Standards (BS), including the foundations, structures and pavements/road surfaces for example the BS EN 1991-1-5:2003, the associated UK National Annex and PD 6688-1-4:2015. The</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>Scheme has also been designed in accordance with National Highways Specification for Highway Works (SHW) (National Highways, 2021).</p> <p>With this mitigation in place, the effect on climate from the Scheme is not considered to be significant</p> <p>The Applicant continues to engage with landowners directly affected by the Scheme using clear statutory procedures, to understand the effects of the Scheme on their land interest. Specific mitigation solutions or compensation will be agreed on a case by case basis as appropriate, in line with the compensation code for compulsory purchase.</p>
<p>D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure</p>			
Local community	Building faster road links encourages more traffic which goes against carbon reduction targets.	N	<p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and DMRB LA 114 Climate. During operation, the main source of greenhouse gas emissions is from end-user traffic. However, with the incorporation of enhancement planting, active travel routes encouraging sustainable modes of transport and technological changes including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the Scheme is not anticipated to have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon reduction targets and therefore, there would be no significant effect.</p>
Local community	Not enough really deep consideration of the environmental impact on climate change - climate heating up as we speak. What are you going to do about it?	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on climate is set out in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . This includes detail about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.
Local community	I don't think you are taking climate change and environmental impact seriously enough.	N	
Local community	The preliminary environmental reports appear weak and much work remains to be done to fill in the gaps before the final Environmental Impact Assessment. Research so far has been minimal. No pollution measurements are shown between the carriageways on M3 and A34 and health impacts on road users have been ignored. There have not yet been any attempts to project air quality or greenhouse gas data beyond the planned 2026 opening year. The modest anticipated traffic growth in 2026 will undoubtedly be outstripped in subsequent years. The 3,100 tonnes CO2 increase in traffic emissions	N	An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the proposal on the environment. This includes details of the environmental mitigation and management such as Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , with Chapter 5, 12 and 14 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) reporting the likely

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>identified in para 14.9.4 in 2026 could be an overly modest estimate, but even so it is an increase in CO2 we cannot afford to let happen. The rate of increase in traffic will be greater than the rate of decarbonisation of vehicles, so it is likely that emissions will continue to rise.</p> <p>Clear long-term year-by-year data on estimated traffic growth are lacking. Without this there can be no justification for para 5.4.16: <i>“It is not considered necessary to also quantify air quality impacts at the design year of 2046 as the decrease in pollutant emissions (from traffic and other sources) in the interim period results in 2026 representing the worst case due to higher background concentrations and emissions.”</i> PM pollution for example is rarely referred to, but will grow continually after 2026. Some of the data given in Appendix 2.1 part 2 are ridiculous e.g. 3 vehicles per day on Morestead Road in 2026, or the doubling of traffic on Easton Lane towards its north-eastern end compared with its south-western end. There is no data on the impact on Garnier Road or Springvale Road.</p> <p>In proportion as road vehicles undergo battery-electrification there will be a growing demand for electricity. Electricity demand for road transport will have to compete with electrification of domestic heating and industry. Energy will be in short supply if we stop using fossil fuels. This could have two equally undesirable results. Either there will be a shortage of energy, or there will be an unplanned continued use of fossil fuels. Private transport will be a relatively unproductive way of using up the inevitably limited supplies of clean energy. At some point we will have to discourage the use of private transport, and there is no satisfactory technology yet for the decarbonisation of heavy freight road transport. The most robust solutions to this dilemma would be to make fuller use of walking, cycling and public transport and to transfer bulk heavy freight to rail. These developments will make these proposals redundant. A full analysis of how decarbonisation of the energy supply is likely to affect transport policy should be included in the PEIR.</p>		<p>significant effects of the Scheme on air quality, population and health, and climate, respectively.</p> <p>CO_{2e} emissions have been calculated for the construction and operation of the Scheme, based on the PAS 2080 (BSI, 2016) lifecycle stages and scopes, and are reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>During operation, the main source of emissions is from ‘end-users’ i.e. traffic. GHGs emitted from operational energy use (i.e. subway lighting, CCTV, VMS and traffic signalling) would contribute a relatively small amount to the overall operational carbon emissions. Based on the transport model for the Scheme, in 2027, , end-user and operational energy is anticipated to emit 3,217,562 tCO_{2e} annually and by 2042 this is anticipated to reduce to 2,500,142 tCO_{2e} annually. When compared to the baseline, net emissions from traffic and operational energy use are anticipated to result in 2,782 tCO_{2e} annually and by 2042, 2,302 tCO_{2e} annually. This includes projected traffic growth which has been accounted for in the transport model for the Scheme.</p> <p>The incorporation of active travel routes would encourage more sustainable, low carbon modes of transport, reducing emissions associated with private vehicles. The Scheme also includes tree and woodland planting which would provide minor carbon sequestration benefits once the maturity stage has been reached.</p> <p>Technological changes, including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the banning of the sale of petrol and diesel cars by 2030, and the decarbonisation of the National Grid, is anticipated to continue to reduce the GHG emissions associated with the Scheme over time.</p> <p>In comparison to the UK carbon budget, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK’s 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK’s 5th and 6th carbon budget. It is considered that the increase in emissions as a result of the Scheme would not have a material impact on the ability of UK Government to meet its carbon budgets, therefore in accordance with the DMRB, there would be no significant effect.</p> <p>Furthermore, in response to there <i>“not being any attempts to project air quality or greenhouse gas data beyond the planed 2026 opening year”</i>, it is not considered necessary to quantify air quality impacts at the design year of 2047 as the decrease in pollutant emissions (from traffic and other sources) in the interim period, result in 2027 representing the worst case due to higher background concentrations and emissions. This is considered standard practice and in accordance with paragraph 2.89 of the DMRB LA1.</p>
Local community	In order to achieve the Government's carbon reduction targets we need to be curbing road transport and not encouraging it. It has been proven that increasing	N	The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>road capacity is only ever a temporary measure in reducing congestion and indeed often results in extra congestion at other pinch points on the road network. We should instead be looking for options that remove traffic from the junction.</p> <p>This is a major construction project that will have a significant impact on the surrounding countryside and the flora and fauna that rely on it. Preserving our natural environment is more important than creating more roads. Our natural environment is important to our mental health and wellbeing and plays a vital role in countering climate change and the extreme weather events that occur as a result.</p>		<p>system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors, including extreme weather events, in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and DMRB LA 114 Climate.</p> <p>During operation, the main source of greenhouse gas emissions is from end-user traffic. However, with the incorporation of enhancement planting, active travel routes encouraging sustainable modes of transport and technological changes including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the Scheme is not anticipated to have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon reduction targets and therefore, there would be no significant effect.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Scheme has been designed to withstand future events such as an increase in precipitation and flooding as a result of climate change. The drainage design has been designed to allow for future climate change events and structural design has been designed in accordance with several UK and British Standards (BS), including the foundations, structures and pavements/road surfaces for example the BS EN 1991-1-5:2003, the associated UK National Annex and PD 6688-1-4:2015. The Scheme has also been designed in accordance with National Highways Specification for Highway Works (SHW) (National Highways, 2021). With this mitigation in place, the effect on climate from the Scheme is not considered to be significant</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on landscape, biodiversity and human health is set out in Chapters 7, 8, and 12 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	Fundamentally, the work is unnecessary. This is a climate crisis and the last thing the government should be doing is encouraging car and road usage. Any destruction of plants, animals and their habitats is not worth the cost. How are you going to stop the increasingly wide roads killing more wildlife? Are you going to invest money in wildlife bridges this time as would be desperately needed if you get your way?	N	The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme. An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on landscape and biodiversity is set out in Chapters 7 and 8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme. Further detail on the mitigation proposed is provided within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) .
Local community	My view is to shelf the idea entirely in favour of sustaining wildlife and helping towards global warming.	N	The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	I am delighted that Boris Johnson committed to '30 at 30' ie a 30% increase in biodiversity by 2030 and also to carbon reduction targets for the UK. These policies are completely incompatible with road upgrades such as the Junction 9 works on the M3. Furthermore, the A34 is at full capacity and already has a high accident rate. Pushing more volumes of traffic onto this road is simply unsafe. I would like to register my objection to these works going ahead, as we need to focus on stopping climate change and the collapse of the ecology on our country.	N	The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which sets out how the Scheme complies with national policy.
Local community	The woefully poor proposals for reducing environmental impacts do nothing to tackle the nature & climate crisis we are in, with a focus on on-site measures and no understanding or ambition of the environmental contribution that could be made. I would want to see: 1. large scale habitat restoration and creation at a landscape scale, including a green bridge to restore ecological connectivity across the M3, chalk grassland re-creation in the Chilcomb Valley to reconnect Deacon Hill & Magdalen Hill Down, 2. wetland extensions and expansions for Winnall Moors and the River Itchen, to improve ecological function and ecosystem services including flood prevention downstream in Winchester, instead of the proposal to destroy parts of the SSSI 3. large scale creation of woodland, natural regeneration and hedgerows to improve ecological connectivity for woodland and scrub species, not amenity plantings	N	The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. The assessment of these is provided within the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and has contributed to the design narrative set out in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) . The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including chalk grassland areas, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) . Due to the lifespan of the proposals, the Scheme design considers potential change from future climate change, including designing in appropriate water attenuation features for extreme events, specifying durable materials, and including a diverse soft landscape species for resilience. There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) , which would create multi-functional habitat

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape. The landscape strategy includes the use of native species of local provenance, to reflect the character of the local landscape, however the selected species mix will be as diverse as reasonably practicable to ensure resilience against potential future diseases and climate change whilst providing functional habitat for wildlife present in the local area. Opportunity for maximising biodiversity benefit has also been provided for with the use of scrub planting throughout the Scheme and species rich grasslands (including chalk grassland).</p> <p>At the detailed design stage, the planting specifications and tree mix would be explored to assess options according to the potential to maximise the carbon sequestration benefits of landscape features.</p>
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	As many trees as possible as they mitigate noise and sink CO2 and other gasses.	N	Details of the landscaping proposals for the Scheme are provided in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) . At the detailed design stage, the planting specifications and tree mix would be explored to assess options according to the potential to maximise the carbon sequestration benefits of landscape features.
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			
Local community	Who wants to walk or cycle near a massive multi lane motorway with all the pollution and noise? This is in a National Park! Where is all the peace and quiet and birdsong? Have you learnt nothing in this pandemic?! Where does this proposal address the climate emergency? Or the massive loss of biodiversity we are in the middle of?	Y	<p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the current provisions and introduce new routes and connections providing greater access to the South Downs National Park from Winchester. The Scheme also promotes further access opportunities to the South Downs National Park including areas of newly created chalk downland. Given the undulating landform and levels changes a detailed understanding of the topography has been key to ensure routes are well considered and improve the user experience both with the accessibility and also the visual interest for users travelling along them. All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to ensure accessibility for all users. Details of the landscaping proposals along the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities are provided in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The Climate Emergency, declared by Winchester City Council, is acknowledged in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on climate is set out in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This includes detail about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.</p> <p>A biodiversity assessment has been undertaken which considered the effects on designations, habitats and species during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>The assessment identified a number of residual adverse and beneficial effects to biodiversity receptors predominantly during construction (as by operation effects would have been mitigated) including, European Designated Sites (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation), other statutory designated areas (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest), non-statutory designated areas, habitats, badgers, bats, hazel dormouse, otter, water vole, birds (breeding and over-wintering), reptiles, freshwater fish, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates and notable plants. Effects predicted were as a result of habitat loss and gain, fragmentation of populations / habitats, disturbance, habitat degradation, and species mortality. However, in all cases the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation during the construction and operation of the Scheme effects were predicted not significant. Further details are provided in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
<p>F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.</p>			
Local community	Lifting the soil releases yet more carbon dioxide - it just doesn't need to be done	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>
Local community	Any movement of soil will release carbon emissions. While it is important to retain as much as possible there will always be some loss of soil.	Y	<p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides a qualitative assessment of greenhouse gas emissions associated with land use change, soil disturbance and vegetation loss during construction. Organic soil, i.e. soils with higher carbon content, are not anticipated to be disturbed as a result of constructing the Scheme, therefore the GHGs resulting from land use change is anticipated to be minimal in the context of emissions from other construction activities, as reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
<p>G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds</p>			
Local community	Revisit the original plans, re-write taking into consideration the environment and climate change and the compounds may well end up in different places.	Y	<p>The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the location of the construction compounds during the refinement of the current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been studied by the</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>Applicant and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, further work was undertaken by the Applicant to consider the potential impacts of the two options for the main construction compound. This further work was predominately in relation to carbon emissions given the heightened focus on climate change. The assessment predicted CO_{2e} emissions over the construction period associated with travelling to the site from the main construction compound locations of 0.6 tonnes with the central construction compound (presented as number 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation) compared with 135 tonnes of CO_{2e} with the northern construction compound (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation). The lesser distance also reduces congestion on the surrounding local road network and the local communities. As a result, northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals.</p> <p>In order to facilitate construction of the Scheme, a number of temporary construction compounds would be required as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A central temporary construction compound (presented as construction compound number 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation), located to the immediate east of Junction 9. • Two smaller areas within the footprint of the Junction 9 gyratory roundabout (presented as construction compound number 2 at the 2021 statutory consultation) • A small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as construction compound number 3 at the 2021 statutory consultation).
General commentary			
Local community	Stop it all. It is appalling that we are using public money to make our world uninhabitable from climate change.	N	The objections to the principle of the Scheme are noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which sets out how the Scheme complies with national policy.
Local community	I object to the scheme in its entirety. It is inappropriate because we are in a climate emergency and seeing much environmental and landscape loss.	N	
Local community	I am a resident in Winchester. I object to the widening of the M3 near Winchester as part of the planned improvements as I believe it is contrary to tackling air pollution and climate change .	N	The Climate Emergency, declared by Winchester City Council, is acknowledged in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on climate is set out in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . This includes detail about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme.
Local community	I totally object to this plan. It flies in the face of the country declaring a climate emergency and should not be allowed.	N	
Local community	I FULLY OBJECT to your plans for the M3 Junction 9. We are living in a climate emergency. These plans are completely unacceptable. Increasing the capacity of the M3	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	has never led to a reduction in congestion. Please rethink these plans, and listen to the concerns of Hampshire residents.		
Local community	If it is really acknowledged that there is a climate emergency, the futility of increasing capacity for road traffic would be obvious to you. Such moves are completely counter-productive. I can only imagine how future generations will view this insanity. Have you no shame? Reducing traffic volume instead of accommodating it may seem more difficult to you but is the only way out of this traffic mess. Building greater capacity is what has got us into this hole and a completely different approach is what is needed to get us out.	N	
Local community	<p>I want to object to the proposed widening, extending and enlarging of the M3 around Junction 9 at Winnall. I know that you have your instructions to follow through with a road programme. However, I would ask that you all think of the consequences of this proposal at this time in our history.</p> <p>We are facing the gravest threat to humanity ever known in the form of the heating of our planet. We need to shift away from fossil fuels very rapidly within the next 10 years. So, road building needs to be held in check whilst a holistic programme is developed of how we are going to make this shift.</p> <p>Widening the M3 will emit carbon in its building and once built the traffic will increase, and the destruction to the local flora and fauna may not be recoverable. Pollution levels around Winchester already breach safe levels. It is time to be moving us all towards public transport, to put goods on trains, to increase bus services, to minimise long distance travel.</p> <p>The money to be spent on this road could be better spent on so many other things that would contribute to a cleaner, safer future. We all have individual and collective responsibilities for the world we live in and for the way we are leaving it for future generations.</p>	N	
Local community	It is my view that continuing investment in the road network at the expense of other more sustainable means of transport is unjustifiable in terms of climate change targets. As already evidenced, expansions of the road network only serve to generate more traffic.	N	
Local community	<p>Please log my email as an OBJECTION to the proposed works to the M3 at Junction 9.</p> <p>We are facing a climate emergency which threatens our very survival - this is no time to be expanding motorways. This could perhaps be reconsidered once electric vehicles and shared driverless vehicles are in the large majority, but not before that time.</p>	N	
Local community	Very sad that apparently no consideration whatsoever has been given to the desperate situation we are all in regarding climate change. World temperatures still going up fast as we speak.	N	
Local community	Reducing congestion = reducing car use. It's the only way. This is a climate and biodiversity crises	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	There can be no exceptions to the rule that there should be no schemes that cause a net increase in emissions and energy use. We do not have enough plans for reducing emissions in time to prevent runaway global heating. We must be creative about how we redesign our world to prevent disaster. We must find better, low pollution, energy-saving ways of moving goods and people.	N	
Local community	We have a UK commitment to reduce emissions from all areas of the economy. This project will only increase emission from construction and higher levels of traffic and as such is totally at odds with the governments own legally bound commitments.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed relating to the need for the Scheme in light of climate change and those responses received which object to the Scheme going ahead in principle.
Local community	It is time to stop all major road construction and improvement projects. It is hypocritical to continue with these when we claim to be taking a lead in tackling climate change. The science tells us that we must reduce road travel substantially over the next few years. The Climate Change Committee states that the Government must make this a priority and take action within the next year to make driving less attractive. This scheme is in direct opposition to that advice.	N	The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which sets out how the Scheme complies with national policy.
Local community	The Scheme goes against climate reduction targets and should not take place.	N	
Local community	The Climate Change Committee has recently stated that new road schemes should not go ahead unless they can be shown not to increase carbon emissions. Since your scheme plans to increase capacity, it would increase emissions.	N	
Local community	This project violates the 2015 Paris agreement and would therefore be illegal. It contradicts our declaration of a climate emergency. It spoils taxpayers money that would be much better used to transform our transport infrastructure to reduce carbon emissions. Car use is the most inefficient and unhealthy way to travel that does not need to be encouraged further but what is needed is safer cycling and better public transport for short and long distance travel.	N	The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and DMRB LA 114 Climate.
Local community	The Climate Crisis has indeed been coming up stealthily for a very long time. And, finally, it is on front pages of newspapers and is acknowledged by most governments around the world. Unfortunately, there is now only a very little time to act. It was almost getting too late when in 2008 the UK Climate Change Committee was formed. Just to remind you of these well-known facts: (1) There is more CO2 in the atmosphere than at any time over the last 400.000 years, or at any time when humans have been in existence. This CO2 has been building up since the Industrial Revolution, mainly from the use of coal and oil to provide energy; (2) The temperature of the planet has consequently risen 1.2 degrees Celsius since the Industrial revolution and is now rising more quickly. If it rises to 1.5 degrees which it could do as early as 2035, the world will be in real trouble; (3) one of the drivers of this rise in temperature is the growth in human population from 1,000,000,000 in 1800 to 8,000,000,000. But it is the rich nations' populations that are	N	Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that, when compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK's 4 th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK's 5 th and 6 th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in isolation, would materially affect the UK's ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, in accordance with the DMRB LA 114 Climate, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>chiefly driving it, especially the wealthiest 10%. ALL THIS IS WELL KNOWN. PLEASE DO NOT IGNORE IT.</p> <p>What is less well known is the present sources of CO2 in the UK. The two main drivers are ROAD TRAFFIC and DOMESTIC DWELLINGS. Human beings in this part of the world have to live in houses! Otherwise they would die. These houses have to be heated; otherwise they are more likely to die. They do need to move around sometimes; it is part of their nature, but it is not as important as living in a permanent dwelling.</p> <p>And so, because coal and oil are being discarded as sources of energy, for the next few years (and may be more than a few) we have to depend on sustainable energy from wind, water, geothermal and solar energy, and nuclear energy from the power stations already being built. There will not be enough to go round until hydrogen is produced without using electricity, until nuclear fission becomes a reality. A sizeable portion of the sustainable energy will be used on schemes that produce more sustainable energy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not the time to build better roads. The very building of them will produce more CO2 and their use will be at the expense of domestic dwellings and the construction of other means of producing energy. • M3 J9 will not improve the ambience of Winchester City where people live. It will trash that part of the Itchen Valley which was an important concern when the M3 was discussed at the Inquiry of 1976. • It just may happen that in the future better roads are needed. That being so, the sensible way forward would be to pause the actual construction and breaking of earth for new road developments for four years to see how the development progresses of sustainable energy and how it is used. 		
Local community	<p>I do not think this should even go ahead. If we are to be serious about achieving net zero carbon emissions – and the government says it is even passing legislation to that effect – then we should not be encouraging yet more road use.</p> <p>Even if it does go ahead all we will have is an increased density of southbound cars reaching Twyford Down thus causing huge tailbacks. Whereas now we have a break in traffic caused by junction 9 which means we can negotiate the hill well even when there are numerous lorries joining the motorway on the upslope of the hill at junction 10. Those delays are, in my opinion, a benefit to the flow of traffic not a hindrance.</p> <p>Northbound is not currently a significant issue apart from the hill through Twyford Down which this development would not change other than potentially encouraging yet more traffic to use this route.</p> <p>As for the environmental impact. Words fail me.</p>	N	<p>The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which sets out how the Scheme complies with national policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The Treasury commissioned the Dasgupta Review which was published earlier this year which even prompted the PM to state, “<i>protecting and enhancing nature needs more than good intentions – it requires concerted, coordinated action. This year is critical in determining whether we can stop and reverse the concerning trend of fast-declining biodiversity.</i>”</p> <p>This proposal does not appear to have taken this into any account at all.</p> <p>If this was someone’s homework, I would ask them to go away and do it again. The money spent on this could go a lot further in supporting alternative modes by which to move goods and people that do not entail net increases in emissions and energy use.</p> <p>I’m sorry if my tone is antagonistic, but the development of these proposals is incompatible with the pragmatic reality of climate emergency.</p> <p>The renegeing of promises WRT to cycling and equestrians seems inexplicable, given that the difference appears to be negligible in terms of budget provision or any other factor that I can think of.</p>		<p>relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes the assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate. This chapter concludes that, when compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK’s 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK’s 5th and 6th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in isolation, would materially affect the UK’s ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents the assessment of effects on biodiversity. The assessment identified a number of residual adverse and beneficial effects to biodiversity receptors predominantly during construction (as by operation effects would have been mitigated) including, European Designated Sites (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation), other statutory designated areas (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest), non-statutory designated areas, habitats, badgers, bats, hazel dormouse, otter, water vole, birds (breeding and over-wintering), reptiles, freshwater fish, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates and notable plants. Effects predicted were as a result of habitat loss and gain, fragmentation of populations / habitats, disturbance, habitat degradation, and species mortality. However, in all cases the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation during the construction and operation of the Scheme effects were predicted not significant</p> <p>The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including chalk grassland areas, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. Opportunity for maximising biodiversity benefit has also been provided for with the use of scrub planting throughout the Scheme and species rich grasslands (including chalk grassland).Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Furthermore, the Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.</p>
Local community	<p>The road scheme is not appropriate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it will destroy and fragment important protected habitats for wildlife which is rapidly declining (State of Nature reports, RSPB) • building roads induces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. traffic (SACTRA reports) b. CO2 emissions and noxious pollutants • it contravenes government targets to reduce climate change and public efforts to deal with the climate emergency • it contravenes cycling and walking strategies and need for investment in public transport • it contravenes need for an integrated transport policy • it contravenes government's 25-year Environment Plan (government earlier manifesto to leave the environment in a better place than the one in which they found it) • it contravenes the SDNP nature plan where its efforts for nature's recovery would be an interconnected 'nature network' • it contravenes people's need for green spaces and landscapes for health, recreation and visual upliftment 	N	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>In response to point 2:</p> <p>Impacts from emissions from vehicles (NOx) during the construction and operation of the Scheme has been taken into account in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The scheme is estimated to lead to an increase in total emissions of NOx and particulates. Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that the Scheme would not have a significant effect on air quality concentrations.</p> <p>CO₂ emissions are reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Scheme is estimated to lead to an increase in CO₂ emissions over a 60-year operational period. It is considered that the emissions from the scheme in isolation would not have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon budgets.</p> <p>In response to point 3:</p> <p>The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. This chapter concludes that, when compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK's 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK's 5th and 6th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in isolation, would materially affect the UK’s ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, in accordance with the DMRB LA 114 Climate, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.</p>
Local community	<p>This road scheme should not be built because the proposals are a legacy from the road building era which is adding to our global warming emissions. Last year the National Park launched its Nature plan with 12 Investment Areas - one of these is where Highways England proposes to build a £130 million road scheme! They will destroy and fragment important protected habitats. This scheme affects the local nature reserve, which is home to rare and notable wildlife, and a SSSI site. In a recent press release from your authority, your own Countryside Director and Ecologist Andrew Lee said “... the South Downs National Park has a crucial role to play to lead nature recovery and be the hub of an interconnected ‘nature network’.....”. The Highways England intrusion flies in the face of nature recovery.</p> <p>I support the Hampshire and IoW Wildlife Trust’s proposal for a green bridge to the National Park would reunite wildlife habitats that became disconnected by the 1990s M3 construction.</p> <p>More roads equals more traffic - when a new road is built, new traffic will divert onto it. Many people may make new trips they would otherwise not make just because of new roads. This well-known and long-established effect is known as 'induced traffic'.</p> <p>The Highways England proposal will increase CO2 emissions by attracting more cars onto the roads! How are we going to meet the Government’s commitment to net zero emissions in less than 30 years with road schemes like this? Transport accounts for 30% of all CO2 emissions. It is likely that there will still be 40 million petrol and diesel cars and vans on the roads in 2030 pulse diesel HGV!</p> <p>The UK's new climate target to cut our emissions by 78% by 2035 has now been put into law last month - the Highways England plan is out of step with this. As for nature, you have clearly never taken on board the Government's report by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta. He says, “Human demands on nature must be curbed” This statement is not in Highways England’s vocabulary. Neither have you paid any heed to the Government's 25-year Environment Plan. The proposal does not include a landscape strategy.</p> <p>Please bear in mind the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this scheme.</p>	N	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with current and emerging national and local policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Legislation, in relation to biodiversity net gain, is also covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current Scheme programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>A landscape strategy has been prepared for the Scheme. Details are provided in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP), within Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets (including the 6th Carbon Budget). This assessment is reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. This chapter concludes that, when compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK’s 4th carbon</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>budget and 0.001% of the UK's 5th and 6th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in isolation, would materially affect the UK's ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, in accordance with the DMRB LA 114 Climate, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.</p>
Local community	<p>I am very disappointed with this second round of consultation - I have given all of my thoughts on this project once before, as have many local residents, and yet nothing has changed. Indeed, a majority of respondents to the last consultation were concerned about the environmental impacts. Why are you not listening to us?</p> <p>You are proposing to spend over £100m to make things worse - increase traffic, increase noise, increase pollutions, increase carbon emissions.</p> <p>The government, the Winchester and Eastleigh local councils, and Hampshire County Council have all declared a climate emergency and committed to reducing climate damaging carbon emissions significantly. The UK government is to host COP26 in the autumn, where it will further promise to reduce emissions. And yet Highways England continues to forge ahead with a massive road-building plan. I would like to see a detailed Climate Emergency Impact assessment which shows the likely increase in emissions.</p> <p>In Winchester a large proportion (60%) of emissions come from road transport and of these, 25% come from the motorway. Highways England propose to increase these by a third. This cannot be allowed to happen.</p> <p>There are may better ways to reduce the congestion at J9 such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developing a network of fast Winchester District bus routes to encourage people to keep their cars off the M3 and leave them at home 2. Developing a network of bus feeder services at Southampton Airport Station for onward connections to Winchester and Basingstoke 3. Building a railway station at North Whiteley 4. Building a district-wide safe cycle network 5. Increasing the capacity of the railway line through Winchester, so it can play a greater part in catering for those commuting into Winchester, especially from the Solent area 6. Improving frequency and connections on the whole of the south Hampshire rail network 7. Electrifying the railway line from Didcot to Birmingham and Nuneaton to encourage the transfer of lorry traffic to low carbon low energy goods train services from Southampton Docks to national distribution points in the Midlands 8. Developing a rail-connected goods distribution hub in the north Solent area (Eastleigh or Micheldever?) to divert traffic to proposed rail-based distribution networks." 	N	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors, including extreme weather events, in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate.</p> <p>During operation, the main source of greenhouse gas emissions is from end-user traffic. However, with the incorporation of enhancement planting, active travel routes encouraging sustainable modes of transport and technological changes including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the Scheme is not anticipated to have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon reduction targets and therefore, there would be no significant effect. During operation, the main source of emissions is from 'end-users' i.e. traffic. GHGs emitted from operational energy use (i.e. subway lighting, CCTV, VMS and traffic signalling) would contribute a relatively small amount to the overall operational carbon emissions. Based on the transport model for the Scheme, in 2027, , end-user and operational energy is anticipated to emit 3,217,562 tCO_{2e} annually and by 2042 this is anticipated to reduce</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Please call a halt to this awful project. It will not help, and it will continue to have damaging repercussions for many decades.</p>		<p>to 2,500,142 tCO_{2e} annually. When compared to the baseline, net emissions from traffic and operational energy use are anticipated to result in 2,782 tCO_{2e} annually and by 2042, 2,302 tCO_{2e} annually. This includes projected traffic growth which has been accounted for in the transport model for the Scheme.</p> <p>The incorporation of active travel routes would encourage more sustainable, low carbon modes of transport, reducing emissions associated with private vehicles. The Scheme also includes tree and woodland planting which would provide minor carbon sequestration benefits once the maturity stage has been reached.</p> <p>Technological changes, including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the banning of the sale of petrol and diesel cars by 2030, and the decarbonisation of the National Grid, is anticipated to continue to reduce the GHG emissions associated with the Scheme over time.</p> <p>In comparison to the UK carbon budget, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK's 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK's 5th and 6th carbon budget. It is considered that the increase in emissions as a result of the Scheme would not have a material impact on the ability of UK Government to meet its carbon budgets, therefore in accordance with the DMRB, there would be no significant effect.</p>
<p>South Downs Network</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>The South Downs Network objects to the proposed M3 Junction 9 Development in its present form.</p> <p>Executive Summary: Move over to Sustainable Transport</p> <p>We respectfully suggest that this £180+ million road scheme should be referred back to be replaced by a sustainable transport version that will help us meet our climate change commitments, providing better bus services, bus and rail infrastructure, integrated green cycle and walking routes, safe crossing for active travel, green (car free) bridges, safer paths for access to schools and access to rail stations.</p> <p>Secretary of State for Transport guidance</p> <p>We would take this opportunity to remind Highways England of the words used by the Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps when launching the Government's 'Decarbonising Transport: Setting the Challenge,' said in the foreword that: "public transport and active travel will be the natural first choice for our daily activities" and that "We will use our cars less and be able to rely on a convenient, cost-effective and coherent public transport network".</p> <p>More roads - more traffic</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges South Downs Network's objection to the Scheme. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>Response in relation to climate impacts:</p> <p>The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>More roads equals more traffic - when a new road is built, new traffic will divert onto it. Many people may make new trips they would not otherwise make just because of new roads. This well-known and long-established effect is known as 'induced traffic'</p> <p>Increase of emissions and global warming gases</p> <p>The Highways England proposal will increase CO2 emissions by attracting more cars onto the roads! Highways England's own report admits a significant increase in carbon emissions as a result of the project - some 534,628 tonnes of CO2 for user emissions. This doesn't include the emissions from the construction which doesn't seem to be reported on.</p> <p>How are we going to meet the Government's commitment to net zero emissions in less than 30 years with road schemes like this? Highways England say the project will be completed in 2026 so the timeline is even shorter at less than 25 years to achieve net zero! Wouldn't it be better to cancel the project and spend the £180 million on sustainable transport solutions?</p> <p>In 2020 transport accounted for 29.8% of all CO2 emissions. The majority is from road transport! How can Highways England advance a road scheme that will actively increase CO2 emissions?</p> <p>It is likely that there will still be 40 million petrol and diesel cars and vans on the roads in 2030 pulse diesel HGVs!</p> <p>The UK's new climate target to cut our emissions by 78% by 2035 was passed into law in June 2021 - the Highways England plan is out of step with this. The proposal does not include a landscape strategy. Road developments are not excluded from the UK's legally adopted climate commitment. The UK Government has a commitment to tackle climate change.</p> <p>Nature</p> <p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation Design Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that this design plan consists of just one page! We are concerned that there is no landscape strategy or detailed plan. The Mitigation Design Plan contains simply focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, we urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and biodiversity net gain. As part of this, we would like to see large scale habitat creation and</p>		<p>relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors, including extreme weather events, in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate.</p> <p>CO_{2e} emissions are reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This chapter states that during construction, 32,880 tCO_{2e} are anticipated to be emitted as a result of the Scheme. During operation, the main source of emissions is from 'end-users' i.e. traffic, with some emissions also resulting from operational energy use. Based on the transport model for the Scheme, in 2027, end-user and operational energy is anticipated to emit 3,217,562 tCO_{2e} annually and by 2042 this is anticipated to reduce to 2,500,142 tCO_{2e} annually. When compared to the baseline, net emissions from traffic and operational energy use are anticipated to result in 2,782 tCO_{2e} annually and by 2042, 2,302 tCO_{2e} annually. This includes projected traffic growth which has been accounted for in the transport model for the Scheme. When compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK's 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK's 5th and 6th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in isolation, would materially affect the UK's ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, in accordance the DMRB LA 114 Climate, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done. The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. We want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</p> <p>Whilst the actual road design plan seems to be very firm there seems to be a lack of commitment by Highways England to the environment, an EIA and a landscape and biodiversity/habitats plan. Words such as 'ongoing' and "is being developed" keep cropping up. One gets the impression that the natural world is not important to Highways England.</p> <p>We are concerned that Highways England seemed to be avoiding a commitment to the production of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). In Para 1.5.4 of the PEIR Highways England says "It should be noted that at this stage the information is preliminary. An iterative process of scheme development and EIA is ongoing". Surely a draft EIA should be available for public consultation now, and not be delayed until the DCO application? Indeed there seems to be a fudging of the commitment even at that stage to the production of an EIA. Highways England says "The final EIA work will be reported in the ES."</p> <p>Indeed further fudging of commitment to environmental assessment is contained in the response to Natural England's submission of 9 November 2020. They highlighted that the impact of emissions to designated ecological sites is required. Highways England response was "Ongoing EIA work will include the assessment of the impacts of emissions from traffic on designated habitats."</p> <p>Avoiding say yes to Natural England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England said "The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies." Highways England said "ongoing EIA work is to be reported." • Natural England said they would welcome the opportunity to comment on the landscape, biodiversity and access enhancement plan. Highways England responded "A biodiversity and landscaping mitigation package is being developed." But when? • Natural England advised that "the potential impact of the proposal upon features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for habitat creation/enhancement should be included within this assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance on such matters." Highways England responded ""The Biodiversity chapter of the ES will identify all potential impacts on identified biodiversity features"" Further fudging." <p>SDNPA Nature Investment Areas</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The road site is where the South Downs National Park has identified one of its 12 nature investment areas. These nature recovery areas are part of a hub of an interconnected 'nature network.' The Highways England intrusion flies in the face of nature recovery and will destroy and fragment important protected habitats. This scheme affects the local nature reserve which is home to rare and notable wildlife, and a SSSI site.</p> <p>Previous environmental damage</p> <p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust's nature reserve at St Catherine's Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally. "</p> <p>SSSI and Special Area of Conservation</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network.</p> <p>Government Environmental Policy</p> <p>Highways England need to take on board Government policy on the environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government's Final Report of the Independent Review on the Economics of Biodiversity led by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta. Amongst other things he says "Human demands on nature must be curbed • We say - road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government 'Dasgupta Review' says, 'Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).' We should no longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to urbanisation pressures. • Also please bear in mind the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this scheme. 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Green Bridge</p> <p>We support the Hampshire and IoW Wildlife Trust’s proposal for a green bridge to the National Park which would reunite wildlife habitats that became disconnected by the 1990s M3 construction.</p> <p>We want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature’s recovery despite modern transport development.</p> <p>Spoil</p> <p>The Highways England report says “We have not yet completed our junction design, so we do not know exactly how much material may need to be placed in these areas, or whether we will need all three areas”. Surely after at least two and a half years of preparation such civil engineering detail should be known? The amount of spoil will affect the landscape design. This should be known now; before Highways England applies for a Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>2019 consultation</p> <p>We have serious concerns about the previous stages of public consultations.</p> <p>Highways England says “There was a high level of support for the Proposed Scheme”. “We received 526 responses to our consultation”. Other than a few meaningless and valueless paragraphs the Public Consultation Summary Report does not provide any substantive information on exactly what those 526 respondents said. What organisations responded and what did they say? How many of the 526 comments were from individual members of the public. How many were car, commercial and HGV vehicle owners/drivers? Did horse riding, walking and cycling groups respond? Indeed were they invited to respond?</p> <p>References are made to ‘stakeholders.’ It is understood they were invited to workshops to give their input. Exactly who were they? and how were they selected? We hope it wasn't a question of selecting the appropriate stakeholders so that it assisted in giving the right answer to suit Highways England.</p> <p>Walking and Cycling Proposals Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that there is little substance to walking and cycling provision. The plan just consists of one page. There seems to be very little reference to provision for horse riders.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Walkers, cyclists and horse riders to be put in a 'subway'! Underground? Highways England say "On both sides of the motorway, the existing walking and cycling route links both parts of Easton Lane, which would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders will be improved with a widened 3m route, which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway..."</p> <p>This is unacceptable. This proposal is fraught with all sorts of problems. Who is going to police the subway to ensure the safety of users? Who will maintain it and how will it be lit? Will there be security cameras? Will there be traffic separation to ensure safety of different users such as horse riders and cyclists?</p> <p>Instead of hiding these active travel users away below ground highways England should provide a green bridge out in the fresh air above the pollution from the motorway style road.</p> <p>In any event Highways England should ensure that cycle provision is compliant with Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20 Published last year by the Government.</p> <p>Highways England must take account of latest Government policy</p> <p>The business case for this project should be rewritten taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Gov policy paper - A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment (pub Jan 2018) • DfT's policy paper - Decarbonising transport: setting the challenge (pub March 2020) • UK Gov policy paper: Gear change: a bold vision for cycling and walking • UK Gov policy paper: Bus Back Better: national bus strategy for England 		

K.2.L In-combination and cumulative effects

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	The A34 between King's Worthy and Three Maids Hill is in a terrible condition. The carriageway is life expired and constantly needing patching up because it is continuously breaking up. Full reconstruction of this length of A34 should be coordinated and combined with the junction upgrade, firstly to minimise disruption compared with having two projects back-to-back, and secondly because when the junction upgrade is completed traffic levels will likely grow, making traffic management for a reconstruction scheme even harder in the future.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment however the A34 between King's Worthy and Three Maids Hill is not part of the Scheme's proposals.

K.2.M Environment – general

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	Disagree with the proposed scheme because of its environmental impact.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.
Local community	Environmental issues are not taken into consideration. Regeneration. To take off Winnall Moors is unbelievably wrong.	Y	
Local community	The proposal is ridiculous, get a sense of urgency about the planet you're destroying and stop thinking of convenience.	N	
Local community	Not only will the plans cause massive disturbance the environmental impact would be even worse.	N	
Local community	Strongly disagree to all changes on environmental grounds	N	
Local community	Disagree because environmental concerns are not addressed fully	N	
Local community	Environmental impact should be the most important factor.	N	
Local community	At non-peak times the road is often very clear I've been on it at peak times and true there can be a bit of a queue but not one that is worth significant expense especially at a cost to the environment and biodiversity in the area. To be honest the only way that you can ease congestion is for the government to help make trains a more attractive alternative to driving.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	Environmental impact should be considered as a first priority. Road improvements should not come at the expense of environmental issues particularly with regard to climate change and lost wildlife habitat.	N	An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the proposal on the environment. This includes details of the environmental mitigation and management such as Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , with Chapters 8 and 14 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) reporting the likely significant effects of the Scheme on biodiversity and climate, respectively
Local community	The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust's nature reserve at St Catherine's Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would	Y	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the historic impacts on Twyford Downs. An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapters 6 (Cultural Heritage), 7 (Landscape and Visual) and 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES assess the likely significant effects on designated sites such

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally.</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network, as well as potentially impacting the ability of Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust to manage the nature reserve.</p>		<p>as the SAC / SSSI, scheduled monuments and the South Downs National Park with mitigation developed through consultation with statutory consultees. Mitigation measures proposed to reduce likely significant effects are also included in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>The Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including extensive areas of chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes</p> <p>The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>Hugely disruptive and expensive project that will, within a short period of time be congested again if you continue with an approach of accommodating traffic. Increased capacity leads to increased demand. The current environmental mitigation plans from extremely limited and lack any ambition to make the project a net gain for nature. It is a farce that the South Downs National Park is split by the M3 and Junction 9. Twyford Down continues to be a landscape disaster and road widening and lack of routes for wildlife across the road (eg a green bridge), will make this worse.</p>	N	<p>The Scheme proposals achieve a positive biodiversity net gain which will support the variety of wildlife and habitats within the South Downs National Park.</p>
Local community	<p>The effect on the North Downs Nature Reserve and CO2 emissions. We should be improving public transport, not encouraging people to use the roads more</p>	N	<p>The North Downs Nature Reserve is not within or in close proximity the Application Boundary and has therefore not been considered in the environmental assessments.</p>
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	<p>Consider first and foremost the environmental impact. Private car numbers will have to be brought down to meet carbon targets. We don't need more roads which only encourage more traffic. Saving and improving green spaces is far more important than any road work can ever be.</p>	N	<p>The acknowledges the range of views expressed relating to the consideration of the environment. An Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) has been submitted as part of the DCO application, which identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p>
Local community	<p>You should consider not starting construction and should consider ways on getting more people to use public transport or to work from home. Our</p>	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	environment and the wildlife within it are far more important to this world than a few drivers being held up for a short period of time.		<p>Construction mitigation measures are outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3). As the design develops towards construction phase, mitigation would be refined and included within the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (siEMP), which would be secured through a DCO requirement. The EMPs would be drafted in consultation with statutory bodies, and regular contact would be had with these parties through the subsequent detailed design and delivery (construction) phases.</p> <p>Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.</p>
Local community	I consider that you have given thought to the close proximity of the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, as well as other environmental issues such as soil colour. It is essential that any trees which need to be removed are replaced.	N	
Local community	Wildlife. Trees and plants. Environment.	N	
Local community	How this effects the natural environment. This was ignored when the Twyford gap was created but I hope that 25 years later we can be more responsible with nature	N	
Local community	Cutting into the South Downs and important wildlife areas. Yet again destroying the countryside slowly	N	
Local community	Limiting damage to environment and not isolating natural environments	N	
Local community	Please consider the beauty and history of Hampshire and what we plan to pass to future generations. When it is gone it is gone.	N	
Local community	General concerns about the potential environmental impacts during construction.	N	
Local community	Environment, Climate change Looking at reducing traffic, not increasing it	N	
Local community	You should consider the environment before starting work , the pollution caused by construction and the destruction to the local wildlife habitats will take decades to recover.	N	
Local community	Environmental impact on local residents specifically and especially noise pollution	N	
Local community	The natural environment. The river Itchen. The chalk downlands. Insects. Plants. Wildlife.	N	
Local community	The devastation to the environment and wildlife that can't be replaced or made 'good' if you go ahead with this development.	N	
Local community	How you will reduce traffic. How you will reduce the number of road journeys. How you will dramatically reduce vehicle emissions and overall road pollution, including litter. How you will protect and progressively enhance the environment. How you will use sustainable materials and avoid fossil-derived tars etc	N	
Local community	The impact on the South downs national park and the destruction of wildlife habitat	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	The natural environment and nature - avoid building though it, reduce building up the area further	N	
Local community	The impact the road system is having on Havens such as the South Downs is significant. As much as we all realise the network needs to improve this can be done with a more harmonious and respectful design rather than cutting into the surroundings.	Y	<p>The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Scheme design avoids introduction of tall bridge structures or elevated embankments and instead the Scheme is positioned within cutting with structures and associated headwalls set within the landform at as low an elevation as possible. Views of the Scheme from the designated landscape have been considered with the aim where possible to minimise any adverse effects.</p> <p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthworks which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p> <p>Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the special qualities of the South Downs National Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	Reparations should be made for the past damage to our wildlife habitats by providing green corridors to connect the remaining wildlife areas and not taking any more land for car use. All protected nature reserves should be untouched and remain for the use of Winchester residents. They are not a pool of land ready and waiting to be used for development when you think the need arises. Road 'improvement' only leads to more traffic, climate change and the degradation of the natural environment which we all rely on to live. This makes no sense.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the historic impacts on Twyford Downs. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2)).

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Environment. Living in Winchester when the M3 cut through Twyford down, the area has just started to recover.	N	Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.
Local community	Minimising environmental impact and trying to redress damage M3 has caused to Twyford down.	N	
Local community	Focus on eating into the countryside as little as possible, build a wildlife bridge to enable wildlife to move freely over the downs and to reduce their preventable loss of life via road kills and being trapped in small habitats, invest and plant native and appropriate hedges, trees, and plants to support wildlife and reduce noise and air pollution. Now build more roads when we should be making trains cheaper, especially now the Government has already said tracks will be re-nationalised. Realise humans need to coexist with the world, not senselessly dominate and destroy everything just because we can, to have more conscience.	Y	<p>At the foremost the Scheme proposals look to avoid impacts and the Scheme retains as much existing vegetation as possible, with landscape mitigation measures including extensive areas of native woodland planting, linear planting, roadside tree planting, species rich grass verges, and areas of chalk grasslands creation (which all complement biodiversity and respond to the key characteristics of the landscape in which the Scheme is located). There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape.</p> <p>New areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape during operation. Much of the additional woodland and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. The provision of areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for wildlife in a north-south direction. Please refer to Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Green bridges are not direct proposed in the Scheme with the of linking ecology corridors as there are no instances of new severance.</p>
Local community	Increase the package of habitat improvements to achieve net gain. Ensure the environmental impact is further minimised.	N	The environmental mitigation has been designed to respond to the specific impacts of the Scheme, and to be sensitive to the local area. Habitat creation has been developed in consultation with a range of stakeholders. Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3) demonstrates that the scheme will deliver net gains in biodiversity units.
Local community	Environmental impact - not just mitigating this but to every possible extent, preventing it - even if this requires a radical re-think of or withdrawal from these plans.	N	<p>The Applicant has applied the mitigation hierarchy to the Scheme. This is outlined in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) includes habitat creation and enhancement measures which provide substantial additional areas of biodiversity rich habitats. In addition, Figure 2.3 shows further mitigation measures such as wildlife fencing, along with provision of habitats for specific species.</p>
Local community	Winnall Moors is directly behind the river which should not be touched. The congestion will be ridiculous. The wider environmental impact will be ridiculous. Right on the edge of the south downs. Just no.	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Not causing any impact on the environment and biodiversity of the area such as compulsory purchase of any part of Winnall Moors nature reserve, which is already a vital flood defence for Winchester. I would prefer to see the millions of pounds being spent going towards a greener economy and protecting and enhancing the nature of the area than creating an opportunity to encourage more road users to not seek alternatives to driving.	Y	<p>The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.</p> <p>The Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p>
Local community	Yes: what is the least environmental impact; and how best to meet our UK net zero carbon targets?	N	<p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations.</p>
Local community	<p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme and the historical severance of the landscape.</p> <p>The Mitigation Design Plan contains very little detail on the mitigation and focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, I urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and net gain, aiming for at least 20% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>As part of this, I would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done.</p> <p>The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. I want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p>	Y	<p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision set out on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Appendix 8.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) assesses that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Scheme would provide a net increase of approximately 9.8 ha of chalk grassland, which is appropriate to the local area. The protection and enhancement of this habitat is a key theme within the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i> (adopted July 2019) and has been a key theme within consultation responses from stakeholders.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			However, the use of this habitat type suppresses the overall result of the metric, due to risk factors associated with this habitat type. For example, if 'other neutral grassland' was provided in place of chalk grassland then the overall biodiversity net gain score for the Scheme would change from +4.14% to +14.93%. This demonstrates that the Scheme can comfortably deliver over 10% biodiversity net gain. However, whilst a change from chalk grassland to other neutral grassland would be technically feasible, given the wider benefits, chalk grassland has been taken forward as being most appropriate habitat for the Scheme.
Local community	That you listen to the various environmental groups and make this project a win win for the environment	N	The Applicant has engaged with a range of stakeholders, including statutory environmental bodies, throughout the development of the Scheme design and environmental assessment work.
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure			
Local community	You seem to have thought about it thoroughly	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed, including those received in support of the environmental assessment.
Local community	It sounds nice. How much will be delivered?	N	
Local community	Landscaping and environmental concerns seem to be well considered.	N	
Local community	I have listened to the consultation videos you have published and am satisfied with what is proposed.	N	
Local community	Haven't studied but generally think your doc good job in this regard.	N	
Local community	I know the legislation around the environmental impacts will help to ensure the right outcomes are achieved, which seems to be the case with these proposals.	N	
Local community	Due consideration seems to have been given to a most of the environmental impact of the scheme.	N	
Local community	Get it built the easiest way possible, taking into account any important local environmental factors.	N	
Local community	You will be held to account by the wildlife trusts and other local environmental interest groups and so am content that a sensible compromise on environmental issues will be found.	N	
Local community	Do not know enough about the subject to express a view.	N	As part of the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant hosted bespoke webinars which covered a range of topics and specialist areas, including environmental impacts, and also offered telephone appointments to help members of the public understand the Scheme and supplement any face-to-face conversations that they

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			would have had with the project team. Full details of the environmental impact assessment undertaken for the Scheme is presented in the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) .
Local community	I don't believe you are giving enough thought to the environment, particularly the sensitive site of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve which is a SSSI. This will increase disturbance for wildlife that is already squeezed by the city. It will also require habitat destruction which has happened here before, but local people have been lied to time and again about how this will be mitigated and the structures agreed to be put in place such as the wildlife bridge never appeared.	Y	The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals. The Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.
Local community	Winnall moors will be affected.	Y	
Local community	The minimal effect on the Itchen Valley is to be welcomed, and the use of the old pre-war bypass bridge for the A34 southbound route, together with the routing of the proposed footway along the line of the old A33 northbound is an ingenious solution.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
Local community	<p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust's nature reserve at St Catherine's Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally.</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network, as well as potentially impacting the ability of Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust to manage the nature reserve.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the historic impacts on Twyford Downs.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapters 6 (Cultural Heritage), 7 (Landscape and Visual) and 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES assess the likely significant effects on designated sites such as the SAC / SSSI, scheduled monuments and the South Downs National Park with mitigation developed through consultation with statutory consultees. Mitigation measures proposed to reduce likely significant effects are also included in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>The Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including extensive areas of chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes</p>
Local community	Repeating environmental mistakes of Twyford Down again!	N	The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>I think all of the plans prioritise road use over our natural environment, nature and wildlife, in a climate emergency where floods, droughts, heatwaves and cold spells are likely to increase we need to pay more attention to nature than to just building.</p> <p>The plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. they give so many people happiness, it supports so much wildlife and OUR ecological systems, please don't compromise them.</p> <p>The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network, as well as potentially impacting the ability of Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust to manage the nature reserve. There MUST be a wildlife bridge to connect the two sides of the Downs over the M3, there does NOT need to be a new junction/roundabout or anything else.</p>	Y	<p>The Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p> <p>Due to the lifespan of the proposals, the Scheme design considers potential change from future climate change, including designing in appropriate water attenuation features for extreme events, specifying durable materials, and including a diverse soft landscape species for resilience.</p> <p>There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape. The landscape strategy includes the use of native species of local provenance, to reflect the character of the local landscape, however the selected species mix will be as diverse as reasonably practicable to ensure resilience against potential future diseases and climate change whilst providing functional habitat for wildlife present in the local area. Opportunity for maximising biodiversity benefit has also been provided for with the use of scrub planting throughout the Scheme and species rich grasslands (including chalk grassland).</p> <p>The Scheme would result in an increase of wooded areas once the mitigation has effectively established and is approaching its early maturity stage and functioning as a woodland. The proposals show retention of existing vegetation where possible and a range of enhancement planting is proposed. Further detail of planting proposals is provided within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). At the detailed design stage, the planting specifications and tree mix would be explored to assess options according to the potential to maximise the carbon sequestration benefits of landscape features.</p> <p>The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)	
Local community	You are not investing in alternative means of transport as well as originally promised and this will have negative consequences on the environment in the future.	Y	The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded. This includes an improvement to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23. An additional footway, cycleway and horse riding route is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. A new combined footpath and cycle path for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane.	
Local community	Your 'Preliminary Environmental Information Report' is based on flawed assumptions.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the views expressed. The final findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) . The ES has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations') and developed in consultation with a range of stakeholders including; the environment Agency, Natural England, Historic England, South Downs National Park Authority, Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.	
Local community	I think the environmental impacts didn't enter your minds.	N		
Local community	Make a better effort.	N		
Local community	Leave the environment alone	N		
Local community	While you seem to be trying to mitigate some of problems caused by this Scheme I feel you have failed to take into account the full impact and damage this scheme will cause to the environment	N		
Local community	Little to no regard for the environment	N		
Local community	Having read a blog and viewing plans, I don't believe you have thought about the wildlife and the impact it will have on our children's Earth.	N		
Local community	Environment is not being considered fairly at the moment	N		
Local community	Considerations are at best lip service with no thought or account to actual impact to local area	N		
Local community	You don't take the environmental impact seriously.	N		
Local community	You would not consider destroying this beautiful land and habitat if you were being at all 'considerate'	N		
Local community	Not enough consideration has been taken for the huge impact this will have on the green space.	N		Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on population and human health, resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. The assessment considers the impacts on open/green space.
Local community	Your proposals do not go anywhere near enough to protect the environment and all that lives in the area	N		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	I think it's rather evident that building into green belts and protected land that no consideration for the environment have be sought at all. Instead, at a time where we should be building more trees in the face of global warming, you want to turf up green spaces to make way for more exhaust pollution?	N	The Applicant has applied the mitigation hierarchy to the Scheme. This is outlined in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) includes habitat creation and enhancement measures which provide substantial additional areas of biodiversity rich habitats. In addition, Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) shows further mitigation measures such as wildlife fencing, along with provision of habitats for specific species.
Local community	Greater care to replace and repair the environmental impact is needed.	N	
Local community	<p>The local landscape and it's natural habitats have been severely degraded by the construction of the M3 extension through Twyford Down and associated development. Two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty were irreparably damaged.</p> <p>The preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 would further negatively impact nature and wildlife here. The plans would destroy more nationally important habitat and weaken vital wildlife corridors.</p> <p>The Winnall Moor nature reserve will be disconnected from neighbouring habitat, reducing it's ability to fulfil its function as a nature reserve. Winnall Moor is a valued resource for people in Winchester and nearby, who do not wish to see it degraded in this way.</p>	Y	<p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapters 6 (Cultural Heritage), 7 (Landscape and Visual) and 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES assess the likely significant effects on designated sites such as the SAC / SSSI, scheduled monuments and the South Downs National Park with mitigation developed through consultation with statutory consultees. Mitigation measures proposed to reduce likely significant effects are also included in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals. The Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p> <p>Green bridges are not direct proposed in the Scheme with the of linking ecology corridors as there are no instances of new severance.</p>
Local community	Even the outlined effects on the environment (that have still not fully explored) should be enough evidence to stop this project. More needs to be done to explore the effects: what are the health effects of extra pollution? How many people will die prematurely due to the increased traffic? Pollution measurements are incomplete. Even if electric cars will be used more widely in the future, each car will continue to cause air pollution due to break use and tyre decay. There is not enough renewable energy available to charge all cars if the were electric. Cars that use electricity from fossil fuels will continue to contribute to carbon emissions in a very significant way. One should not forget that resources to build electric cars are limited, especially for their batteries. It would increase mining	N	<p>This objection to the Scheme in principle is noted.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects</p> <p>Specifically, impacts on human health are considered within Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). This has been prepared</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>activities which again contribute to carbon emissions. The effects of disturbing the soil and moving materials as well as emissions from tarmac and concrete have not been recognised fully.</p>		<p>in accordance with the latest DMRB LA 112 Population and Human Health (National Highways, 2020). With respect to pollution, Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that the Scheme would result in a neutral health outcome on ambient air quality.</p>
Local community	<p>If you were going to take the effects on the environment seriously you really should have undertaken more extensive impact studies before you submitted the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Incredibly section 1.7 of the summary of the PEIR fails to recognise Winnall Moors – a Special Area of Conservation as well as a Site of Scientific Interest that enables biodiversity almost to the centre of Winchester - which is astounding considering your proposal would take over part of the moors.</p> <p>Your ‘effect on the environment’ panel states that you’re undertaking a thorough ‘Environmental Impact Assessment’ of the Proposed Scheme. Now, considering the capitalisation is enough to show it’s a title this makes it seem like you’re not really going to take this seriously – If I see titles written like this I immediately see someone saying it using air quotes, ie, it will be a box-ticking exercise at best and a sham at worst.</p> <p>I trust it is simply a presentation error and nothing so cynical.</p> <p>If this is to go ahead it would be greatly appreciated if you made some efforts towards repairing the immense damage you caused to the nature reserve at St Catherine’s Hill and wildlife corridors in the area.</p>	Y	<p>The 2021 PEIR was a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>St Catherine’s Hill SSSI and the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve are both considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve. Furthermore, St Catherine’s Hill SSSI is located approximately 500m south of the Scheme. No direct or indirect impacts on the SSSI are anticipated during the construction phase, due to the distance and physical separation from the Scheme. As such there would be no change to the St Catherine’s Hill SSSI.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.</p>
Local community	<p>It will impact a nature reserve, a corridor for wildlife and will destroy both the history and nature in that area.</p>	Y	<p>A green bridge is not proposed as part of the Scheme because no existing ecological corridors are being severed by the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>The whole proposal is detrimental to the environment. You have not considered the overall and cultural environmental impacts - though, to be fair, the local impact is considered, but it is insignificant in the grand scheme.</p> <p>Some proposals have regressed since the 2019 proposal. For example, some cycle ways and bridle ways have been downgraded to foot ways. This is mean. In any case who would want to walk along a motorway ... a cycle way at least is quick!</p>	Y	<p>The 2021 PEIR was a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme. The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.
Local community	It is insufficiently developed at this stage. The framework you are using may be okay in principle but at this stage it tells us little about what the real impacts will be. There remain too many unknowns, for instance the volume of excess soil to be disposed of.	Y	<p>The 2021 PEIR was a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, all spoil deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>No to cutting through Winnall Moors; No to carving out yet more greenfield sites; No to the greenwash displayed in your proposals. Rethink entirely. Any proposed scheme must include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Large scale habitat creation. Significant new areas of chalk downland could be restored, utilising chalk excavated during construction. 2. Restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. 3. A green bridge across the motorway, re-uniting the severed down of St Catherine’s Hill and the ‘dongas’ and establishing a proper gateway to the South Downs National Park. 4. A commitment to investing in sustainable transport for the future, improving public transport. 	Y	<p>The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.</p> <p>The Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) includes habitat creation and enhancement measures which provide substantial additional areas of biodiversity rich habitats. New planting has been proposed adjacent to new elements of road infrastructure to provide visual screening and green infrastructure connectivity, as shown on the Figure 2.3.</p> <p>A green bridge is not proposed as part of the Scheme because no existing ecological corridors are being severed by the Scheme. In addition, the Application Boundary does not extend south of Junction 10.</p> <p>Revised proposals since statutory consultation provide greater opportunities for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders to access the South Downs National Park. In addition, the route from Winnall to Kings Worthy has been revised to include cyclists. This has been discussed with stakeholders.</p>
Local community	Destroyed ancient woodland and moorland habits will never be able to be repaired	N	<p>The Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p> <p>Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3) sets out the vegetation loss</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>assuming the reasonable worst case position. Appendix 7.5 (Preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3) has considered for the presence of ancient woodland and trees and veteran trees to inform the iterative design process and baseline constraints. No ancient woodland, trees or veteran trees have been identified within the Application Boundary.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) identifies areas for new woodland and scrubland planting which will contribute to enhancing connectivity of these resources as part of the Scheme's mitigation package.</p>
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	Don't get too hung up on this stuff - local environmental impacts will sort themselves out before too long, or further measures can be undertaken where necessary.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Not needed to kill beautiful places	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the views expressed. The final findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1). The ES has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations') and developed in consultation with a range of stakeholders including; the environment Agency, Natural England, Historic England, South Downs National Park Authority, Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects</p>
Local community	Environment and its importance to humans health and survival is being completely ignored!	N	
Local community	Local impacts are insignificant in the overall picture	N	
Local community	Not enough consideration of the environmental impact	N	
Local community	There will be considerable disruption and damage. Given the overall unjustifiable harmful impact of this scheme no level of impact reduction will be sufficient.	N	
Local community	No real consideration given to the environment	N	
Local community	Off setting the damage caused by the Twyford cutting 25 years ago has never been achieved. Maybe start there first before doing more damage.	N	
Local community	Leave environment alone	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The proposals will not be enough to mitigate the damage caused by this scheme	N	<p>The Applicant has applied the mitigation hierarchy to the Scheme. This is outlined in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) includes habitat creation and enhancement measures</p>
Local community	Are you even taking mitigation seriously? The proposal contains barely any detail on mitigation.	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>And surely shouldn't we be going beyond mitigation and seeking to restore and improve those habitats and corridors that will be damaged by this development and those destroyed by the extension of the M3 back in the 90s?</p> <p>It would be nice, for once, for developers to seek to improve what is there already rather than just lessen the damage a bit.</p> <p>I do not think that the development will result in significant improvements to travelling times and I do not believe we should be encouraging yet more traffic when we are trying to achieve net zero carbon emissions.</p> <p>Don't go ahead with it and you will reduce the environmental impacts considerably.</p>		<p>which provide substantial additional areas of biodiversity rich habitats. In addition, Figure 2.3 shows further mitigation measures such as wildlife fencing, along with provision of habitats for specific species.</p>
Local community	<p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme and the historical severance of the landscape.</p> <p>The Mitigation Design Plan contains very little detail on the mitigation and focuses solely on on-site enhancements. This concerns me as you are not giving the bigger picture to the audience.</p> <p>Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, I urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and net gain, aiming for at least 20% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>As part of this, I would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done.</p> <p>The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. I want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>I want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature's recovery in modern transport development.</p>	Y	<p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision set out on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Appendix 8.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) assesses that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Scheme would provide a net increase of approximately 9.6 ha of chalk grassland, which is appropriate to the local area. The protection and enhancement of this habitat is a key theme within the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i> (adopted July 2019) and has been a key theme within consultation responses from stakeholders. However, the use of this habitat type suppresses the overall result of the metric, due to risk factors associated with this habitat type. For example, if 'other neutral grassland' was provided in place of chalk grassland then the overall biodiversity net gain score for the Scheme would change from +4.14% to +14.93%. This demonstrates that the Scheme can comfortably deliver over 10% biodiversity net gain. However, whilst a change from chalk grassland to other neutral grassland would</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			be technically feasible, given the wider benefits, chalk grassland has been taken forward as being most appropriate habitat for the Scheme.
Local community	Concerned about the construction impact of the works on biodiversity, such as “skylarks and yellow hammers, birds, butterflies and plants”, and the use of “good agricultural land” for the spoil deposition areas. I do not agree that the environmental impact of the Scheme is justified and believe the benefits do not outweigh the disadvantages. The landscape plans do not cover the whole area affected – for instance any plans for embankments or planting beside the M3 Highcliffe/ Petersfield Road, South Downs Way pedestrian bridge.	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)) Regulations 2017. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Potential construction impacts to biodiversity are assessed within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). No significant effects are reported following the implementation of mitigation measures described in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) sets out the planning policy context and assesses the Scheme against policy requirements, including an assessment of the overall planning balance. The Applicant considers that the benefits of the Scheme significantly outweigh any harm predicted. As required by Section 104(7) of the Planning Act 2008, the benefits of the Scheme must be weighed against any adverse impacts identified in the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) demonstrates that any unavoidable adverse environmental effects which may remain following mitigation are outweighed by the public benefit that will accrue as a result of the Scheme and the Government’s commitment to upgrading the SRN. and, for the purposes of Section 104(7) of the Planning Act 2008, that any adverse impacts would not outweigh the benefits of the Scheme. The Scheme complies with the NPS NN and accords with all other relevant and important matters which need to be taken into consideration, including the adopted development plan for the local area and the NPPF.</p> <p>Since statutory consultation, all three of the soil deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme and therefore drainage in this area will not be required. The removal of these areas has resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced potential impacts on tranquillity (both visual and acoustic intrusion) within the South Downs National Park and results in the need to affect less ‘best and most versatile’ (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included for land within the Application Boundary.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	You say yourselves that there will be adverse effects on the national park. While these might 'lessen over time' they should never happen in the first place.	Y	The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park.
Local community	Are the designers aware this is an internationally important area?	Y	<p>The Scheme design avoids introduction of tall bridge structures or elevated embankments and instead the Scheme is positioned within cutting with structures and associated headwalls set within the landform at as low an elevation as possible. Views of the Scheme from the designated landscape have been considered with the aim where possible to minimise any adverse effects.</p> <p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p> <p>Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the special qualities of the South Downs National Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	Not enough broad awareness of impact assessment.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Difficult to comment on this area due to lack of knowledge of the current state of things so unable to see whether the proposals represent a net positive or negative.	N	This comment has been noted.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Simply because they are completely inadequate in terms of protecting the environment.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the landscaping proposals. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
Local community	Not enough consideration of the environmental impact.	N	
Local community	Bunds seem to have been designed for convenience not for benefit of residents or wildlife.	N	
Local community	No amount of 'landscaping' can compensate for the further encroachment of development on the National Park and the loss of part of a SSSI.	N	
Local community	I am neutral because, of themselves, the proposals are an improvement but the negative impact of the scheme overall outweighs their benefits.	N	
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			
Local community	Not good enough. People don't want old landscapes and environments destroyed.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The whole area should be undisturbed. 30 years ago a big chunk of nature has been destroyed in the area and I am opposed to any proposal to develop the area in any way.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Plans are not valued or considerate to the environment	Y	<p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme will be retained and upgraded. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCN Route 23, with a widened 4m underpass and 3m route either side of the M3 junction 9 gyratory. • A new minimum 3m wide (increasing to 4m) combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. The dedicated route linking Kings Worthy to Easton Lane, with careful siting of the proposed River Itchen pedestrian bridge, has been sympathetically designed to minimise visual impact, and impact of existing features and designations. • An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. <p>The provision of new routes increases opportunities for recreational experiences with access from Winchester to the South Downs National Park, whilst the design of these routes provides for an improved user experience.</p>
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have	Y	A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity and the water environment are set in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.		<p>ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies. Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.</p>
Local community	Stop vehicles and put on more public transport to protect our environment	N	This comment has been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.

F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.

Local community	The sites chosen seem to be in areas where little or no long term damage will occur.	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>The earth spoil and site gained chalk material provides the opportunity for new creation of chalk grassland within the open downland areas of the Scheme as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).. This is a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p>
Local community	This could be used to build better environment corridors	Y	
Local community	You're destroying even more of our local environment.	Y	
Local community	None of this work is necessary and will have a totally negative impact. There is no justification for the disruption and destruction that will be caused with your plans for spare soil.	Y	
Local community	See comments above. The current plans lack detail, are not compatible with the principles of the South Downs National Park and may have a detrimental effect on properties close to these locations	Y	
Local community	The disruption will have an adverse effect.	Y	

F.4: Please let us know the reasons for your response to question F3 and any other views about the locations we've identified

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	The southern area is more likely to have an environmental impact, with its proximity to Magdalen Hill and Chilcomb.	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
Local community	Difficult to exactly pinpoint these and see what impact it will have on surrounding area	Y	
Local community	You're destroying even more of our local environment.	Y	
Local community	As a frequent visitor to Magdalen Hill Down I am especially concerned about the potential adverse impact of dumping up to four metres of excess soil on the southern area. I also have major concerns about the adverse environmental impacts of the lorry movements that would be involved in moving the excess soil.	Y	
Local community	They contribute nothing positive and just a way of disposing of 'waste', with imagination of how it could be used for positive environmental features.	Y	
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	They have to be in the most low impact areas possible, low impact is relative to NO impact!	Y	The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the location of the construction compounds during the refinement of the current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been studied by the Applicant and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects. Following the 2021 statutory consultation, further work was undertaken by the Applicant to consider the potential impacts of the two options for the main construction compound. This further work was predominately in relation to carbon emissions given the heightened focus on climate change. The assessment predicted CO _{2e} emissions over the construction period associated with travelling to the site from the main construction compound locations of 0.6 tonnes with the central construction compound (presented as number 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation) compared with 135 tonnes of CO _{2e} with the northern construction compound (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation). The lesser distance also reduces congestion on the surrounding local road network and the local communities. As a result, northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals. In order to facilitate construction of the Scheme, a number of temporary construction compounds would be required as follows:
Local community	Further damage to wildlife and the environment	Y	
Local community	Revisit the original plans, re-write taking into consideration the environment and climate change and the compounds may well end up in different places.	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A central temporary construction compound (presented as construction compound number 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation), located to the immediate east of Junction 9. - Two smaller areas within the footprint of the Junction 9 gyratory roundabout (presented as construction compound number 2 at the 2021 statutory consultation) - A small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as construction compound number 3 at the 2021 statutory consultation). <p>A range of measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to avoid and reduce potential effects. Essential mitigation measures are outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3). As the design develops towards construction phase, mitigation would be refined and included within the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (siEMP), which would be secured through a DCO requirement. The EMPs would be drafted in consultation with statutory bodies, and regular contact would be had with these parties through the subsequent detailed design and delivery (construction) phases.</p>
Local community	I have no options other than choose one that has least environmental impact during the construction phase	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	All look as if they will have minimal impact on residents	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	I am completely against these works. Too many of your questions are leading and assume that these proposals will go ahead. The damage caused to our lovely city will be unacceptable.	N	This objection to the principles of the Scheme has been noted.
Local community	Any of these will result in you concerting over more countryside.	N	The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the location of the construction compounds during the refinement of the current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been studied by the Applicant and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.
Local community	This project has been blown into ridiculous proportions the amount of construction compounds needed for this project should be a warning on how much disruption and damage to the environment going to be caused by National Highways.	N	
Local community	Damage to the environment	N	
Local community	Number 1 seems to me to involve the destruction of fewest trees - but it's hard to tell from your maps. Minimising destruction of any green space should be a priority.	N	This comment has been noted. It is proposed that the main construction area is to be located to the immediate east of Junction 9 (presented as number 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation). Activities within this compound would include plant storage, car parking, fuel and water storage, 'skills school', staff welfare facilities, waste segregation areas and a wheel wash. The area would also be used for material

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>storage, a tree and hedging nursery area and material processing (earthworks and pavements) and storage of topsoil.</p> <p>A range of measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to avoid and reduce potential effects. Essential mitigation measures are outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3). As the design develops towards construction phase, mitigation would be refined and included within the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (siEMP), which would be secured through a DCO requirement. The EMPs would be drafted in consultation with statutory bodies, and regular contact would be had with these parties through the subsequent detailed design and delivery (construction) phases.</p>
Local community	<p>From the published diagrams and maps it is difficult to precisely identify where some of the proposed temporary construction compounds will sit in the existing landscape or, at least, where their boundaries will lie. It would have been helpful if these plans were shown overlaid on a satellite view of the area to assist visualising how the proposed works would sit in the landscape.</p> <p>Nevertheless, examination of the diagram showing the construction compounds reveals that Temporary Construction Compound Number 1 will cover a large area of land east of the J9 roundabout and, in part, bordering the A272 Spitfire Link. Most of this land is currently arable - and I do not object to the temporary use of arable land for a construction compound.</p> <p>However - the plan also shows that Compound No. 1 will have an extension on its northern side, roughly rectangular in shape, stretching up towards Easton Lane. The plan shows this northern extension of Compound No. 1 as occupying an area of land simply shown as plain white - suggesting it is nothing more than arable land. This is incorrect.</p> <p>A walk around the proposed site of Compound No. 1, or even just a glance at a satellite view of the area, clearly shows that this northern extension of Compound No. 1 would cover and destroy the western end of a belt of young trees and natural grassland.</p> <p>Incidentally, while the published plan showing the temporary construction compounds does show the belt of young trees in question, the plan incorrectly shows the tree belt as stopping some distance to the east of the northern extension of Compound No. 1. This belt of trees and natural grassland in fact extends the whole way to the boundary of the existing J9 roundabout, and does not end in the middle of a field - as is wrongly shown on the plan.</p> <p>Why is an inaccurate and misleading plan being used?</p> <p>Is it really essential that Temporary Construction Compound No. 1 should extend</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed, including support of the Scheme. Details on the locations of the construction compounds are presented on Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>In order to facilitate the construction of the Scheme, the following construction compounds would be required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A central temporary construction compound (presented as number 1 in the 2021 statutory consultation) located to the immediate east of Junction 9. Activities within this compound would include plant storage, car parking, fuel and water storage, 'skills school', staff welfare facilities, waste segregation areas and a wheel wash. The area would also be used for material storage, a tree and hedging nursery area and material processing (earthworks and pavements) and storage of topsoil. 2) Two smaller areas within the footprint of the Junction 9 gyratory roundabout (presented as number 2 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to facilitate construction of the new gyratory bridge. 3) A small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities. <p>The Applicant has reduced the impact of the central construction compound by reducing its footprint and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant has reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area of the tree line.</p> <p>Standard construction management practices would be adopted to reduce potential environmental effects during construction of the Scheme. Specific measures to reduce visual impacts of the construction compounds include:</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>over this northern area and so destroy a valuable natural resource of young trees and natural grassland?</p> <p>I support the need for J9 to be improved, and accept this will inevitably involve the loss of some valuable natural habitat, but it is not obvious that this particular piece of environmental destruction - just to provide space for the northern extension of Temporary Construction Compound No. 1 - is either essential or inevitable.</p> <p>Could the plans for Compound No. 1 be reviewed so as to dispense with, or at least reduce, the northern extension and so preserve the tree and grass belt?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to reduce impacts of nearby highly sensitive visual receptors should be sought through sensitive design of construction compounds e.g. organising compound features and using earthworks / fencing to screen internal activities during the construction phase; and • Standard temporary boundary fences for construction compounds would be used. These reduce visual intrusion, assist in noise attenuation and ensure public safety (including uninvited intruder entrance to the site). <p>Further details are provided in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p>
Local community	<p>There is insufficient detailed information on potential compound 3 to be able to understand the potential impact arising from its use. It is located in an area where there could be potentially significant noise, landscape and visual and other impacts arising from its use. Further detailed information on the detailed proposals for the pound are needed, including uses, proposed hours of operation, visual screening, fencing, noise mitigation, lighting and other measures to be able to provide conclusive comments.</p>	N	<p>The construction of the Scheme would require a small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) to be used to for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities. Details of the other construction compounds required to construct the Scheme can be found Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) provide details on the proposed construction working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme.</p> <p>Working hours would be restricted to the following core hours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07.00 to 19.00 Monday to Friday • 07.00 to 13.30 Saturday • No Sunday working <p>Works outside of the core working hours are likely to be required in certain circumstances and would be carried out following consultation with Winchester City Council.</p> <p>The temporary compounds would also be subject to surface water drainage measures to avoid significant environmental effects. Such measures would include (refer to the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) for further details):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the amount of topsoil stripping where possible and soil stockpiles would be located as far from watercourses as practicable • Use of silt fences • Plant and wheel washing and haul road damping in designated areas

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plant to be re-fuelled in designated locations at a safe distance from water courses and good practise to be in place with relation to pollution prevention (adequate bunding, storage etc) Spill kits are to be positioned at strategic locations on site and thorough training provided for staff to ensure a rapid and effective response to any pollution incidents that occur on site Use of an Ecological Clerk of Works / Environmental Manager, along with toolbox talks and training to promote contractor awareness of pollution risks <p>The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited. Works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p>
Local community	Disagree with the necessity of the work given the overall destructive effect it will have.	N	This comment has been noted.
General commentary			
Local community	Thank you for listening to the comments of local residents for trying again to get it "right". I think this is an excellent, creative, 3-dimensional scheme which will make it safer for everyone who drives though M3 Junction 9. I like the proposed footpaths and cycleways too and think you have made great efforts to minimise environmental disruption.	N	The Applicant acknowledge the range of views expressed, including those in support of the Scheme.
Local community	I just wanted to say that this looks like a marvellous project to manifestly improve this junction (that should have been built like this originally - in the nineties was it! Any way better late than never. As usual you are doing your very best to deal with environmental issues. Unfortunately, also as usual, the eco people in various guises want to block/delay/change. As reported in the local media very recently. They are never happy - witness the A303 debacle	N	
Local community	Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme and the historical severance of the landscape. The Mitigation Design Plan contains very little detail on the mitigation and focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, I urge Highways England	Y	The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and net gain, aiming for at least 20% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>As part of this, I would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done.</p> <p>The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. I want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>I want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature's recovery in modern transport development.</p>		<p>Habitat provision set out on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to exiting habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Appendix 8.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) assesses that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Scheme would provide a net increase of approximately 9.6 ha of chalk grassland, which is appropriate to the local area. The protection and enhancement of this habitat is a key theme within the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i> (adopted July 2019) and has been a key theme within consultation responses from stakeholders. However, the use of this habitat type suppresses the overall result of the metric, due to risk factors associated with this habitat type. For example, if 'other neutral grassland' was provided in place of chalk grassland then the overall biodiversity net gain score for the Scheme would change from +4.14% to +14.93%. This demonstrates that the Scheme can comfortably deliver over 10% biodiversity net gain. However, whilst a change from chalk grassland to other neutral grassland would be technically feasible, given the wider benefits, chalk grassland has been taken forward as being most appropriate habitat for the Scheme.</p>
Local community	Please think again about the environmental impacts. You don't want another Twyford Down on your hands here. The environment must be considered alongside the proposals as key to them and not as something trivial as just the construction works alone.	N	This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.
Local community	It's too big. Too invasive on the local land and habitat. Stop.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	<p>Winnall Moor, the South Downs and River Itchen must be protected from further damage. The harm caused to these sites by The Junction 9 proposals is unacceptable, at a time when we need to be prioritising preventing the loss of such habitats and the species that use them.</p> <p>The preferred proposals for Junction 9 will cut off local communities from local resources and services. It will contribute to the fragmentation of the local landscape, impeding the movement of wildlife, thereby threatening the long-term projects for many species.</p>	N	<p>The objection to the Scheme has been noted.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapters 6 (Cultural Heritage), 7 (Landscape and Visual) and 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES assess the likely significant effects on designated sites such as the SAC / SSSI (including the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve and the River</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	Highways England should not proceed with these proposals as they currently exist.		Itchen), scheduled monuments and the South Downs National Park with mitigation developed through consultation with statutory consultees. Mitigation measures proposed to reduce likely significant effects are also included in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . The Scheme includes elements that either help ensure continued access for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders or bring improvements in terms of current accessibility / severance. The Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes.
Local community	Needs to be more environmentally sensitive. Talk to the Hampshire IOW national trust people who help manage some of the local areas which will be impacted. But with the pandemic, how many people commute less? Work from home more is there really a need? When I was commuting I loved traffic jams by j10/j11 - an opportunity at the right time of year to admire the orchids (only were perhaps 1 a month or so), but a positive!	N	The Applicant has engaged with the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust throughout the pre-application process.
Local community	I object to the scheme in its entirety. It is inappropriate because we are in a climate emergency and seeing much environmental and landscape loss.	N	The objection to the Scheme has been noted.
Local community	It is needed but really must come up to speed and take on board the considerable environmental concerns. We are in the 2020s not the 1980s	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The proposals are long overdue. What is currently proposed appears to be an improvement over the previous proposals. Further detailed information is needed to be able to comment more meaningfully - as a number of key areas are still subject to further detailed work and assessment, with mitigation currently not finalised. It is not currently possible to conclude on the extent to which the proposals comply with the relevant National Policy Statement	N	This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Further details on the mitigation proposed is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.
Local community	As a keen motorist, and a recent purchaser of a BEV, I find the proposal to carry out the works to be out of all proportion to the supposed benefits. The impact on	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>the wildlife and the atmosphere will be dire, if not catastrophic. It is bizarre that it is being pursued a matter of months before COP26.</p>		<p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors, including extreme weather events, in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations.</p>
Local community	<p>I do not think this should even go ahead. If we are to be serious about achieving net zero carbon emissions – and the government says it is even passing legislation to that effect – then we should not be encouraging yet more road use.</p> <p>Even if it does go ahead all we will have is an increased density of southbound cars reaching Twyford Down thus causing huge tailbacks. Whereas now we have a break in traffic caused by junction 9 which means we can negotiate the hill well even when there are numerous lorries joining the motorway on the upslope of the hill at junction 10. Those delays are, in my opinion, a benefit to the flow of traffic not a hindrance.</p> <p>Northbound is not currently a significant issue apart from the hill through Twyford Down which this development would not change other than potentially encouraging yet more traffic to use this route.</p> <p>As for the environmental impact. Words fail me.</p> <p>The Treasury commissioned the Dasgupta Review which was published earlier this year which even prompted the PM to state, “protecting and enhancing nature needs more than good intentions – it requires concerted, coordinated action. This year is critical in determining whether we can stop and reverse the concerning trend of fast-declining biodiversity.”</p> <p>This proposal does not appear to have taken this into any account at all.</p> <p>If this was someone’s homework, I would ask them to go away and do it again.</p>	Y	<p>The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published ‘The Road to Zero’ which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which sets out how the Scheme complies with national policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes the assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate. This chapter concludes that, when compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK’s 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK’s 5th and 6th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>isolation, would materially affect the UK's ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.</p> <p>Legislation is also covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current Scheme programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents the assessment of effects on biodiversity. The assessment identified a number of residual adverse and beneficial effects to biodiversity receptors predominantly during construction (as by operation effects would have been mitigated) including, European Designated Sites (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation), other statutory designated areas (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest), non-statutory designated areas, habitats, badgers, bats, hazel dormouse, otter, water vole, birds (breeding and over-wintering), reptiles, freshwater fish, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates and notable plants. Effects predicted were as a result of habitat loss and gain, fragmentation of populations / habitats, disturbance, habitat degradation, and species mortality. However, in all cases the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation during the construction and operation of the Scheme effects were predicted not significant</p> <p>The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. Opportunity for maximising biodiversity benefit has also been provided for with the use of scrub planting throughout the Scheme and species rich grasslands (including chalk grassland). Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Furthermore, the Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.
Local community	I do not believe there is need for any changes to the junction 9 changes on the M3. Encouraging extra road travel is a backwards step to a carbon neutral society so I would reject any planned changes. There is also no way that more roads makes any positive environmental difference. It will always be negative.	N	The objection to the Scheme has been acknowledged. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	<p>Traffic flows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed routing of the M3 and A34 appears to offer the opportunity of improved the traffic flows from M3 to A34 and from A34 to M3, with less risk of congestion. 2. The proposed routing of the A33 between the Cart & Horses junction and Winnall is improved compared to the previous proposal. The arrangement appears to offer a clearer route from Kings Worthy to Winnall and avoids joining the A34 and the queues that build up towards Jct 9 currently. This promises to make this route potentially easier to access the amenities just off junction 9. It also may offer a better option for people to access the new Sports & Leisure park, than driving through Winchester. If these assumptions prove correct this may reduce traffic flow along the Worthys Road and lower pressure at peak times on the City Rd junction in Winchester – we hope. 3. Referring to the A33 link to Jct 9, with one of the current lanes becoming a path, there will be changes to the A33 and how it flows through to the Cart & Horses junction. In addition, the new arrangement for accessing the M3 from Jct 9 will likely attract some proportion of drivers from areas such as Harestock, Kings Barton and Weeke, who will see the route through to the Cart & Horses Junction as the quickest route. This will add pressure on this junction which is a well-known trouble spot where priorities are ambiguous to many. The A33 junction with the London Rd/B3047 aka Cart & Horses junction, should be addressed within the overall scheme. <p>Cycling and walking</p> <p>I welcome that National Cycle route 23 will continue to be in place. This route is an important route for cyclists in Winchester to head east and for people who cycle to work from the east into Winchester. Steps should be taken to ensure that this route remains open and free from mud etc during construction.</p> <p>It is disappointing to see that the “path” between the Cart & Horses junction and Winnall has been downgraded to a walking only path from what was a</p>	N	<p><i>Response to environmental concerns:</i></p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, CO_{2e} emissions associated with the Scheme are reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Scheme has been designed using PAS 2080:2016 Carbon management in Infrastructure (British Standards Institute (BSI), 2016) to manage and reduce embodied carbon and has been iteratively updated to refine and improve the proposals in relation to a range of design requirements and criteria, including the consideration of sustainability, material use and construction efficiency. Recordings of the online webinars are available on the Scheme webpage.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>shared cycle/walking path in the previous proposal . The route proposed between the north & south bound carriageways of the A34 would be quite intimidating. Proximity to some traffic is inevitable, but better options are available, with zero or very marginal change in costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The path should be designated as a shared walking and cycle path. I'd have no objections to it being a bridleway, but I'd be surprised to see the horse riding community using it as such. The route is likely to be used by people using it to get between the Worthys & Winnall, and perhaps beyond, rather than as a nice leisurely walk. In addition to providing access to Winnall for people in the Worthys, this could link to other paths - current & future – to give a cycle route to the new Sports & Leisure complex. This route would be flatter than cycling along the Worthy Road. b. Routing – This shared path should be routed to minimise the proximity to the fastest traffic. The current routing of the past does the opposite. I can envisage two possible better routings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A path that runs alongside the north-bound A34 on the south side of the road, to join in with Nuns Walk. Nuns walk could be upgraded to a shared cycle path / footpath from the point where they join, into the Worthys. The Nuns walk route could be extended alongside the A34 all the way until this path meets the London Road in Headbourne Worthy. This would be a welcome improvement in amenity to residents in Headbourne Worthy ii. The shared path could be designed into to follow the same route between Winnall and the Cart & Horses Junction as the A33. This would use the same under-passes as the road. <p>There are pro's and con's to each of these two options, but both options are better than the route proposed"</p> <p>Noise mitigation</p> <p>A reduction in the frequency of major congestion between the A34 and the M3 at junction 9 will be welcomed by many from well beyond the Worthys and indeed for many in the Worthys. It is reasonable to anticipate that, on average, there will be an increase in road noise generated. One of the “benefits” of the Southbound A34 being jammed is that traffic speed is much reduced which reduces the noise levels which are intrusive for many who live in Headbourne Worthy and Kings Worthy either side of the A34. I'd particularly highlight residents of Willis Waye and The Dell, but there are plenty of others for whom noise levels are intense. The scheme plan should make clear what measure are being put in place to limit the noise levels to ensure that they do not increase and preferably that they decrease by at least 3dB – preferably more. I believe there are noise survey sensors in place in several back gardens in</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>some houses in Willis Way. The environmental services team at Winchester City council could provide details and data.</p> <p>Environmental concerns</p> <p>The webinars on this were scheduled for while I was on holiday, so I have been unable to get enough insight into these areas to make well informed comments. But it is clear that this project would be a major undertaking in a fragile environmental area. In addition, the volume of material used will have an associated impact in terms of CO2 and other emissions. It is critical that any impact is mitigated and that an “environmental” business case analogous to a financial business case is conducted.</p> <p>Consultation with public</p> <p>While I understand the approach chosen was done so to be able to navigate the restrictions placed on all of us by the Covid Pandemic, the On-Line consultation process is quite different to that which people are used to before, as exemplified by the consultation in Tubbs Hall, Kings Worthy for the previous iteration of the proposed junction. The Online process has some advantages for some people, but it could be onerous for many. Indeed, I was unable to attend any of the briefings on the mitigations of the environmental impact for example. Many people are unfamiliar with “online” meetings and many more still are not familiar enough to be able to get as much insight from the Online resources as they would from an “in person” consultation. Given that we have a significant easing of the Covid rules from 19th July 21, I strongly recommend that to ensure better stakeholder engagement, that a series of in person consultations be added into the process. While clearly, this will take time, it will pay back in terms of stakeholder engagement.</p>		
Local community	<p>This road scheme should not be built because the proposals are a legacy from the road building era which is adding to our global warming emissions.</p> <p>Last year the National Park launched its Nature plan with 12 Investment Areas - one of these is where Highways England proposes to build a £130 million road scheme! They will destroy and fragment important protected habitats. This scheme affects the local nature reserve, which is home to rare and notable wildlife, and a SSSI site. In a recent press release from your authority, your own Countryside Director and Ecologist Andrew Lee said “... the South Downs National Park has a crucial role to play to lead nature recovery and be the hub of an interconnected ‘nature network’.....”. The Highways England intrusion flies in the face of nature recovery.</p>	N	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with current and emerging national and local policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>I support the Hampshire and IoW Wildlife Trust’s proposal for a green bridge to the National Park would reunite wildlife habitats that became disconnected by the 1990s M3 construction.</p> <p>More roads equals more traffic - when a new road is built, new traffic will divert onto it. Many people may make new trips they would otherwise not make just because of new roads. This well-known and long-established effect is known as 'induced traffic'.</p> <p>The Highways England proposal will increase CO2 emissions by attracting more cars onto the roads! How are we going to meet the Government’s commitment to net zero emissions in less than 30 years with road schemes like this? Transport accounts for 30% of all CO2 emissions. It is likely that there will still be 40 million petrol and diesel cars and vans on the roads in 2030 pulse diesel HGV!</p> <p>The UK’s new climate target to cut our emissions by 78% by 2035 has now been put into law last month - the Highways England plan is out of step with this. As for nature, you have clearly never taken on board the Government's report by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta. He says, “Human demands on nature must be curbed” This statement is not in Highways England’s vocabulary. Neither have you paid any heed to the Government’s 25-year Environment Plan. The proposal does not include a landscape strategy.</p> <p>Please bear in mind the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this scheme.</p>		<p>Legislation, in relation to biodiversity net gain, is also covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current Scheme programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>A landscape strategy has been prepared for the Scheme. Details are provided in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP), within Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets (including the 6th Carbon Budget). This assessment is reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. This chapter concludes that, when compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK’s 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK’s 5th and 6th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in isolation, would materially affect the UK’s ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, in accordance with the DMRB LA 114 Climate, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.</p>
Local community	I strongly object to plans for M3 Junction 9. Road building is never the answer. We know that for sure now. Pollution and congestion increase. Biodiversity is lost. Total disaster.	N	The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.
Local community	I object strongly to this whole scheme. It has been shown repeatedly that the effect of road "improvements" is always to generate additional traffic. Therefore, on environmental grounds alone we should not be going ahead with this scheme. It is inevitable in addition that any speeding of traffic at this junction will transfer the bottleneck further along the A34.	N	
Local community	I am very disappointed with this second round of consultation - I have given all of my thoughts on this project once before, as have many local residents, and yet nothing has changed. Indeed, a majority of respondents to the last	N	The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>consultation were concerned about the environmental impacts. Why are you not listening to us?</p> <p>You are proposing to spend over £100m to make things worse - increase traffic, increase noise, increase pollutions, increase carbon emissions.</p> <p>The government, the Winchester and Eastleigh local councils, and Hampshire County Council have all declared a climate emergency and committed to reducing climate damaging carbon emissions significantly. The UK government is to host COP26 in the autumn, where it will further promise to reduce emissions. And yet Highways England continues to forge ahead with a massive road-building plan. I would like to see a detailed Climate Emergency Impact assessment which shows the likely increase in emissions.</p> <p>In Winchester a large proportion (60%) of emissions come from road transport and of these, 25% come from the motorway. Highways England propose to increase these by a third. This cannot be allowed to happen.</p> <p>There are many better ways to reduce the congestion at J9 such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing a network of fast Winchester District bus routes to encourage people to keep their cars off the M3 and leave them at home • Developing a network of bus feeder services at Southampton Airport Station for onward connections to Winchester and Basingstoke • Building a railway station at North Whiteley • Building a district-wide safe cycle network • Increasing the capacity of the railway line through Winchester, so it can play a greater part in catering for those commuting into Winchester, especially from the Solent area • Improving frequency and connections on the whole of the south Hampshire rail network • Electrifying the railway line from Didcot to Birmingham and Nuneaton to encourage the transfer of lorry traffic to low carbon low energy goods train services from Southampton Docks to national distribution points in the Midlands • Developing a rail-connected goods distribution hub in the north Solent area (Eastleigh or Micheldever?) to divert traffic to proposed rail-based distribution networks. <p>Please call a halt to this awful project. It will not help, and it will continue to have damaging repercussions for many decades.</p>		<p>Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors, including extreme weather events, in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate.</p> <p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations') and in consultation with the relevant local planning authorities and statutory environmental bodies. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p>
South Downs Network	Objection	Y	The Applicant acknowledges South Downs Network's objection to the Scheme. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The South Downs Network objects to the proposed M3 Junction 9 Development in its present form.</p> <p>Executive Summary: Move over to Sustainable Transport</p> <p>We respectfully suggest that this £180+ million road scheme should be referred back to be replaced by a sustainable transport version that will help us meet our climate change commitments, providing better bus services, bus and rail infrastructure, integrated green cycle and walking routes, safe crossing for active travel, green (car free) bridges, safer paths for access to schools and access to rail stations.</p> <p>Secretary of State for Transport guidance</p> <p>We would take this opportunity to remind Highways England of the words used by the Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps when launching the Government's 'Decarbonising Transport: Setting the Challenge,' said in the foreword that: "public transport and active travel will be the natural first choice for our daily activities" and that "We will use our cars less and be able to rely on a convenient, cost-effective and coherent public transport network".</p> <p>More roads - more traffic</p> <p>More roads equals more traffic - when a new road is built, new traffic will divert onto it. Many people may make new trips they would not otherwise make just because of new roads. This well-known and long-established effect is known as 'induced traffic'</p> <p>Increase of emissions and global warming gases</p> <p>The Highways England proposal will increase CO2 emissions by attracting more cars onto the roads! Highways England's own report admits a significant increase in carbon emissions as a result of the project - some 534,628 tonnes of CO2 for user emissions. This doesn't include the emissions from the construction which doesn't seem to be reported on.</p> <p>How are we going to meet the Government's commitment to net zero emissions in less than 30 years with road schemes like this? Highways England say the project will be completed in 2026 so the timeline is even shorter at less than 25 years to achieve net zero! Wouldn't it be better to cancel the project and spend the £180 million on sustainable transport solutions?</p> <p>In 2020 transport accounted for 29.8% of all CO2 emissions. The majority is from road transport! How can Highways England advance a road scheme that will actively increase CO2 emissions?</p>		<p>7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>Response in relation to the PEIR:</p> <p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations') and in consultation with the relevant local planning authorities and statutory environmental bodies. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>Specifically, Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the effects on designations, habitats and species during construction and operation of the Scheme and has been developed in consultation with stakeholders including Natural England. The assessment identified a number of residual adverse and beneficial effects to biodiversity receptors predominantly during construction (as by operation effects would have been mitigated) including, European Designated Sites (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation), other statutory designated areas (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest), non-statutory designated areas, habitats, badgers, bats, hazel dormouse, otter, water vole, birds (breeding and over-wintering), reptiles, freshwater fish, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates and notable plants. Effects predicted were as a result of habitat loss and gain, fragmentation of populations / habitats, disturbance, habitat degradation, and species mortality. However, in all cases the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation during the construction and operation of the Scheme effects were predicted not significant.</p> <p>Response in relation to previous environmental damage:</p> <p>The Applicant has received several comments in relation to the impacts on the Twyford Down. The suggestions put forward by consultees are not within the scope of this application and have therefore not been considered.</p> <p>This DCO application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>It is likely that there will still be 40 million petrol and diesel cars and vans on the roads in 2030 pulse diesel HGVs!</p> <p>The UK's new climate target to cut our emissions by 78% by 2035 was passed into law in June 2021 - the Highways England plan is out of step with this. The proposal does not include a landscape strategy. Road developments are not excluded from the UK's legally adopted climate commitment. The UK Government has a commitment to tackle climate change.</p> <p>Nature</p> <p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation Design Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that this design plan consists of just one page! We are concerned that there is no landscape strategy or detailed plan. The Mitigation Design Plan contains simply focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, we urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and biodiversity net gain. As part of this, we would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done. The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. We want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</p> <p>Whilst the actual road design plan seems to be very firm there seems to be a lack of commitment by Highways England to the environment, an EIA and a landscape and biodiversity/habitats plan. Words such as 'ongoing' and "is being developed" keep cropping up. One gets the impression that the natural world is not important to Highways England.</p> <p>We are concerned that Highways England seemed to be avoiding a commitment to the production of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). In Para 1.5.4 of the PEIR Highways England says "It should be noted that at this stage the information is preliminary. An iterative process of scheme development and EIA is ongoing". Surely a draft EIA should be available for public consultation now, and not be delayed until the DCO</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>application? Indeed there seems to be a fudging of the commitment even at that stage to the production of an EIA. Highways England says “The final EIA work will be reported in the ES.”</p> <p>Indeed further fudging of commitment to environmental assessment is contained in the response to Natural England's submission of 9 November 2020. They highlighted that the impact of emissions to designated ecological sites is required. Highways England response was "Ongoing EIA work will include the assessment of the impacts of emissions from traffic on designated habitats."</p> <p>Avoiding say yes to Natural England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England said “The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies.” Highways England said “ongoing EIA work is to be reported.” • Natural England said they would welcome the opportunity to comment on the landscape, biodiversity and access enhancement plan. Highways England responded “A biodiversity and landscaping mitigation package is being developed.” But when? • Natural England advised that “the potential impact of the proposal upon features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for habitat creation/enhancement should be included within this assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance on such matters.” Highways England responded ""The Biodiversity chapter of the ES will identify all potential impacts on identified biodiversity features"" Further fudging." <p>SDNPA Nature Investment Areas</p> <p>The road site is where the South Downs National Park has identified one of its 12 nature investment areas. These nature recovery areas are part of a hub of an interconnected ‘nature network.’ The Highways England intrusion flies in the face of nature recovery and will destroy and fragment important protected habitats. This scheme affects the local nature reserve which is home to rare and notable wildlife, and a SSSI site.</p> <p>Previous environmental damage</p> <p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust’s nature reserve at St Catherine’s Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally. "</p> <p>SSSI and Special Area of Conservation</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network.</p> <p>Government Environmental Policy</p> <p>Highways England need to take on board Government policy on the environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government's Final Report of the Independent Review on the Economics of Biodiversity led by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta. Amongst other things he says "Human demands on nature must be curbed • We say - road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government 'Dasgupta Review' says, 'Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).' We should no longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to urbanisation pressures. • Also please bear in mind the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this scheme. <p>Green Bridge</p> <p>We support the Hampshire and IoW Wildlife Trust's proposal for a green bridge to the National Park which would reunite wildlife habitats that became disconnected by the 1990s M3 construction.</p> <p>We want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature's recovery despite modern transport development.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Spoil</p> <p>The Highways England report says “We have not yet completed our junction design, so we do not know exactly how much material may need to be placed in these areas, or whether we will need all three areas”. Surely after at least two and a half years of preparation such civil engineering detail should be known? The amount of spoil will affect the landscape design. This should be known now; before Highways England applies for a Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>2019 consultation</p> <p>We have serious concerns about the previous stages of public consultations.</p> <p>Highways England says “There was a high level of support for the Proposed Scheme”. “We received 526 responses to our consultation”. Other than a few meaningless and valueless paragraphs the Public Consultation Summary Report does not provide any substantive information on exactly what those 526 respondents said. What organisations responded and what did they say? How many of the 526 comments were from individual members of the public. How many were car, commercial and HGV vehicle owners/drivers? Did horse riding, walking and cycling groups respond? Indeed were they invited to respond?</p> <p>References are made to ‘stakeholders.’ It is understood they were invited to workshops to give their input. Exactly who were they? and how were they selected? We hope it wasn't a question of selecting the appropriate stakeholders so that it assisted in giving the right answer to suit Highways England.</p> <p>Walking and Cycling Proposals Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that there is little substance to walking and cycling provision. The plan just consists of one page. There seems to be very little reference to provision for horse riders.</p> <p>Walkers, cyclists and horse riders to be put in a ‘subway’! Underground? Highways England say “On both sides of the motorway, the existing walking and cycling route links both parts of Easton Lane, which would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders will be improved with a widened 3m route, which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway...”</p> <p>This is unacceptable. This proposal is fraught with all sorts of problems. Who is going to police the subway to ensure the safety of users? Who will maintain it and how will it be lit? Will there be security cameras? Will there be traffic separation to ensure safety of different users such as horse riders and cyclists?</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Instead of hiding these active travel users away below ground highways England should provide a green bridge out in the fresh air above the pollution from the motorway style road.</p> <p>In any event Highways England should ensure that cycle provision is compliant with Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20 Published last year by the Government.</p> <p>Highways England must take account of latest Government policy</p> <p>The business case for this project should be rewritten taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Gov policy paper - A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment (pub Jan 2018) • DfT's policy paper - Decarbonising transport: setting the challenge (pub March 2020) • UK Gov policy paper: Gear change: a bold vision for cycling and walking • UK Gov policy paper: Bus Back Better: national bus strategy for England 		
Winchester Friends of the Earth	<p>2021 Response</p> <p>This is another formal objection to the scheme in its entirety. It has no place in any sane world. It consumes unrennewable resources; it is unsustainable; it is socially exclusive and economically regressive; it contributes directly to global warming; it destroys landscapes and habitats; it poisons the air and kills people; it has negative economic consequences; it destroys proper public transport dispositions; it has no transport sense, no planning sense, no moral sense.</p> <p>Ironically, beyond all it does the opposite of what it claims to achieve – it does not remove congestion in the network as a whole, because it generates traffic; it does not save time because it merely disperses (Metz effect) the same activities over ever greater distances, consuming ever greater resources. Of course HE personnel must know this, but it is in their interest to always create work for themselves that generates more work for themselves.</p> <p>We are not going to waste any more of our time on the Kafkaesque futility of trying to talk rationality to Highways England. We have had too much experience of how the agency treats consultation processes and the distance between the agency's behaviour and any normal form of truthful discourse, to think that anything anybody says that does not map to HE's ambitions or intentions, will be listened to or analysed in any way whatsoever.</p>	Y	<p>The range of views expressed by Winchester Friends of the Earth, including their objection to the Scheme, have been noted.</p> <p><i>Public consultation</i></p> <p>The planning regime established by the Planning Act 2008 places a significant importance on pre-application consultation. The Applicant has encouraged a range of stakeholders, including the local community, those with an interest in the land, local authorities and statutory consultees, to express their views on the Scheme through non-statutory engagement, non-statutory consultation and statutory consultation activities. The main stages of the Applicant's pre-application consultation is described in Table 2.1 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1).</p> <p>The Applicant developed its consultation strategy for the 2021 statutory consultation with Winchester City Council, South Downs National Park Authority and Hampshire County Council (see Chapter 10 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) for further details). Due to the uncertainties posed by COVID-19, the Applicant adopted a digital first approach to the 2021 statutory consultation. In addition to digital methods, the Applicant endeavoured to consult using traditional methods, where safe and practical to do so, including using post and telephone communications methods. The Applicant also sought to provide further publicity and promotion of the 2021 statutory consultation prior to its commencement, including posting and maintaining 15 site notices at key locations around the Application Boundary, parking an 'Engagement Van' outside local venues and placing posters in local venues and newspapers. Paper copies of the consultation documents could also be requested.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>We respond now only for the reason that we cannot be accused in the future of tacitly agreeing with such irresponsible projects. We will have a locus standi for any examination in public that may take place, though we note how major infrastructure projects in this country are subject to less and less scrutiny and less and less public (cross) examination of evidence. But well beyond that rubber-stamping process, it is necessary that we show to future generations, who will gape in disbelief at what government and HE did to them, that some people told the truth at the time.</p> <p>Our formal objection reiterates our formal objection to the 2018 and 2019 'consultations'. We simply note that our predictions about how HE would treat the 2019 responses is entirely borne out by the latest M3 Junction 9 Improvements Public Consultation Summary Report – no analysis of points raised, no arguments to counter the objections. And so it goes on. Highways England have learned nothing and forgotten nothing in the last 50 years. They seem to believe they live on a different planet from the rest of us, so they simply don't care what they do to our planet.</p> <p>2019 Response</p> <p>We wish to record (again) our objection to this scheme in its entirety.</p> <p>We hesitate to repeat the arguments we made in our submission to the consultation process last year except to say that we stand by them completely and world events and even government policy have so far moved on that the force of such arguments must be indisputable now even to the most blinkered purveyors of old-fashioned transport thinking.</p> <p>2018 CONSULTATION</p> <p>We also wish to put on record, for whatever rubber-stamping Examination in Public will take place for this scheme, that we regard the 2018 consultation as a travesty of process. Not only has Highways England assumed that the input from environmental groups with hundreds of members in the District should be tallied up in its superficial consultation arithmetic, as if each group were a single individual, but all argument against the scheme in principle has been entirely suppressed in the report on Public Consultation.</p> <p>We know that nothing we said gets mentioned at all unless it is imagined that those concerns can be disposed of by the following statements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 61% are concerned with environmental impacts of the scheme (Executive Summary) 2. Concern over environmental impacts – 10 respondents (Q11); 5 respondents Q15) 3. General comments on wider roads/Winchester city centre (Q13) 		<p>It is therefore considered that the Applicant made all reasonable endeavours to consult the community within the context of COVID-19 restrictions.</p> <p>Chapters 5, 9 and 12 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) provides an overview of the relevant responses received to the 2018 consultation, the 2019 consultation and the 2021 statutory consultation, respectively, and provides summary of how the Scheme has developed because of the responses received.</p> <p><i>Need for the Scheme</i></p> <p>M3 Junction 9 currently experiences a high level of congestion and delay with poor journey time reliability. Projected development of the region's ports is anticipated to substantially increase heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements and as demand for freight grows, existing congestion on the M3 and A34 is likely to worsen. The need for the Scheme is presented in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1). This report concludes that there is a strong need case for the Scheme in order to address the significant existing congestion and road safety issues on the M3. While it is recognised that great weight is attached to conserving the South Downs National Park, it is also considered that addressing the existing road safety issues and removing an impediment to strategic economic growth is in the public interest.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) presents an assessment of how the Scheme complies with the Scheme objectives. It is considered that the Scheme performs well when assessed against the Scheme objectives, as described in Table 3.1 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1).</p> <p>This document also outlines the economic appraisal of the Scheme and presents the expected benefits and disbenefits associated with the Scheme (see Section 5 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) for further details). In summary, the results of the transport economic analysis indicate that the Scheme is forecast to generate economic benefits, with the greatest benefit relating to travel time savings, which are predominantly due to the provision of the free-flow movement between the A34 and the M3. The accident assessment indicated a predicted reduction in accidents and corresponding monetised benefits. The full economic appraisal is provided in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10).</p> <p><i>Traffic and transport</i></p> <p>The transport case for the Scheme is set out in Section 4 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and details of the traffic impacts are presented in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13). These documents display that the traffic on a number of local roads within Winchester City are predicted to decrease.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>4. Environmental Impacts of proposed junction; air pollution; noise pollution; River Itchen (Q15)</p> <p>Nothing at all about the climate impact; nothing at all about how this scheme clashes with SACTRA; nothing at all about the economic unreality of it; nothing at all about the ineffectiveness of any road building on reducing overall congestion. Yet these things were raised and not just by us - we know of at least one other group making similar points.</p> <p>HE may not agree with what we said, but that is no excuse for not addressing the points made. If it thinks we are wrong then it should say how we are wrong. Simply ignoring environmental and economic truths has always been the Highways England or Highways Agency way. It is lazy and dishonest and not the less disgraceful because we are habituated to it.</p> <p>2019 CONSULTATION</p> <p>Since the 2018 consultation was entirely phoney in its tendentious format and its ludicrously trivial pretence at analysis, we must expect the current 'consultation' to be equally dishonest in intention and that its results will be equally biased or trivialised in its interpretation. But we have to be able to say that we responded, even if our response will be entirely ignored by HE.</p> <p>OBJECTIVES</p> <p>The (standard) objectives are declared to be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. improve safety as a result of a reduction in delays and queue lengths 2. support economic growth by unlocking development capacity for jobs, business and housing creation 3. reduce congestion and increase journey time reliability 4. improve the environment by reducing adverse noise, improving air quality and making sure there is no net loss to biodiversity 5. improve accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders. <p>As always Highways England carelessly state these objectives with an intimation that the scheme will actually achieve them or is even designed to achieve them. But they either know this is not true or they offer no evidence that they might be true. We've gone over this time and again to continuing silence from HE.</p> <p>Does the scheme improve safety?</p> <p>There is no evidence for this. The Department for Transport (DfT) has been asked for proof of accident benefit and it has never provided it. It has never researched the safety aspects of road building. The 'cost-benefit analysis' of</p>		<p><i>Environmental impacts assessment</i></p> <p>This application is also accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p><i>Air quality</i></p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the operation of the Scheme on air quality. The assessment confirms that the Scheme's operation does not have a significant air quality impact and does not affect reported compliance with the Air Quality Regulations.</p> <p><i>Noise</i></p> <p>An operational noise assessment has been undertaken and the findings are presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Figures 11.19 to 11.22 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The Scheme objectives include consideration to reduce the number of households adversely affected by noise. Furthermore, to comply with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the Scheme must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; 2. Mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and 3. Contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effect management and control of noise, where possible <p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) also sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The Scheme design includes the earth embankments and low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid.</p> <p><i>Biodiversity</i></p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents the findings of an assessment of the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. The assessment identified a number of residual adverse and beneficial effects to biodiversity receptors predominantly during construction (as by operation effects</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>road schemes usually assumes a benefit on the basis that the average accident rate (i.e. the probability of an accident per vehicle per mile) for a motorway, for example, is lower than that for a lower class of road. Even this assumption is dodgy – Newbury bypass was predicted to reduce fatalities on the corridor by 47%, but within 5 years fatalities had increased by 67%.</p> <p>But the DfT have never attempted to measure the changes in overall accidents in the network away from a scheme itself that may arise from speed habits on fast roads spilling into the rest of the network from junctions and will arise from the induction (see below) of new traffic across the whole network. Cross-correlation of national casualties and accident data with mileage of trunk road built actually seems to suggest that building roads tends to increase the accidents and their consequences.</p> <p>Does the scheme reduce delays and queue lengths?</p> <p>This is the same question as the congestion question below. The assumption is that congestion relief should only be measured at the locality of the scheme – it does not take account of the overall contribution to congestion in the network of the diversion, suppression relief and induction effects on other roads (or even at other sectors of the same road).</p> <p>Does the scheme support economic growth by unlocking development capacity for jobs, business and housing creation?</p> <p>This is highly contentious, not least because with the £100billion or so given to road building over the last 50 years, the DfT has never once spent money researching whether there is a net economic benefit to the nation from the projects. It is too complicated to go into here, but Winchester MP Steve Brine was challenged to get the DfT to provide evidence of such research and while it responded with many documents of a highly circular nature (assuming economic benefit in order to demonstrate it), it provided not a shred of real evidence to support its case. Also the case has been made that roadbuilding has the opposite effect to that claimed – this was made as a submission to the Transport Select Committee and later sent several times to the DfT and never answered or refuted.</p> <p>Essentially the problem of DfT’s economic analysis lies in the fact that motoring and road freight massively externalise their costs (pollution, policing, accidents etc., not to mention climate costs) – a subsidy that amounts to around 3 times the total tax take on the activity. Economic benefit to the nation cannot be construed as arising from reducing the costs of a highly subsidised activity</p> <p>Unlocking development opportunity is also a highly suspect concept.</p>		<p>would have been mitigated) including, European Designated Sites (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation), other statutory designated areas (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest), non-statutory designated areas, habitats, badgers, bats, hazel dormouse, otter, water vole, birds (breeding and over-wintering), reptiles, freshwater fish, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates and notable plants. Effects predicted were as a result of habitat loss and gain, fragmentation of populations / habitats, disturbance, habitat degradation, and species mortality. However, in all cases the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation during the construction and operation of the Scheme effects were predicted not significant.</p> <p>Impacts from dust during the construction phase and emissions from vehicles (NO2) during construction as well as emission from the operational phase have been taken into account in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) with regard to nitrogen deposition.</p> <p>The Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is also considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.</p> <p><i>Climate</i></p> <p>The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published ‘The Road to Zero’ which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase in emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Certainly roads bring development with them, usually of a very unenvironmental nature (megasheds, out of town shopping etc.), but it is not demonstrated that this does not suck activity out of more human-centred communities.</p> <p>The housing argument is even more concerning.</p> <p>Roads-based housing development means car-based communities. It always means green-field development instead of traditional town-centre renewal. For example West Wiltshire housing growth is entirely based around development of the A350 road – the road justifies the housing on green-field sites and the housing justifies the road and public transport is almost non-existent – yet the neighbouring town centres of Trowbridge and Westbury are in decay despite sitting on the investment-starved railway from Southampton to Bournemouth.</p> <p>Does it reduce congestion?</p> <p>This is the big claim and HE knows that it is false.</p> <p>Reassignment can lead to new congestion or new polluting activity on roads where this more important (e.g. central Winchester). HE haven't bothered to model traffic reassignment through Winchester presumably on the grounds that they think it doesn't matter.</p> <p>Desuppression will mean motor journeys that would have been deterred by congestion become available - e.g. shopping at Tesco from across Winchester could occur more often (for the same economic activity) because the previous congestion on Easton Lane might have prevented this shorter journey previously.</p> <p>Modal shift is a special sort of desuppression – e.g. journeys made by public transport revert to car journeys or freight moving by rail will move back to road.</p> <p>Induction – journeys that have never been made or imagined, but which become possible as a result of capacity increase. The DfT denied this reality for years but finally conceded it following the SACTRA report. After that the DfT became fond of asserting that building roads therefore offers new opportunities, which is a benefit to the road user. Obviously new opportunities for car journeys means new opportunities to burn carbon. But there is also good reason to believe that an entirely different and even more undesirable thing happens.</p> <p>How will congestion be affected by this scheme?</p>		<p>emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate. The Scheme is estimated to lead to an increase in CO_{2e} emissions over a 60-year operational period. It is considered that the emissions from the scheme in isolation would not have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon budgets.</p> <p><i>Cycling</i></p> <p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length <p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the provision of National Cycle Network Route 23. On both sides of the gyratory (east and west), the existing walking and cycling route which links both parts of Easton Lane, would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. The existing provision for horse-riders is being retained, and as part of the Scheme would be improved with a widened 3m route (with 4m wide underpasses), which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway to enable rider dismounting for leading horses through to continue the route to the existing bridleway extent (which currently ceases within the existing roundabout).</p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway, footpath and cycle track for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Tesco's situated on Easton Lane. The route runs parallel to the west of the A33 with the route to be constructed within the existing verge. A signalised (unlit) Toucan crossing is proposed adjacent to the proposed National Highways depot roundabout, to provide</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Reassignment: We do not know what reassignment effects will occur since Highways England do not have a detailed traffic model to tell us. So reassignment could increase or decrease traffic elsewhere on the network, within Winchester or outer settlements. Whatever effects there were would likely happen very soon after the scheme was in place.</p> <p>Desuppression: HE has not revealed whether it has any idea what motor trips are being suppressed or whether the level of current congestion would imply significant suppression. The claim is that the congestion is significant so that significant suppression might be expected. Removal of congestion would result in suppressed trips taking place, but since this would involve a change of habits one might expect a slower response than with reassignment.</p> <p>Modal shift: There is likely to be a significantly elastic response to congestion relief on the strategic corridors, both for commuter traffic and road freight. The growth of rail commuting to London and the M4 employment corridor must have taken place against the competing dynamics of road commuting. Increasing road capacity would naturally shift the balance between these modes. One imagines a fairly swift reaction to this – perhaps over a year or so (and the annual biasing of the choice by greater-than-inflation rail fare rises). Over the last decade rail freight from Southampton to the Midlands has grown very significantly. The reason freight operators move from highly subsidised (i.e. cost-externalised) road infrastructure to rail (more commercially priced and with far fewer externalities) seems likely to be about time (driver costs) and reliability (delivery commitments). If cheap roads are accompanied by lower time costs the balance will be tilted towards reversing the modal change of recent years. The pace of this change may be over the same sort of timescale as the modal shift we have seen recently – and it will eventually peter out as the congestion on the road increases again through growth of all traffic and especially the planned (and HE-encouraged) growth of imports to Southampton docks.</p> <p>Induction: Trips being made possible that were not thought of before. This would include trips to new or expanded destinations (e.g. the planned expansion of Southampton Airport) or more distant destinations (see Metz below) for the same functionality (e.g. a leisure day-trip from Farnborough to Winchester might extend itself to the New Forest). Induced traffic takes some time to build up, but perhaps not so slowly as one imagines. The Newbury Bypass increased A34 traffic at twice the rate of that in the surrounding county and within 8 years of its completion traffic levels in Newbury, that it was meant to relieve, had returned to pre-bypass levels.</p> <p>Overall congestion?</p>		<p>a link to this route through the north-western side of the gyratory roundabout. The route then transitions to utilise the existing A34 northbound and A33 carriageways which are to be abandoned as part of the Scheme. The existing informal link to the existing PRow would also be upgraded from its connection to the A33. For the first River Itchen crossing (i.e. most northern), the route follows the existing A33 and is accommodated on the existing bridge deck abandoned carriageway.</p> <p>For the second river crossing (i.e. most southern), the Scheme includes a new cycle/footbridge to be constructed across the River Itchen, with the route extending south along the east of the new A34 alignment, crossing under the A34 in a new 4m wide subway which would then traverse around new attenuation basins, then progressing to the existing depot junction and towards NCN 23 via a new subway under the northern arm of the gyratory roundabout.</p> <p>An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>When John Prescott finally shut down Mrs Thatcher’s great road building binge (Roads to Prosperity) around 1998, he pointed out that £70B of road expansion had resulted in increased overall congestion of the nation’s roads. He famously stated that ‘You can’t build your way out of congestion’ – a lesson that DfT has spectacularly unlearned.</p> <p>Does it improve journey time reliability?</p> <p>Well this depends on what is meant. Until induction, desuppression and modal shift bring back the congestion it is reasonable to suppose that there will be some increase in journey time reliability on the trunk roads in question. Nothing can be said about the effects on journey times across the rest of the network arising from the traffic induction or any of the other results of decongesting the trunk roads. But this criterion of success has another side to it:</p> <p>METZ: Does roadbuilding save journey time?</p> <p>That it does save journey time is the central plank of road economic appraisal. It is primarily why the DfT claims that road building is economically beneficial and it does so through a highly elaborate mechanism of counting millions of small time savings and declaring that people value those time savings enough that the sum of them outweighs the cost of building and maintaining the road. That this whole process is fraudulent is examined in footnote 1. But the fundamental time-saving premise is itself false.</p> <p>David Metz demonstrated the falsity of it by showing that for all the roadbuilding that was supposed to save time, the individual average motorist spent the same amount of his/her life driving as before – he/she simply drove further.</p> <p>It is not hard to see what this signifies. The DfT will claim that these extra miles amount to the realisation of greater opportunities. But to do what? Have we really got greater opportunities for leisure or shopping or employment or health service by travelling further towards them? Or isn’t the reality that these trip ends move further away from us? Shops in villages and towns move further away to out-of-town locations (taking them and their economies of scale out of the reach of the poorer car-less part of the population); housing locates away from facilities; longer distance commuting replaces local work; hospitals amalgamate at greater distances from population; the efficiency and social cohesion of urban population with local facilities is replaced by the entropic distribution of population and activity that characterises much of transatlantic society.</p> <p>Does it improve the environment by reducing noise?</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>We all know this is an old lie. The noise footprint of the M3 crossing the Itchen Valley between Hockley and Compton is far greater than it was 30 years ago both on urban Winchester and Twyford. The noise of both the A34 and the M3 in urban Winchester is almost unavoidable now – yet the Highways Agency said that it would be much reduced with the Twyford Down construction. The removal of the old bypass has led to the recovery of a visual downland scene of value but the real enjoyment of it on St Catherine’s Hill can only be reserved for the deaf.</p> <p>The claim appears to be centred on the notion that relief of congestion means that free-flowing traffic is less noisy, but this is largely due to an assumption that noise is primarily engine noise. Tyre noise is now the far greater contributor and free-flow actually increases that for the same number of journeys. And, of, course, traffic growth that results from the scheme simply multiplies the overall noise.</p> <p>Does it improve the environment by improving air quality?</p> <p>This is an absurd claim of the HE. For one thing it has no real information on air pollution resulting from the existing road. It relies on the most over-simplified diffusion modelling process imaginable, that has no prospect of saying what happens in urban streets (or even the leisure centre being built at Bar End) as a result of the increased traffic on the M3 and A34. The argument that congested traffic is more polluting is a simplistic one since we do not know what the average prevailing congestion is. If the overall average speed of flow goes up from 50mph to 70mph there could be an increase in pollution (certainly an increase in carbon emission). And the traffic growth resulting from the removal of the congestion will likely outweigh any savings from reducing the pollution from crawling traffic and eventually the system will congest again at a greater volume of traffic.</p> <p>We do not know the extent of the likely traffic increase across central Winchester, because HE has not bothered to model it. But it is likely to add to the air pollution problem in the places where it is currently at its worst, most lethal and most illegal. In any case HE has no way of estimating what these effects will be.</p> <p>Does it improve the environment by ensuring no loss of biodiversity?</p> <p>We have no idea what this assertion means. We know that the scheme impinges on an SSSI in the Winnall Moors. Network connectivity is a big determinant in whether species can survive or perish through isolation. Big roads prevent the crossing of species such as bats and butterflies. Watercourse pollution from carriageways is normally reasonably intercepted provided the structures are properly maintained. Nitrate deposition from vehicle</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>emissions is a significant threat to both the important downland turf and the chalk stream habitats.</p> <p>Does it improve accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders?</p> <p>Yes it probably does briefly, but no credit is due to HE for this. The reason that J9 is so difficult to cross (for access to Easton, Avington etc.) for cyclists is because Highways England deliberately made it so only a few years ago by increasing the existing roundabout capacity, bringing the traffic much closer to the cyclists and forcing them to dismount . They consciously compromised the National Cycle Route to achieve that earlier capacity increase.</p> <p>CLIMATE EMERGENCY:</p> <p>Highways England appears to inhabit a different planet from the rest of us. The government has declared a Climate Emergency, both the District and County Councils have declared a Climate Emergency. There is a Climate Emergency. Even though it makes some questionably optimistic assumptions, the Science and Technology Select Committee has just reported: In the long-term, widespread personal vehicle ownership therefore does not appear to be compatible with significant decarbonisation. The Government should not aim to achieve emissions reductions simply by replacing existing vehicles with lower-emissions versions.</p> <p>It spells out that this means getting out of our cars. The ‘long-term’ apparently signifies by 2035 “at the latest”. 16 years from today! And of course this M3 scheme will be appraised in the usual way by inventing time savings over 60 years, several decades after the planet has passed its tipping point. Why are we all wasting our time responding to the absurdity of consultations like this? If Highways England is incapable of discerning reality in the world today then the agency should be closed down and the management of the essential changes to our road network and its use should be put into the hands of those who can understand what is needed.</p> <p>2018 Response</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>This is an objection to this scheme, as a waste of public money at a time of continuing austerity and near-breaking-point pressures on health, social and educational services. It is worse than a waste of money since it makes the world a worse place, increasing pressures on climate, remaining mineral resources and the quality of the air we breathe, contributing more and more to landscape and biodiversity loss, diminishing of natural amenity and</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>encouraging inactive lifestyles with long-term health disbenefit. It is worse than a waste of money because it is based on a false assertion of economic benefit.</p> <p>The scheme is represented as solving a local problem of congestion, yet it ignores the consequences here and elsewhere of the traffic it induces. It ultimately solves no problem but creates bigger ones. It fails to assess its pollution consequences or its effect on the traffic within Winchester City.</p> <p>We do not comment on the options presented since our position is that Do Nothing is the only proper fall-back if the Department for Transport cannot bring itself to move away from its last-Millennium policy direction.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Almost exactly twenty six years ago, the then Highways Agency (HA) began the destruction of Twyford Down and the ruination of the Itchen Valley at Hockley. It systematically wiped out or severely marred five designations of so-called protection, ancient monuments, SSSIs and one of the most important landscapes in southern England. It brought traffic growth to the streets of Winchester; it left the City and its valley landscape with an insistent background of noise; it made the last western rampart of the South Downs, looking down on to the ancient capital of England (which ought to have been one of the glories of the National Park) a place of noise and visual intrusion; it blocked the waters of the Itchen Navigation, leaving it a soggy ditch; it brought air pollution to the south east of the City. Beyond Winchester it brought the noise and pollution of the traffic it generated to the southern towns and villages and into Southampton; it generated the traffic that has so much worsened the acoustic environment in the New Forest.</p> <p>The Highways Agency made promises of traffic reduction in Winchester – broken; it made promises to reduce traffic noise in Winchester – manifestly not kept; it made a promise to connect the Navigation to the Itchen at the railway viaduct – it cynically breached the banks to allow the waters to drain off through multiple channels across the water meadows; it made promises of restoring the old A33 to recreational land in mitigation for the loss of Twyford Down – it (or rather the Department for Transport [DfT] its masters) then allowed the City Council and the County Council to build car parks over significant chunks of it.</p> <p>The assault of the Highways Agency on Twyford Down and the Itchen Valley was almost certainly the key starting event in the great road protests of the early-to-mid 1990s. These protests led to a profound questioning of the whole Roads to Prosperity programme and an almost complete retrenchment. By the end of the millennium those who cared for the state of the environment were beginning to feel some encouragement that, at long last, central government</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>was taking seriously the dire consequences of road transport for planetary health.</p> <p>An Argument Won – But Ignored</p> <p>The case against large-scale road-building was seemingly made irrefutable. The SACTRA report (1994) officially put paid to HA’s ridiculous assertion that road-building merely diverted traffic into more suitable channels, but clearly showed what everyone else in the world knew, that roads induce traffic – journeys that would not have been made otherwise. The DfT was quick to assert an economic benefit from this (new opportunity), though it did not go so far as to add this supposed benefit to its spurious appraisal methodology. But this was entirely to miss the point. By this time the carbon demands of the ‘Great Car Economy’ were also clearly apparent to even the most environmentally blinkered. It was clear then that, despite the improved carbon balance arising from the collapse of the coal industry and the move to hydrocarbon power sources, our international commitments on Climate Change were not going to be honoured. Even with the very welcome wide-scale adoption of renewable power generation, we are still not on course to meet our commitments and transport (both road and aviation) is increasingly seen as one of the major threats to planetary stability. The pretence of the DfT that the growth of traffic that it forecasts (and does its best to bring about) is planetarily sustainable (because road vehicles will be increasingly electric and increasingly efficient) shows an extraordinary failure to understand the physical limits of a finite world, the carbon cost of vehicle production and other elementary economic factors such as ‘rebound’.</p> <p>Another study punched a hole in the HA’s contention that road-building reduced journey times and therefore represents an economic benefit. David Metz demonstrated that what has actually happened with the post-war road-building frenzy is that people spend just as long travelling by road as they ever did; it’s just that they travel much further. Presumably this is related to the diffusion of economic activity away from traditional centres. How the national economy benefits from such entropic behaviour is anyone’s guess. GDP might be imagined to increase, since GDP is a measure of activity however mindless (it was never a measure of wealth production), and in any case the GDP-road-building correlation seems to be in the opposite direction – GDP rises lead to road-building, not the other way round. The DfT’s Eddington Report itself made it clear that no assumptions about the direction of the correlation (i.e. which cause precedes which effect) could be made, an essential point the DfT has ignored ever since. Eddington also stated that users of the road system should pay the costs they externalise on society, another essential point conveniently ignored by the DfT and the Treasury ever since.</p> <p>A New Triumphalism</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Unfortunately, even though all the research and intellectual argument made the irrefutable case against roadbuilding as a sensible environmental and economic policy, the politics remains in denial. Eighteen years into the new Millenium and Highways England, with its new triumphalism, still talks the same primitive language – like Talleyrand’s Bourbons ‘Ils n’ont rien appris, ni rien oublié’. We look at the Consultation document and see no mention of traffic induction and the preposterous implication remains that road building will lead overall to less carbon emission, less noise, less congestion and less air pollution; and that all sorts of economic benefits will result (no mention of the peripherality in encouraging more and more travel).</p> <p>Above all, we continue to see (as across the country and in our southern region) every damaging scheme that was rejected in the 1990s dragged out of some bottom drawer in Walnut Tree Close or Marsham Street and given a new zombie life in the evidence-free and value-free policy environment of the Treasury and the DfT. The South Coast, from Dover to Southampton, has had its railway deprived of proper investment for decades, with increasingly poor and expensive service, but the South Coast Superhighway ambition, long shown to be detrimental to meeting environmental and transport needs in the corridor, has been resurrected via the usual trick of stringing together a paternoster of ‘bypass’ schemes. Never mind that the South Downs has been recognised as a National Park of great landscape importance, since the HA was last minded to turn this region into a channel for megashed distribution centres and other inappropriate development.</p> <p>Amongst the zombie schemes in the south, to which the HA or DfT are apparently giving an encouraging ear, are along the A350 (Westbury, Melksham, Chippenham) and the A36. The threats to Constable’s Salisbury meadows, the Wylde Valley and to the supposedly highly protected Avon at Bath are all being made again. And Stonehenge! Highways England are seemingly dead set on carving an expressway across the most important prehistoric landscape in Europe. The Chief Executive of HE, Jim O’Sullivan, dismissed the objection of UNESCO’s Advisory Mission (the people who will decide whether the UK will have so neglected its duty as to put its greatest archaeological site on the World Heritage Sites in Danger list) out of hand as being of limited relevance:</p> <p>“I don’t think so, I mean we have the support of the major stakeholders..... ...When you look at the people who are in favour of us doing something they are the people who live somewhere on that corridor and they know the situation is desperate. When you look at the people who object they are, like UNESCO, from all over the world”.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>As if Stonehenge was not important to anyone outside Wiltshire (are the Buddhas of Bamiyan or the great artefacts of Palmyra of no meaning to the rest of the world? Are the Taliban or ISIS to be condemned for wanton Philistinism but Highways England allowed to plead some spurious reason of local need?). The project manager for the Stonehenge scheme (the delightfully named Derek Parody) went further by asserting that the UNESCO Mission had simply got it wrong and not understood its own guidelines for assessing impact on the World Heritage Area!</p> <p>This is the new Trump-like hubris of HE, where anything is confidently asserted without evidence, appropriately relevant data or argument, with a clear expectation that the public examination process is now so emasculated that no critical analysis will get near to establishing relevant facts.</p> <p>The message has gone wider. Away from the trunk road responsibility of HE, local authorities are being encouraged to think roads – build houses and allow megashed developments in inappropriate places in order to gain CLI, not to help with social or welfare needs or look after the economy and structure of town centres, but to build roads through green fields in order to create ever more road-based development opportunity. Key to this is the Local Enterprise Partnership. LEPs are unelected, unaccountable bodies, largely of vested interest, spending large sums of public money, much more likely than not on road projects. There is a self-reinforcing circularity in this – the Government tips the wink to the LEPs that road building would be very nice, wouldn't it? And HE then cites local LEPs as supposedly expert authorities as providing evidence of need for road building. And where is the control or accountability in all this when the Planning Inspectorate (and, infamously, the environmental protection agencies) now have to regard the developer as 'customer'?</p> <p>The Fallacy of Composition</p> <p>At the heart of all HE assertion is a logical fallacy that needs to be considered both in the appraisal methods (COBA etc.) and in the presentational arguments put to the public. Given that a particular scheme may have certain immediate benefits to a locality (though we would probably dispute some of them), the assumptions are firstly that the benefits endure; secondly that the effects of the scheme are confined to the locality; and thirdly (since HE is a national body) that the scheme contributes to an overall benefit to the nation.</p> <p>The first assumption is clearly not valid since we know that whatever happens elsewhere on the road network, traffic through this junction will increase (the cost-benefit analysis relies on this), through what the DfT is pleased to call 'natural growth' (though there is circularity in this – see footnote 1) and primarily through induction. The HE makes specific reference in its Technical</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Appraisal to its desire to accommodate more road freight from Southampton (journeys that could not be made if the junction remained congested).</p> <p>Secondly, there are clearly concerns for unwanted effects in the locality from increasing capacity at this junction. For example the congested Spitfire Link and congested Easton Lane are likely deterring some local trips. Removing the deterrence (certainly from the latter) will have the consequence of imposing such deterred trips on the central streets of Winchester and contributing further to the traffic and pollution problem the local authorities are claiming they want to solve. The induction of traffic on to the A34 and M3 as a result of this significant capacity increase will also (together with the other capacity increases planned through hard-shoulder running) put pressure on the Twyford Down cutting and the Hockley embankment. We already know that HA have a report tucked away in their bottom drawer on how to widen Twyford Down (with high concrete walls). It is clear that this is where we are heading – ever more traffic through the blighted landscape of the western hills of the National Park.</p> <p>Thirdly and arguably more importantly, the induced traffic from this scheme will have trip ends all over the national network, contributing to new congestion (none of the road building programmes in the past has actually brought about a reduction in the total congestion of the network), new pollution, new resource consumption and new carbon emission. Nobody (least of all HE and the DfT) ever computes the consequences of this, but who can possibly say that the overall effect is beneficial.</p> <p>This is the fallacy of composition, often illustrated by the theatre story – a member of the audience stands up to get a better view – he has an immediate benefit but the cost is borne by the person behind, who seeks to mitigate that disadvantage by standing up himself – in the end almost everyone is standing up, nobody has an advantage and everybody is more uncomfortable.</p> <p>It is with these little immediate apparent advantages that HE always seeks to seduce local populations into agreeing to what will ultimately disadvantage the whole country including those who are seduced.</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>We see no justification for this network capacity increase. The argument for a local reduction of congestion is falsified by the congestion consequences elsewhere, arising from the traffic induced by the scheme. The arguments for reduced pollution and carbon emission are equally fraudulent if the boundary of concern is moved out to the whole network and are not even plausible in the local and immediate context. The construction of this scheme will of itself consume resources that shouldn't be wasted and burn carbon that shouldn't be</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>added to the planetary burden. The argument on journey time savings is out-of-date and known to be falsified by the Metz research.</p> <p>The argument for economic benefit has never been demonstrated – the DfT has never even carried out any research to discover whether an economic benefit exists. Eddington’s remarks on the correlation of road building with GDP and his stipulation that externalisation of costs by road users (essentially a regressive subsidy(10) since it benefits the better off and disadvantages the poorest in many ways) should be recovered to the public purse, have been consistently ignored. This scheme has all the hallmarks of that wilful disregard for its economic and environmental consequences.</p> <p>Because we see no justification for a capacity increase here, there is little point in our involvement in the discussion of options for achieving that increase. ‘Do Nothing’ (and spend the money on something socially useful) is our clear preference. We do not expect to be listened to, especially with a compliant Planning Inspectorate, since HE will effectively be judge and jury in the matter and its interest is self-reinforcing. But in whatever process of Examination in Public will take place, we expect that certain matters will have to be discussed, that HE seems unwilling to discuss at this ‘consultation’ stage. We briefly state them here.</p> <p>Winchester Traffic</p> <p>Winchester has a traffic problem that has a countable pollution mortality and morbidity consequence, leads to a forgoing of valuable urban space and the economic consequence of inefficient access in a constricted street pattern (much more footfall could be achieved through car restriction and public transport encouragement). The City and County Councils have undertaken a Movement and Access study which has yet to report. If sensible car restriction (e.g. through parking reduction etc.) policies are adopted there will be a need to ensure that through traffic does not increase as a result of capacity increases on the periphery.</p> <p>It is very difficult to predict the immediate re-assignment effects of any of the HE’s options on the City’s network. It will, therefore be essential for HE to create a fine-grained zonal traffic model that credibly shows the likely effects.</p> <p>Air Pollution</p> <p>The reliance of HE on DEFRA’s wholly inadequate modelling of air pollution is to be deplored. A simple free-space diffusion model can have something to say about the peripheral receptors (including the sports facilities at Bar End) of M3 pollution (though it must include the likely traffic multiplication by induction) but nothing to say about the infiltration of pollution into the complex of urban</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>streets in the Bar End and Highcliffe areas. Whether better modelling of street pattern diffusion is achievable or not we do not know, but HE would need to make a case that it will not add to the burden of pollution already in this area (indeed the DfT is under an obligation to reduce the burden).</p> <p>The DEFRA modelling is in any case still reliant on the thoroughly discredited emission figures given by vehicle manufacturers. And we are alarmed to see that HE considers that its only duty in respect of air pollution is to meet the legal threshold for Nox pollutants – it does not mention particulates. The HE must know that Public Health England has identified a formula for computing the mortality figures for particulate pollution and that the formula pertains at all levels ('goes through zero' in the words of its chief author). So there is a calculable effect on the local population and the effect will be significant (countable numbers of people are dying in Winchester as a result of such pollution). It cannot morally be ignored by HE on the presumption that the wholly inadequate thresholds set by law are not being exceeded. It must measure the levels of particulate pollution, compute its increase as a result of the induction of traffic by this scheme and model its diffusion into the outskirts of the town and its contribution to background levels within the town.</p> <p>Cycling</p> <p>We will leave comment on the cycling aspects of this scheme to others more informed on the subject, but we have to record a certain amount of displeasure that the scheme is representing itself as a benefit to cyclists. While there was never a good crossing of the junction by the NCN23, it must be pointed out that HE took it upon itself to make this crossing far more intimidating and dangerous than it was by its earlier increase of capacity at the junction. To now claim credit for remaking the link is a bit much.</p>		

K.2.N Design

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	Vast improvement over the initial proposals.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of comments received, including those supporting the Scheme proposals.
Local community	Very pleased with these plans.	N	
Local community	Scheme looks good now the A33 traffic is separated. Free flowing traffic between M3 and A34 will be a great improvement in many ways, reducing delays, accidents and pollution. Many of us said it should have been built like that originally!	N	
Local community	The change of route to get to the A33 is better , but why was the cycle route taken out? Will cyclists have to share the roundabout with the traffic heading for the M3?	N	
Local community	Concerned about the direct impacts on the nature reserve. These works need a drastic re-think otherwise they will wreak the same level of devastation on the countryside locally as the M3 cutting did decades ago.	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.</p> <p>The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Scheme design avoids introduction of tall bridge structures or elevated embankments and instead the Scheme is positioned within cutting with structures and associated headwalls set within the landform at as low an elevation as possible. Views of the Scheme from the designated landscape have been considered with the aim where possible to minimise any adverse effects.</p> <p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>grassland a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p> <p>Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the special qualities of the South Downs National Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	Looks ok in practice. The route to A33 still seems complicated	N	Clear route signage will be provided as part of the Scheme's proposals.
Local community	It does look as if getting onto the A33 could be a little complex and would need to be well signed.	N	
Local community	This is an excellent scheme that should have been delivered as part of the M3 provision 30 years ago. I have strong reservations about the link to the A272 from M3 and A34 southbound link. This appears to be a dedicated left turn that avoids the roundabout, but drivers will have to give way - it should be clearly one or the other and not a hybrid with a surprise give way at the last moment!	Y	The support for the Scheme has been noted. Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant reassessed the dedicated left turn lane and traffic flows. The modelling assessment indicated that the dedicated left turn lane to A272 was not required and has therefore been removed from the Scheme's proposals.
Local community	I fear that you may have just moved the current A34 Southbound queue from the roundabout to the M3 Slip and also created a bottleneck for M3 Southbound traffic primarily because M3 Southbound is already restricted to two lanes prior to the junction. Same goes for Northbound M3 traffic to some extent with the volume of Northbound traffic from Winchester and A33.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. In the existing scenario, all traffic travelling via the M3 and A34, is required to exit at Junction 9 and circumnavigate the junction. These traffic movements are now more direct with the introduction of a lane gain / lane drop arrangement. The A34 merge and diverge lanes have been designed following Design Manual for Roads and Bridges design guidance, using forecasted traffic flows. The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. This indicates a predicted improvement to the existing layout in terms of congestions and delays. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) .
Local community	I think this is a major improvement on the initial plans and covers all of the concerns I had earlier. It will keep all the main routes flowing smoothly and make it easy for local traffic to avoid the trunk roads. My only slight concern is the motorway junction becomes quite complex so I hope that signage is very good and satnav companies update the maps quickly!	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Clear route signage will be provided as part of the Scheme's proposals.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>I have a small concern that the two additional roundabouts in place prior to joining the M3 north will increase the perceived journey time, which will encourage people leaving Winchester to use the congested London Road route up to M3 J7 instead.</p> <p>I still don't understand why the two existing south-facing slip roads from Winnall won't be closed once the A34 is diverted. The tiny amount of traffic they will handle can easily be accommodated at the previous junction without any issues. There is now going to be 3 exits in quick very succession between J10 and J9A, which will cause much confusion and disrupt the traffic flow, all so that Tesco can have its own bespoke access to the M3!</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p>In the existing scenario, all traffic travelling via the M3 and A34, is required to exit at Junction 9 and circumnavigate the junction. These traffic movements are now more direct with the introduction of a lane gain / lane drop arrangement. As a result, the traffic flows for the proposed M3 Junction 9 gyratory and A33 link road will be reduced. The two proposed roundabouts are required to provide access / egress to the National Highways Depot and the A33 / M3 Northbound onslip. An alternative junction form would be signalised junctions, which would provide more of an impact upon journey times.</p>
Local community	<p>Great concern over the filtering from J9 onto the A34 north in order to cross over towards Kingsworthy. In one diagram I can see an underpass ? Is this a road ? In another video I can still see the filter lane going north ? Otherwise if you haven't removed the filtering process for traffic getting across towards Kingsworthy then I'm afraid you've a massive problem.</p>	N	<p>This objection has been noted. Kings Worthy would be accessed via the proposed M3 Junction 9 gyratory and re-aligned A33 Link Road. Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14).</p>
Local community	<p>Overall I strongly agree with the revised design. It achieves the strategic objective of providing free-flowing connections for the A34 while eliminating the weaving on the A34 between Junction 9 and the A33 junction that the previous design would have introduced. Nevertheless, there are aspects of the design that could be improved:</p> <p>A34 southbound route to the M3:</p> <p>4. Currently the M3-A34 southbound merge is shown as a single lane gain plus tigertail. This provides lower merging capacity than the previously consulted double lane gain. This does not seem acceptable given the very high merging volumes from the A34 (around 30k AADT). The current proposal has the fourth lane instead joining from the J9 roundabout, which seems unnecessary as only 9k AADT uses this link. In addition the combined M3 southbound+A34 southbound volume will be around 60k AADT on opening according to PEIR figures, which exceeds design capacity for a three lane carriageway. Presumably this is why the northbound M3 has four lanes at this point. In short, providing only three lanes southbound through J9 creates an unnecessary bottleneck.</p> <p>Improve connections to/from the A33?</p> <p>5. First, the proposed NMU route towards Kings Worthy, utilising the current A33 northbound carriageway, is an excellent idea. However, its benefits are limited in the current proposal as the route does not allow cycle access. A route for pedestrians and cyclists would better deliver on HE's objectives of promoting active travel. Ideally it would also start further south, using much of the current A34 northbound carriageway.</p>	Y	<p>The support for the Scheme has been noted.</p> <p><u>A34 southbound route to the M3:</u></p> <p>DMRB CD 122 (Geometric Design of Grade Separated Junctions), defines several options for merge layouts. These options are dependent upon forecasted traffic flows. Using a combination of the annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) in vehicles per hour (VPH) for a mainline flow of traffic and the AADT in VPH for a merge flow of traffic, a required layout option type for a merge layout can be determined within DMRB CD 122. From an assessment of the forecasted traffic flows (contained within the Scheme transport model), the layout currently shown, follows the requirements of DMRB CD 122 and that a double lane gain is not required. The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p><u>Improve connections to/from the A33:</u></p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p><u>National Highways Proposed Roundabout:</u></p> <p>Consideration was given to the proposed roundabout to the National Highways depot during the preliminary design and a 'left in, left out' junction configuration was considered. The main clear routes for vehicles entering and leaving the depot are the A34 and the M3.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Second, I disagree strongly with the new roundabout for access to the Highways England compound. The A33 at this point is projected to have 13k AADT, which is a lot of traffic being forced to brake and then accelerate for what is, essentially, a property access. This will have non-negligible CO2 and safety impacts, not to mention the cost of building the roundabout. These surely cannot be justified by any convenience to the comparatively tiny amount of traffic accessing the Highways England depot; at any rate, I have found no evidence in the published material that the costs and benefits of this element of the scheme have been considered. Giving such high priority to Highways England depot traffic, without presenting any economic or social case for this, could be perceived to reflect a conflict of interest. There are options that would much better serve general traffic and the taxpayer, such as using a simple priority T-junction in place of the proposed roundabout, or simply retaining the current access arrangements.</p>		<p>The Applicant considered a 'left in, left out' junction configuration during the preliminary design, which has the following disbenefits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction of a left in/left out junction could encourage higher speeds within the proposed A33 link road which could lead to enforcement issues. 2. With the 'left in, left out' arrangement, vehicles exiting at Junction 9 wanting to enter National Highways' depot would need to travel to the proposed A33 roundabout and back on themselves. This would be an additional 1200m (0.7 mile) journey for vehicles. Furthermore, if a 'left in, left out' junction was introduced, a central reserve would be required to prevent vehicles from attempting to make a right turn into National Highways' depot which would result in an increase of the Scheme footprint. 3. With the 'left in, left out' arrangement, vehicles exiting from National Highways' depot who intended to travel north via the M3 would need to circumnavigate the proposed Junction 9 roundabout and travel back on themselves. This would be an additional 1025m (0.6 mile) journey for vehicles. <p>Following design reviews, the Applicant considered that the proposed roundabout to the depot was most appropriate.</p>
Local community	<p>The main issue at stake here is the interconnectivity of the M3 and the A34, if that were smoothed out as proposed (or another, smaller, simpler scheme) the majority of the congestion from the roundabout would be gone. This scheme feels too grand in the context of what has happened during the Pandemic, we need to do better and whilst improvements are required to the A34/M3 interchange, the rest of the scheme seems grandiose and over engineered resulting in a huge budget and very long periods of disruption. We need to do better at reducing traffic volumes, not engineering to cope with them.</p>	N	<p>The interconnectivity of the M3 and A34 is one of the main issues the Scheme is trying to resolve. This is achieved by the proposed direct lane gain / lane drop arrangement to the M3 carriageway. As a direct result of this revised arrangement, the existing gyratory and A33 link road is required to be realigned as presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14).</p>
Local community	<p>The southbound A34 should be a double lane-gain (mirroring the double lane-drop northbound) because the traffic volumes are split roughly equally between A34 and M3. The southbound merge from the new roundabout doesn't need a lane gain.</p>	N	<p>DMRB CD 122 (Geometric Design of Grade Separated Junctions), defines several options for merge layouts. These options are dependent upon forecasted traffic flows. Using a combination of the annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) in vehicles per hour (VPH) for a mainline flow of traffic and the AADT in VPH for a merge flow of traffic, a required layout option type for a merge layout can be determined within DMRB CD 122. From an assessment of the forecasted traffic flows (contained within the Scheme transport model), the layout currently shown, follows the requirements of DMRB CD 122 and that a double lane gain is not required.</p>
Local community	<p>Current A33 / A34 Northbound causes lots of problems - this improves that but means 2 more roundabouts</p>	N	<p>The roundabouts are required to provide connectivity to the existing National Highways network and the A33 / M3 northbound carriageway.</p>
Local community	<p>It is not clear how one can access the M3 from junction 9, as the existing slip road doesn't seem to be present.</p>	N	<p>The M3 Southbound is accessed via a proposed onslip, which is being provided via the proposed new roundabout. This roundabout is accessed from the proposed gyratory via the proposed realigned A33 link road.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	It is great that you are separating the A33 from the A34, but it is very disappointing that the new alignment of the A33 returns to being an empty dual carriageway as soon as possible. If you made the A33 a single carriageway as far as the crossroads at Cart and Horses (which is shown as being inside the works area) it would reduce traffic speeds on the approach to this dangerous junction, it would also make the road easier to cross, it would allow you to increase the amount of greenery and it would leave a lot of space for active travel options. All of these benefits would surely come with very little cost as you would be removing infrastructure, rather than laying new tarmac.	N	<p>The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.</p> <p>The A33 is proposed as a bi-directional carriageway for its entire length within the Application Boundary.</p>
Local community	Relieved and pleased that the connections to and from the A33 now avoid the A34 altogether. Recognising that traffic signals are not shown in the current proposal, I believe it will be necessary to have lights at the roundabout where the A33 southbound joins the link road from the junction 9 roundabout. Traffic heading for the M3 northbound will be moving at speed with priority and slower or near-stationery A33 southbound traffic will be at increased risk of collision unnecessarily. Alternatively, a speed limit lower than 60 mph on the link road from the J9 roundabout to the M3 and A33 northbound should be set.	N	<p>The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047, indicating that traffic signals are not required. The proposed speed limit of the A33 link road between the M3 Junction 9 gyratory and the proposed M3 Northbound onslip / A33 roundabout is 40mph. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p>
Local community	<p>Proposals look like a sensible way to relieve congestion around the junction 9 roundabout / interchange. Confusion over plans for access on to the A34 from the roundabout itself, including travelling northbound on the A34 from Tesco or the other shops near to the roundabout. Agree with this separation as the current blended A33/A34 access route is confusing and dangerous.</p> <p>Cannot stress enough how important it is to use this opportunity to improve routes for cycling/scooting/skateboarding/mobility scooters/walking etc. It is really important that any new paths are wide enough to be multi-use - i.e. for both pedestrians and wheeled transport without a combustion engine! This will mean e.g. excellent signposting, shared routes but distinct surfaces for wheeled transport vs walkers/runners, appropriate bridges and underpasses. Please don't rely on the N23 meeting all the demand for cycling in the area!</p>	N	<p>The A34 Northbound is accessed via a dedicated slip road from the proposed M3 Junction 9 gyratory. Provision for pedestrians and cyclists has been made via a proposed shared use footway / cycleway, providing connectivity from Tesco's (Route 23 NCN) to Kings Worthy as part of the Scheme design development.</p> <p>Bridleways, footpaths and cycleways have been designed to allow all gradients to be less than 1:20 to comply with Department for Transport's (DfT) inclusive mobility impaired users. The walking, cycling and horse-riding routes are designed for cyclists, and therefore as all horizontal radii are suited for cyclists, they are also considered acceptable for mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of users have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	For years we have been promised that the dangerous junction of London Road and the A33 would be resolved with the plans for Winnall M3 changes. Please look at changing this road layout before any further accidents happen.	N	<p>The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	This is a necessary piece of work for the future and the relief of traffic congestion at this location. Pleased to see you have taken on board the concerns about the A33 route and have amended the plans in a way that should remove those concerns.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Additional capacity on Spitfire Link.	N	In the existing junction layout, all traffic travelling northbound on the M3 wishing to join the A34 northbound, must exit the motorway and use the main Junction 9 gyratory. This is the same for traffic travelling southbound via the A34 wishing to travel south via the M3. These flows of traffic currently lead to congestion on the M3 Junction 9 gyratory and all approaches (including Spitfire Link). With the proposed Scheme layout, these traffic movements are separated away from the gyratory roundabout by the introduction of a dedicated lane drop/lane gain arrangement (M3 to A34 and A34 to M3). This enables a smaller M3 Junction 9 (unsignalised) gyratory to be constructed. The revised layout has been assessed using transport modelling, which predicts that queuing on the Spitfire Link will reduce.
Local community	Separating A33 away from A34 is very positive. Old northbound route should be a cycleway not a footway. Southbound merge from A34 to M3 should be two lane gains, not a lane gain and a merge. The local traffic from the roundabout should merge instead.	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p>The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. DMRB CD 122 (Geometric Design of Grade Separated Junctions), defines several options for merge layouts. These options are dependent upon forecasted traffic flows. Using a combination of the annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) in vehicles per hour (VPH) for a mainline flow of traffic and the AADT in VPH for a merge flow of traffic, a required layout option type for a merge layout can be determined within DMRB CD 122. From an assessment of the forecasted traffic flows (contained within the Scheme transport model), the layout currently shown, follows the requirements of DMRB CD 122 and that a double lane gain is not required. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p>
Local community	I think the southbound A34 needs two lanes all the way through to the future four lane M3. Merging into one lane so that the southbound slip from Winnall roundabout can have the nearside lane of four to itself seems to add an unnecessary bottleneck. At busy times I can foresee sudden lane changing during the A34 merge into one lane, followed by vehicles trying to get into lane 1 as soon as practical by ignoring lane markings.	N	The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. DMRB CD 122 (Geometric Design of Grade Separated Junctions), defines several options for merge layouts. These options are dependent upon forecasted traffic flows. Using a combination of the annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) in vehicles per hour (VPH) for a mainline flow of traffic and the AADT in VPH for a merge flow of traffic, a required layout option type for a merge layout can be determined within DMRB CD 122. From an assessment of the forecasted traffic flows (contained within the Scheme transport model), the layout currently shown, follows the requirements of DMRB CD 122 and that a double lane gain is not required. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) .
Local community	It is essential that those leaving the M3 and intending to make a left turn into London Road/Worthy Road at Kingsworthy are able to do so without getting mixed up with traffic travelling north on the A34.	N	This movement is separated out by the proposed alignment of the Scheme. A34 traffic exits the M3 via a dedicated lane drop. Traffic for Kings Worthy exits at the proposed Junction 9 gyratory and via the A33 link road to Kings Worthy.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>In comparison to the 2017 design to the new 2021 design, the 2017 design is better in everyway. The 2017 design flows much better. The 2021 design with the two roundabouts are unnecessary and the M3 junction northbound moving way to far north from the junction is stupid, However I like the flow junction coming from the southbound M3 to the A272, which is an improvement I welcome. However, as a daily commuter on the Junction 9, I see no animal bridge, which are cheap to manufacture and install. I see road kill every day I commute on the junction because there is no animal crossing bridge for the animal from the Winnall Moors to the Avington Country Park/kings worthy area. This results in damage to cars, accidents from cars swerving to avoid them, thus causing tailbacks when a serious accident occurs. All this could be avoid if an animal bridge was installed. It would be a benefit to all in the area and to the economy because there wont be truck and businesses stuck in traffic from these accidents. I'm also seriously concerned that with no hard shoulder, accident fatality will be worse.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments. The design presented at the 2021 statutory consultation considered previous comments from the 2018 and 2019 consultations, which included a number of safety concerns.</p> <p>In the existing scenario, all traffic travelling via the M3 and A34, is required to exit at Junction 9 and circumnavigate the junction. These traffic movements are now more direct with the introduction of a lane gain / lane drop arrangement. As a result, the traffic flows for the proposed M3 Junction 9 gyratory and A33 link road will be reduced. The two proposed roundabouts are required to provide access / egress to the National Highways Depot and the A33 / M3 Northbound onslip. An alternative junction form would be signalised junctions, which would provide more of an impact upon journey times. The scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p>New areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape during operation. Much of the additional woodland and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. The provision of areas of chalk grassland, species rich grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for wildlife in a north-south direction. Please refer to Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2). Green bridges are not proposed as there are no instances of new severance.</p>
Local community	<p>Previous concerns regarding access to Kings Worthy from the Junction 9 roundabout have been considered. It is difficult to see the impact in context of the surrounding businesses and housing. I can't fully accept the design until we can see the new junction as an overlay to a map or actual image rather than design mock-up.</p> <p>Concerned that this junction expansion may not be needed in the post-Covid world with more people working flexibly i.e. from home, which should reduce the overall traffic meaning less delays and believe there are cheaper and quicker changes that could be made while the traffic volumes are reassessed - one of the main issues is with M3 northbound backing up is due to the A34 / A33 off slip. If the A34 remained dual carriageway with a right hand off-slip rather than a filter lane, that would ease the flow with traffic not needing to merge into one lane.</p>	N	<p>Currently, potential pandemic impacts on travel demand and behaviour have not been considered. Low and High traffic growth tests have been undertaken as part of the economic assessment in line with Department for Transport guidance and are reported in Section 5 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10).</p> <p>The comment referring to cheaper and quicker changes is noted; however, the filter lane currently provides direct connectivity to the A33. This arrangement is to be revised as part of the Scheme proposals.</p> <p>The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p>
Local community	<p>Winnall roundabout to and from A33 a great improvement over previous scheme. Much safer. Provision for traffic light and possibly lighting at the Winnall roundabout should be made. The Applicant should consider ducting for cabling should it be decided at a future date it will cause less disruption and be cheaper in the long term.</p>	N	<p>Due to the Scheme's location within the South Downs National Park (which is sensitive to new lighting arrangements), avoiding and minimising light pollution has been a key consideration for the Scheme. The carriageways, junction and the slip roads will not be lit. Lighting will be required within the underpasses and subways due to the length of these facilities and gantry-mounted signage which will be</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>designed in accordance with the South Downs National Park <i>Dark Skies Technical Advice Note</i>.</p> <p>In relation to the provision for traffic lights, the Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling with a forward forecast to 2047, which indicated that traffic signals are not required.</p> <p>Ducting is to be provided within the proposed gyratory bridges to future proof elements of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	The Winnall roundabout simply needs a decent set of lights to improve congestion. You have no right to destroy that area of the South downs park.	N	<p>The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling with a forward forecast to 2047, which indicated that traffic signals are not required. Most of the traffic using the existing gyratory roundabout is vehicles exiting the M3 to travel via the A34 Northbound and A34 southbound traffic utilising the gyratory to travel south via the M3. These flows are to be removed from the gyratory via the proposed dedicated lane gain and lane drop arrangements. Therefore, the predicted traffic flows for the revised Junction 9 roundabout are lower than existing.</p> <p>The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park. Further consideration of the South Downs National Park is presented in the ES (Document Reference 6.1), the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) and the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1).</p>
Local community	The direct connection of the A34 to the M3 would be an enormous benefit to local traffic. I am assuming that there may not be the need for traffic light control on the big roundabout? Perhaps more information can be provided on any traffic control proposals for vehicles entering and leaving the main roundabout system over the M3.	N	<p>The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling with a forward forecast to 2047, which indicated that traffic signals are not required. The majority of traffic using the existing gyratory roundabout is vehicles exiting the M3 to travel via the A34 northbound and A34 southbound traffic utilising the gyratory to travel south via the M3. These flows are to be removed from the gyratory via the proposed dedicated lane gain and lane drop arrangements. Hence, the predicted traffic flows for the revised gyratory roundabout are lower than existing. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p>
Local community	<p>The change to the southbound route is welcomed as drivers would be able to move from the A34 to the M3 without using Junction 9 however the small reduction in travelling time is not worth “the destruction to even more habitats”</p> <p>The change northbound via Junction 9 is not supported. This change is unlikely to make a significant improvement to travelling times when the cause of holdups is the hill through Twyford Down to the south of Junction 9.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) that sets out the need for the Scheme.</p> <p>Careful consideration has been undertaken during the preliminary design in relation to ecology, landscaping and the surrounding environment as summarised within the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	I think this is a much more creative scheme than the previous version. I particularly like that you've made use of the existing hillside to accommodate the crossing over of the various parts of A33, A34 and M3 at different heights. It is a great improvement that traffic for the A33 and local traffic from Tesco's towards Kings Worthy and Itchen Abbas gets an underpass to avoid having to cross several lanes of fast-moving traffic. I think this is a much safer solution.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	My general position of 'agree' is because I believe that some remedy is needed. However, this position may alter as more details, eg on the link to King's Worthy, become available.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Further details (design drawings overlaid on Ordnance Survey Mapping) are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) .
Local community	The improvement to the A33 route from Junction 9 is a good compromise from the previous proposal but perhaps the cycle route could run alongside thus negating the need for the present routing. Concerned as to what the arrangements will be at the northern end of the A33 link as its not shown on the plans thus presented and would urge HE to get to grips with HCC to try to sort out a joint roundabout solution at this end of the A33 link road.	N	The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.
Local community	Agree that it would be useful, especially for those travelling long distance down the A34 and on to the M3 and vice versa, not having to negotiate the roundabout would be very helpful. Think the new proposals to separate the A33 traffic from this fast-moving traffic will be enormously beneficial for those living in Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	It's not clear how to access A33 from Worthy Road in Kingsworthy (the dangerous Cart & Horses junction)... currently SO unsafe, and needs improving - or at the very least not to be made any worse by the new plans. Can't see the long promised cycle route from Jn9 to Kingsworthy - is it now only a footpath? A cycle route is critical to make it safer for cyclists in this area, and reduce the level of cycling in to Winchester along the Worthy Road.	Y	The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route.
Local community	Overall this represents a significant improvement over the existing junction design which is both slow and dangerous with some horrendous accidents occurring on the M3 northbound off ramp in recent years. In the summer, in particular, the M3 northbound comes to a halt as far back as Junction 12 largely because of traffic heading to the A34 stopping at the traffic lights on the existing junction. The sooner this plan is implemented the better.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	Your original scheme included a proposal for a cycle link from Kings Worthy through to Winnall via the junction. You have removed this link in the current proposals, replacing it with a pedestrian (footpath) link. The pedestrian route you	Y	The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>propose would be along mostly current carriageway (A34 and A33 northbound lanes) and as such will presumably be a result of stopping up orders. Reducing the provision to pedestrian only is short-sighted and misses a number of quick (and cheap) wins.</p> <p>Such stopping up orders could remove vehicles (including horse drawn carriages) but leave non-motorised users to share the way. Where additional creation orders are needed (if any) then the cost of making orders for cycle accessible routes will be of no significant difference to making orders for pedestrian only routes.</p> <p>In other schemes that have created routes over residual carriageway surfaces it is not normally necessary to provide much in the way of new surfacing, instead relying on simply not removing the existing surface from the width of the new route. This would mean that the carbon footprint of the new route would also be very low, and would minimise the need to recycle surface materials. There would be negligible difference in cost between providing a cycle friendly surface compared to a pedestrian friendly surface, if any at all. A cycle friendly surface and cycle friendly infrastructure normally helps to ensure a facility that would be open to all, including those in wheelchairs and mobility scooters.</p> <p>The route could be created/stopped-up as a bridleway, but acknowledging that the predominant users would be pedestrians and cyclists keeping a bound bituminous surface. Should bridleway status imply an unbound surface then cycle way / cycle track orders should be the appropriate mechanism to limit equestrian impact. Equestrian use on roads in the area (ie feasible links) is minimal to non-existent in comparison to cycling and walking, and as such should not form a realistic need for inclusion within the scheme. However, should equestrian provision be considered necessary and viable then a greater width should be considered for the route to minimise potential conflict between users.</p> <p>Providing a new, safe, environmentally sustainable access corridor through the proposed road layout would add to the climate-positive aspects of the scheme. In our household it would enable more rapid and manageable access to shops at Winnall without reliance on a car to overcome the various junction issues. With the link that it could provide to the NCN route through Winnall it could enable local people and visitors to the area to negotiate crossing the motorway by traffic free routes.</p> <p>Lastly, providing a multi-user traffic free route of some length must be a good press story to hang the cost and environmental impact of the project upon. Please look at the bigger forward picture and create the cycle friendly routes we need to be able to travel sustainably in the future.</p>		<p>consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. Sections of the existing A34 and A33 carriageways will be stopped up (to vehicular traffic) to facilitate this route. The intention is to utilise the existing stopped up sections of the A34/A33 carriageway construction / surface (where possible), which will reduce the need for new areas of construction. Furthermore, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Very pleased to see that traffic to/from Kings Worthy ie the A33 merge - is being eliminated and separated from the A34 traffic - this will make a huge difference to the safety of local users and for those short trips from Kings Worthy to Winnall.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	The revised proposals are much better than the previous northbound A33/A34 proposal which seemed downright dangerous. One query is on the need for 2 roundabouts, and no roundabout proposed for further up the A33 at Kings Worthy.	N	The roundabouts are required to provide connectivity to the existing National Highways network and the A33 / M3 northbound carriageway. The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.
Local community	If the proposed changes actually take place, with the local traffic travelling to the A33 separated from the A34 north-bound traffic, then I think it is a good proposal. I would have preferred the animated fly-through to have specifically shown these new proposals - as it was this particular problem that was the main focus of the previous proposals - meaning that local traffic (from Easton Lane) had very little time to cross at least 1 lane of A34 with fast-moving traffic having come from the M3. It saddens me that this was not thought important enough to have been shown properly. However, if my interpretation of what I could deduce from the fly-through, then it will at least be safer for local traffic. I wait to be impressed with the final product!	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	Some of the slips roads are in the wrong place and do not need to be there. In addition with a new Green Agenda from the Government and the new park and ride in Winchester there will be a reduction in car use and therefore less of a need for the proposals.	N	The comment is not entirely clear in relation to which slip roads are in the wrong place. However, the Scheme has been carefully thought out to ensure slip roads have been designed to provide appropriate connectivity across the Scheme.
Local community	The previous scheme had a disastrous layout for reaching the A33 from the roundabout. This new scheme is a vast improvement.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	I hope this scheme will release the blockages that occur regularly at the Winnall roundabout and I think it will not damage the environment once it is done as traffic will flow more freely.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	B1 : The existing inadequate J9 junction arrangement causes regular and extensive queuing traffic, both southbound A34 and northbound M3 - but also on Easton Lane and A272 Spitfire Link. This in turn causes drivers seeking to avoid the J9 congestion to use unsuitable local routes through and around Winchester - adding to the already chronic traffic congestion and air pollution in the town. The long-standing issues of severe congestion and pollution on roads in and around Winchester, made worse by drivers trying to avoid traffic problems at J9, is the main reason I wish to see a major revision of this junction to improve capacity	N	The Applicant acknowledges the matters raised and support for the Scheme as suggested in comments B1, B2, B4 and B6. In response to B5, the scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. DMRB CD 122 (Geometric Design of Grade Separated Junctions), defines several options for merge layouts. These options are dependent upon forecasted traffic flows. Using a combination of the annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) in vehicles per hour (VPH) for a mainline flow of traffic and the AADT in VPH for a merge flow of traffic, a required layout option type for a merge

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>and reduce delays and queuing by creating free-flowing links between the M3 and A34. I very strongly agree that major works are needed at J9.</p> <p>B2 : With reservations on some points, overall I welcome and support these latest design proposals by Highways England.</p> <p>B4 : It is proposed that, of the 4 lanes northbound M3 traffic prior to J9, Lanes 1 and 2 diverge to the nearside forming the two-lane A34 northbound, whilst Lanes 3 and 4 continue ahead as the two-lane M3 northbound. I totally agree with this proposal.</p> <p>B5 : Unlike the suggested changes to the A34 northbound route from the M3 (where four lanes of northbound M3 traffic seamlessly diverge to form the A34 and M3 northbound roads) the proposed convergence of the A34 and M3 southbound routes is neither seamless, nor completely free-flowing. By this it is meant that, while Lane 1 A34 southbound joins the M3 southbound at J9 without lane merging and simply becomes Lane 2 of the southbound M3, traffic on Lane 2 A34 southbound joining the M3 southbound is required to emerge as a slip road and combine with traffic on Lane 1 M3 southbound. These two combined lanes (Lane 2 A34 southbound plus Lane 1 M3 southbound), having merged, then form Lane 3 of the 4-lane M3 southbound. To be truly free-flowing, there should be no merging of any southbound A34 and M3 lanes. A34 southbound Lanes 1 and 2 should form Lanes 1 and 2 of a 4-lane M3 southbound - while Lanes 1 and 2 of the 2-lane stretch of southbound M3 should form Lanes 3 and 4 of the 4-lane M3 southbound. Such an arrangement would remove any need for southbound traffic from the A34 and M3 to merge or combine, and so any conflicting movements would be avoided. An arrangement like this would be my preference. However, rather than such a completely free-flowing southbound A34 / M3 arrangement, Highways England propose that the southbound entry slip from the new J9 roundabout would not emerge onto the 4-lane M3 as a slip road, but would instead form Lane 1 of the 4-lane M3 southbound. There may be good reasons for this proposed southbound merging arrangement but, if so, they are not explained by Highways England. Keeping the two main through routes (A34 & M3) flowing completely freely should have priority over traffic joining southbound from the J9 roundabout.</p> <p>B6 : In previous improvement plans, Highways England suggested merging northbound A33 and A34 traffic streams - causing A33 traffic from J9 to join the A34 via a nearside slip road before crossing both northbound A34 lanes and then diverging via an offside slip to the existing A33, all in a short distance. That plan was widely recognised as being inadequate and dangerous. Highways</p>		<p>layout can be determined within DMRB CD 122. From an assessment of the forecasted traffic flows (contained within the Scheme transport model), the layout currently shown, follows the requirements of DMRB CD 122 and that a double lane gain is not required. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	England deserve credit for recognising the deficiencies in their design, and producing this new plan in which the A33 and A34 northbound traffic flows are completely separated, so eliminating the safety problems of the previous version. I completely support these new proposals for dealing with the A33 connections.		
Local community	The new arrangement for traffic to travel to and from Kings Worthy to Junction 9 appears to be planned to be safer than was previously proposed, albeit that it is a more complex journey (in terms of number of junctions to manoeuvre through, and possibly longer journey times).	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) .
Local community	Although the changes to the A33 route improve safety concerns for those who were concerned about crossing traffic at 70mph, the new plan forces everyone going southbound to use the new junction, rather than pass under it. This is regrettable since the aim was to reduce traffic actually on the junction. There is little about implication of noise, pollutants on the changes.	N	In the existing junction layout, all traffic travelling northbound on the M3 wishing to join the A34 northbound, must exit the motorway and use the main Junction 9 gyratory. This is the same for traffic travelling southbound via the A34 wishing to travel south via the M3. These flows of traffic currently lead to congestion on the M3 Junction 9 gyratory and all approaches (including the A33). With the proposed Scheme layout, these traffic movements are separated away from the gyratory roundabout by the introduction of a dedicated lane drop/lane gain arrangement (M3 to A34 and A34 to M3). This enables a smaller M3 Junction 9 (unsignalised) gyratory to be constructed. As a result, traffic flows using the A33 will be lower than the existing flows. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) .
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	Additional capacity on Spitfire Link (A272) and the old A33 carriageway to be opened to cycles as well as foot traffic.	Y	In the existing junction layout, all traffic travelling northbound on the M3 wishing to join the A34 northbound, must exit the motorway and use the main Junction 9 gyratory. This is the same for traffic travelling southbound via the A34 wishing to travel south via the M3. These flows of traffic currently lead to congestion on the M3 Junction 9 gyratory and all approaches (including Spitfire Link). With the proposed Scheme layout, these traffic movements are separated away from the gyratory roundabout by the introduction of a dedicated lane drop/lane gain arrangement (M3 to A34 and A34 to M3). This enables a smaller M3 Junction 9 (unsignalised) gyratory to be constructed. The revised layout has been assessed using transport modelling, which predicts that queuing on the Spitfire Link will reduce. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.
Local community	Leave enough buffer room by the motorway to widen again in the future, if necessary, although this scheme should add a lot of much-needed capacity for more traffic!	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure			
Local community	It looks fine in the context of a huge engineering scheme. I would rather see the ambitions reduced to improving the A34/M3 interface and reduce impact that way.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	Lack of provision for vulnerable road users, which will encourage more people to travel by motor vehicle between Easton/Kings Worthy and Winchester.	Y	The Applicant has noted this comment. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.
Local community	Major queues on A34 southbound/M3 Southbound with lots of idling traffic creates traffic fumes, a free flow will be so much better.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	The minimal effect on the Itchen Valley is to be welcomed, and the use of the old pre-war bypass bridge for the A34 southbound route, together with the routing of the proposed footway along the line of the old A33 northbound is an ingenious solution.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	The biggest problem with these junctions and roads is the barriers it produces for Cyclists, pedestrians and wildlife. I wholly don't support the expansion of the junction but any improvements should include dedicated cycle and walking and wildlife corridors. This could only be done with tunnels and bridges	N	The Scheme has been designed with careful consideration to the surrounding environment, including South Downs National Park. The provision of foot/cycle bridges (as opposed to underpasses) would be visually intrusive to the surrounding environment. In addition, foot/cycle bridges require shallow gradients on the approach/departure ramps to the actual bridge span. These approach/departure ramps require a considerable amount of space and due to the constrained Scheme footprint and reconfiguration of the A34, foot/cycle bridges would not be feasible.
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	Welcome the tunnels instead of flyovers	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			
Local community	Turning the leftover end of the A33 dual carriageway into a single carriageway is an excellent idea that will have huge safety benefits. A footway is a much better use of that space.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	I would like to see a physical separation between the traffic and non-road users whilst traversing the bridge itself	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. It is assumed that this comment refers to the proposed M3 Junction 9 overbridges. Where the proposed footway/cycleway runs across the southern overbridge, a vehicle restraint system it is currently proposed to separate the traffic and non-road users.
Local community	<p>Generally very positive. Two small comments:</p> <p>1. the underpass beneath the J9 roundabout looks very good although does the long loop on the western side make it too indirect? Will the path be well lit and overlooked to promote perception of safety?</p> <p>2. the abandoned A33 carriageway would be perfect as a cycleway not just a footway.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p> <p><i>Response to point 1:</i></p> <p>Due to the Scheme's location with the South Downs National Park (which is sensitive to new lighting arrangements), avoiding and minimising light pollution has been a key consideration for the Scheme. The carriageways, junction and the slip roads will not be lit. Lighting will be required within the underpasses and subways due to the length of these facilities and gantry-mounted signage which will be designed in accordance with the South Downs National Park <i>Dark Skies Technical Advice Note</i>.</p> <p>In relation to the loop on the western side of the M3 Junction 9 roundabout, the Applicant has reduced the size of the loop and incorporated the provision of steps within the loop to enable a more direct and quicker route for walkers. The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved.</p> <p><i>Response to point 2:</i></p> <p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route.</p>
Local community	<p>Generally very favourable, but as a regular user of the cross M3 routes here:</p> <p>1) Add cycling capability on new route to Kings Worthy</p> <p>2) Add steps to remove the loop on the cycle path route for walkers on the western side of M3</p> <p>3) Smooth / reduce the hill from the underpass on the eastern side of M3</p> <p>4) Ensure same cycle and walker routes continue to be available during construction</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p>The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. The Applicant has reduced the size of the loop and incorporated the provision of steps within the loop to enable a more direct and quicker route for</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>walkers. The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length <p>Temporary diversions will be required during construction, and this will be subject to design and approvals prior to construction commencing.</p>
Local community	Suggest that the footpath along the A34 is upgraded to a shared cycle route the underpasses will make it almost impossible to cycle on the new A34 and A33 routes. Use footbridges instead of underpasses to route path over roads (underpasses are very intimidating to lone women and older people). Separate cycles from cars on the new bridges.	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p>The Scheme has been designed with careful consideration to the surrounding environment, including the South Downs National Park. The provision of foot/cycle bridges (as opposed to underpasses) would be visually intrusive to the surrounding environment. In addition, foot/cycle bridges require shallow gradients on the approach/departure ramps to the actual bridge span. These approach/departure ramps require a considerable amount of space and due to the constrained Scheme footprint and reconfiguration of the A34, foot/cycle bridges would not be feasible.</p> <p>All proposed underpasses are to be 4m in width and shall be lit. In addition, visibility to and from the underpasses will not be constrained.</p>
Local community	I like the layout of the new footpaths and cycleways.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	It is good to see connections being provided for non-motorised users. However, I do have two areas of concern. One, at the Junction 9 roundabout there is a 270-degree loop on the western side of the M3, clearly intended for passage of cyclists. However, this is a convoluted route for pedestrians, and pedestrians will follow path of least resistance. If a formal shortcut bypassing the loop is not provided, pedestrians will likely create their own cut through the soft estate. Two, I believe the footway between Easton Lane and King's Worthy should be a shared-use footway/cycleway facility.	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians/cyclists to be achieved. This has been reduced in size as the design has developed and the provision of steps has been incorporated within the loop enabling a more direct and quicker route for pedestrians.</p> <p>In addition, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route.</p>
Local community	The new proposals have scaled back the provision for cyclists and horse riders, thus encouraging more people to make local journeys by motor vehicle. There	Y	The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>must be a proper, LTN 1/20 compliant, cycle route from Kings Worthy to Tesco, and again to Easton. The bridleway should be reinstated as well.</p>		<p>improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. Furthermore, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p>
Local community	<p>I cannot stress enough how important it is to use this opportunity to improve routes for cycling/scooting/skateboarding/mobility scooters/walking etc. It is really important that any new paths are wide enough to be multi-use - i.e. for both pedestrians and wheeled transport without a combustion engine! This will mean e.g. excellent signposting, shared routes but distinct surfaces for wheeled transport vs walkers/runners, appropriate bridges and underpasses. Please don't rely on the N23 meeting all the demand for cycling in the area! And don't forget that not everyone uses a bicycle or wants to walk – there is an increasingly wide range of options for people looking for zero carbon personal transport, including e-bikes, e-scooters, skateboards, skates, trikes, etc; and there is also a need to create safe off-road routes for wheelchair and mobility vehicle users. Please think very carefully about how to provide smooth, wide, shared paths for all these users – this is the future of transport in Britain and globally.</p>	Y	<p>The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.</p>
Local community	<p>Downgrading the cycle path to Kings Worthy to a footpath, with no cycle access makes no sense. It is especially disappointing that this has occurred without warning and with no explanation, despite previous positive dialogue as part of the 2019 consultation round.</p> <p>Please reinstate this as a cycle path; it makes little sense as a footpath but has potential to be a very useful and well-used route commuter and utility route linking up settlements with key services in Winnall (and the city beyond), and offering an alternative to congested and dangerous inner-city routes with little or no cycle provision.</p> <p>The bridleway through the fields to Long Walk has also been downgraded to a footpath, with no access for cyclists or horse riders. Why?</p> <p>Questions raised about the design and safety of the NCR23 route plans have not been met.</p> <p>The above suggests that plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle are not being given the care and attention needed. Given the huge sums of money involved in the project overall, why not work with the walking, cycling and horse riding communities to commit what are very small sums of</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. Furthermore, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	money to make positive change by implementing the previously consulted upon plans?		
Local community	I don't think separating footpaths and cycle paths will work. Also make them wide enough - assume that the number of cyclists will increase as awareness of CO2 increases - we hope!	N	<p>The Scheme's rights of way strategy addresses National Highways design principle 2 (is inclusive), 3 (makes roads understandable), 4 (fits in context), and 6 (is environmentally sustainable).</p> <p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the current provisions and introduce new routes and connections. All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	The footpaths along the side of the motorway and slip roads will be horrific to use. Have the planners ever walked a mile along a path that runs next to a motorway or busy A road? It's noisy and isolating.	N	<p>In the early stages of preliminary design, a walking, cycling and horse-riding optioneering exercise was carried out by the Applicant and the contractor to assess the buildability, routing feasibility against the existing site constraints which include the River Itchen SSSI and floodplain. The outcome of this exercise clearly defined the optimum route as illustrated within the 2021 statutory consultation.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. The route level will be at existing ground where feasible. Information on proposed and existing levels for the Scheme are shown in the Engineering Plans and Sections (Document Reference 2.6). The footway / cycling route along the entirety of the A34 section will be protected by a Vehicle Restraint System (VRS).</p> <p>Noise impacts are reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes the use of low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid.</p>
Local community	Non-vehicle users are a secondary and minor consideration in the scheme put into small footpaths in subways rather than considering the opportunity to properly restore an ecologically functional green bridge which could be used by people as a real connection from Winchester to the South Downs and the River Itchen	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. Furthermore, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>The Scheme has been designed with careful consideration to the surrounding environment, including the South Downs National Park. The provision of foot/cycle bridges (as opposed to underpasses) would be visually intrusive to the surrounding environment. In addition, foot/cycle bridges require shallow gradients on the approach/departure ramps to the actual bridge span. These approach/departure ramps require a considerable amount of space and due to the constrained Scheme footprint and reconfiguration of the A34, foot/cycle bridges would not be feasible.</p> <p>Furthermore, green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p>
Local community	The new footpath on the western side of the junction needs to be a cycle route as well, to provide a link between King's Worthy and Winnall. Could it also be moved away from the A34 carriageway (e.g. through the trees between the two A34 carriageways) to create a pleasanter route?	Y	<p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p>In the early stages of preliminary design, a walking, cycling and horse-riding optioneering exercise was carried out by the Applicant and the contractor to assess the buildability, routing feasibility against the existing site constraints which include the River Itchen SSSI and floodplain. The outcome of this exercise clearly defined the optimum route as illustrated within the 2021 statutory consultation.</p> <p>The route level will be at existing ground where feasible. Information on proposed and existing levels for the Scheme are shown in the Engineering Plans and Sections (Document Reference 2.6). The footway / cycling route along the entirety of the A34 section will be protected by a Vehicle Restraint System (VRS).</p>
Local community	I am neutral because, of themselves, the proposals are an improvement but the negative impact of the scheme overall outweighs their benefits.	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) sets out the planning balance for the Scheme. It demonstrates a clear need for the Scheme which is grounded in national, sub-regional and local planning and transport policy. The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) demonstrates that any unavoidable adverse environmental effects which may remain following mitigation are outweighed by the public benefit that will accrue as a result of the Scheme and the Government's commitment to upgrading the SRN and that any adverse impacts would not outweigh the benefits of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	If the scheme does go ahead, a green bridge for walkers, cyclists and riders should be a priority.	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p>
Local community	Not sure that this will work.	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p>
Local community	(1) The proposed new footpath between Easton Lane and Long Walk, across the shoulder of Easton Down (east side of M3) is a welcome addition to the footpath network in the vicinity of J9 - an area I have walked frequently over many years. Although no public footpath currently exists on this line, I have	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>walked most of the suggested footpath route. From this experience it is clear the new path would be subject to significant traffic noise coming from the adjacent M3, A34, and associated slip roads. Such noise intrusion on this path would be unavoidable - whatever mitigation measures were put in place - but, despite the likely noise levels, the path is still one I would use and value during recreational walks in the area. I welcome this proposed eastern path.</p> <p>From the plans, it seems this path would be largely screened by earthworks and vegetation from the M3 and A34. While this is an understandable design feature, such screening would also block views west across the Itchen valley for people using the path. On some of the more elevated sections of this path I would welcome walkers having the benefit of distant views west across the Itchen valley, even if this meant reduced screening from the roads below.</p> <p>My experience is that walks with an open aspect are much more enjoyable than paths which are completely screened. Please arrange for some open views to the west along the elevated sections of this path.</p> <p>Also, my preference for this eastern footpath would be for it to be reserved for pedestrians only. There is already an existing suitable paved alternative route available for cyclists via Easton Lane and Long Walk. Horses using footpaths inevitably damage the path surface, to the detriment of pedestrians. Also, I have rarely if ever seen horses being ridden in the vicinity of J9 - and there is no pre-existing network of bridleways in the J9 area that would be enhanced by this path being designated as a bridleway. Please keep this proposed eastern path as a footpath only.</p> <p>(2) The proposed new footway route on the west side of the M3 / A34, between Tesco's roundabout (Easton Lane) and Kings Worthy, would provide a useful and worthwhile link making effective use of the abandoned stretch of northbound A33 carriageway. However, it is difficult to see why this route is not proposed as a shared footpath and cycleway.</p> <p>The western route is one which cyclists from the north and west sides of Winchester would find very useful for reaching the eastern side of the town (especially the retail and employment areas of Winnall) without having to use the congested central town area. I would like to see this western route constructed as a shared cycle/pedestrian route.</p> <p>(3) Also, as a footnote to both these proposed new routes for people travelling through the area other than by vehicle - could they be given official names? Naming paths helps identify them and raise public awareness - the local parish</p>		<p>consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions. The proposed route has been designed as a 1:20 gradient route to promote access for all and its position would provide an attractive opportunity for users to connect between Easton Lane and Long Walk and promotes access to the South Downs National Park. The proposed earthwork strategy and woodland planting on the valley slopes west of the proposed chalk grassland would also aid visual screening of the M3 corridor from areas of the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>It is considered that this new route would positively contribute to the special quality of a diverse inspirational landscape with breath taking views, and the qualities of tranquillity within the South Downs National Park, furthermore, allowing increased recreational access to the South Downs National Park from Winchester. The design solutions for the bridleway on the eastern slopes provides a well-considered user route which reinforces the special qualities of the South Downs National Park, whilst minimising visibility of the highway and overall achieving a varied visual experience for future users. The placement within an area of Chalk grassland also positively responds to and provides opportunity for users to experience a feature which reinforces the landscape character of the open downlands. A visual study for users travelling along the proposed bridleway has been undertaken and is summarised in Figures 6.14 to 6.17 in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p>Furthermore, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the comment at point 3. This matter would be considered at detailed design.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	councils could undoubtedly suggest suitable and appropriate names if approached.		
Local community	Please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths.	Y	The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.
Local community	They are a bit convoluted, but I'm not sure if I can come up with a better plan...	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	The route for cyclists and pedestrians looks fairly wiggly and unintuitive - I hope it will be much better signposted than other local cycle routes, and user tested at every stage with local cycling groups heavily involved in the design.	N	The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Clear footway/cycleway wayfinding signage is proposed as part of the Scheme.
Local community	There are a few cycle paths - cycle path 23? A long distance path. Are there local links? Joining up local villages? Leisure walking routes? Better paths from town to AONB? Eg link Winnall moors to St Catherine's? How will this help people going to Winchester? From a33 or a34? Why is there no north park & ride? Or even park & walk as part of the proposal?	Y	The Applicant has noted this comment. A footway/cycleway is now proposed as part of ongoing scheme development, linking the Cart and Horses junction to the existing NCN Route 23 (near Tesco's). This proposed route is an improvement on the existing layout and will provide connectivity to local links and Public Rights of Way where possible. The purpose of the Scheme is to reduce congestion and improve journey times. In the existing junction layout, all traffic travelling northbound on the M3 wishing to join the A34 northbound, must exit the motorway and use the main Junction 9 gyratory. This is the same for traffic travelling southbound via the A34 wishing to travel south via the M3. These flows of traffic currently lead to congestion on the M3 Junction 9 gyratory and all approaches. With the proposed Scheme layout, these traffic movements are separated away from the gyratory roundabout by the introduction of a dedicated lane drop/lane gain arrangement (M3 to A34 and A34 to M3). This enables a smaller M3 Junction 9 (unsignalised) gyratory to be constructed. It is expected that as the main flow of traffic is now separated from the junction, trips to and from Winchester will improve as a result of the scheme. Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) .
Local community	Your original scheme included a proposal for a cycle link from Kings Worthy through to Winnall via the junction. You have removed this link in the current proposals, replacing it with a pedestrian (footpath) link. The pedestrian route you propose would be along mostly current carriageway (A34 and A33 northbound lanes) and as such will presumably be a result of stopping up orders. Reducing the provision to pedestrian only is short-sighted and misses a number of quick (and cheap) wins.	Y	The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Such stopping up orders could remove vehicles (including horse drawn carriages) but leave non-motorised users to share the way. Where additional creation orders are needed (if any) then the cost of making orders for cycle accessible routes will be of no significant difference to making orders for pedestrian only routes.</p> <p>In other schemes that have created routes over residual carriageway surfaces it is not normally necessary to provide much in the way of new surfacing, instead relying on simply not removing the existing surface from the width of the new route. This would mean that the carbon footprint of the new route would also be very low, and would minimise the need to recycle surface materials. There would be negligible difference in cost between providing a cycle friendly surface compared to a pedestrian friendly surface, if any at all. A cycle friendly surface and cycle friendly infrastructure normally helps to ensure a facility that would be open to all, including those in wheelchairs and mobility scooters.</p> <p>The route could be created/stopped-up as a bridleway, but acknowledging that the predominant users would be pedestrians and cyclists keeping a bound bituminous surface. Should bridleway status imply an unbound surface then cycle way / cycle track orders should be the appropriate mechanism to limit equestrian impact. Equestrian use on roads in the area (ie feasible links) is minimal to non-existent in comparison to cycling and walking, and as such should not form a realistic need for inclusion within the scheme. However, should equestrian provision be considered necessary and viable then a greater width should be considered for the route to minimise potential conflict between users.</p> <p>Providing a new, safe, environmentally sustainable access corridor through the proposed road layout would add to the climate-positive aspects of the scheme. In our household it would enable more rapid and manageable access to shops at Winnall without reliance on a car to overcome the various junction issues. With the link that it could provide to the NCN route through Winnall it could enable local people and visitors to the area to negotiate crossing the motorway by traffic free routes.</p> <p>Lastly, providing a multi-user traffic free route of some length must be a good press story to hang the cost and environmental impact of the project upon. Please look at the bigger forward picture and create the cycle friendly routes we need to be able to travel sustainably in the future.</p>		<p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. Sections of the existing A34 and A33 carriageways will be stopped up (to vehicular traffic) to facilitate this route. The intention is to utilise the existing stopped up sections of the A34/A33 carriageway construction / surface (where possible), which will reduce the need for new areas of construction. Furthermore, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	I agree with the new footpath route, in principal, provided it is constructed away from the carriageway of the A34 with a wide verge incorporating planting or some sort of physical barrier separating cars from pedestrians, this should not be built as a pavement directly alongside the road which would inevitably be followed by lower speeds limits and safety issues for pedestrians not to mention	Y	<p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p>In the early stages of preliminary design, a walking, cycling and horse-riding optioneering exercise was carried out by the Applicant and the contractor to assess the buildability, routing feasibility against the existing site constraints which include</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>creating a very unpleasant walking environment. Having said that the new footpaths provide exciting opportunities to see the area in a way it hasn't been seen before. The footpaths certainly represent an improvement over what is currently provided.</p>		<p>the River Itchen SSSI and floodplain. The outcome of this exercise clearly defined the optimum route as illustrated within the 2021 statutory consultation.</p> <p>The route level will be at existing ground where feasible. Information on proposed and existing levels for the Scheme are shown in the Engineering Plans and Sections (Document Reference 2.6). The footway / cycling route along the entirety of the A34 section will be protected by a Vehicle Restraint System (VRS).</p>
Local community	<p>I really like having the pathway between the lanes of the A34 to Kingsworthy utilising what will be the old A33 Northbound under the A34 Southbound. The new bridge over the Itchen is great and the access given here to the Itchen Way footpath is a good idea. I like the new path to the East too. Easier access from the Winnall Trading estate on the Western edge of the new A33 is good.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p>
Local community	<p>Steps taken are nominal and nowhere near sufficient. Footpaths along the Itchen Valley will have to contend with a new layer of noise pollution and fumes without substantial sound and pollution barriers. Failure to retain the proposal for a cycle route between King's Worthy and Winnall, and poor design of the revised NCN23 are deeply disappointing given the budget for this project. The walking route from King's Worthy will be horrifically dominated by speeding traffic and should be diverted away from the roads wherever possible e.g. by using the road to the west of Homebase. Footpath interconnections between the new path and the existing footpath network are poor and dysfunctional. Concessions to the horse-riding community should not have been abandoned.</p>	Y	<p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p>In the early stages of preliminary design, a walking, cycling and horse-riding optioneering exercise was carried out by the Applicant and the contractor to assess the buildability, routing feasibility against the existing site constraints which include the River Itchen SSSI and floodplain. The outcome of this exercise clearly defined the optimum route as illustrated within the 2021 statutory consultation.</p> <p>The route level will be at existing ground where feasible. Information on proposed and existing levels for the Scheme are shown in the Engineering Plans and Sections (Document Reference 2.6). The footway/cycling route along the entirety of the A34 section will be protected by a Vehicle Restraint System (VRS). Noise impacts are reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), which also sets out the measures the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The Scheme design includes the use of low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid.</p> <p>An additional footpath, cyclepath and bridleway is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. A new combined footpath and cyclepath for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane</p> <p>Air quality and noise impacts of the Scheme on receptors are assessed and presented in Chapters 5 and 11 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), respectively.</p>
Local community	<p>You can't even use the words pedestrian and cyclists. I have said earlier that using subways is something I never do - they are intimidating. The fact that you are hiding pedestrians and cyclists reflects your lack of consideration for them.</p>	N	<p>All proposed pedestrian / cyclists underpasses are to be lit. Due to the configuration of the Scheme and classification of roads, at-grade crossing facilities would be deemed unsafe.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Not enough space/consideration given to cyclists and pedestrians	Y	The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.
Local community	<p>I'm disappointed that you've gone against your promises on providing decent and safe transport links for active and alternative transport- especially as the government aims to double cycling activity and reduce deaths and injuries on UK roads by 2025. Please can you restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths. This way we could encourage young children and students to cycle into Winchester for school, shopping and socialising. For adults it would be ideal for reducing the amount of traffic that is caused by short journeys for commuting and leisure. In Holland these routes between smaller settlements and cities are very common and they serve the population well. Children gain a sense of independence, improved physical fitness, mental health and wellbeing. It's also a great opportunity for walkers and horse riders to gain a quiet route away from the traffic too.</p> <p>As well as this, I would like to remind you that your upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 should meet the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20).</p>	Y	<p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>An additional footpath, cyclepath and bridleway is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. A new combined footpath and cyclepath for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane</p>
Local community	<p>a) The information about the replacement for NCN 23 is woolly. It does not make it clear what standards are to be followed, in particular does it meet the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20)?</p> <p>b) The cycle path to Kings Worthy that was in the previous document has been downgraded to a footpath, with no cycle access. This is terrible. The whole point of this connection was to provide a fast, relatively level and traffic-free access from Kings Worthy to Winnall, for commuting and retail. It is not a recreational path due to its proximity to the motorway, and while it may be used by walkers, as a 2-mile route it is rather a long way for the person on foot, but a very comfortable distance for a person on a bicycle. There is no alternative cycle route except for going all the way into Winchester and out again, on a substandard and hilly cycle path. No justification has been offered for downgrading the link. It must be reinstated in the design.</p> <p>c) The bridleway through the fields to Long Walk shown on the first design has also been downgraded to a footpath, with no access for horse riders and off-road cyclists. This is disappointing. Unlike the route to Kings Worthy this bridleway would not be a particularly key link for people on bicycles to access work or leisure facilities, but it would be used for recreational cycling I am sure. Again no reason is given for downgrading it.</p>	Y	<p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,7,17m in length
Local community	Very difficult to tell the benefits or otherwise as the information on the current state of connectivity is either missing or difficult to decipher. It is often presented as existing infrastructure that is being left untouched rather than a comparison.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	They'd be much better avoiding this area.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.
Local community	Looks good to have more links and being a little more distant, or at least protected from the road.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	The hope must be for a convenient, attractive and segregated route. It's not entirely clear that this has been achieved.	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>The Consultation Summary document states that there were supportive comments on all of the WCH routes proposed in the scheme. The main WCH route linking Kings Worthy with Winnall and the NCN 23 seems however to have been removed. Even though WCC/HCC's Infrastructure wish list clearly includes a cycle path from the Worthy's to join NCN 23 at Winnall.</p> <p>As a local cyclist I would use a cycle route from Kings Worthy to and through junction 9. To for example shop at Winnall and for onwards travel to Winchester and the NCN 23 in both directions. A cycle path would link Kings Worthy with the leisure centre and HWRC using the existing route to Highcliffe.</p> <p>The current options for the journey are the B3047 which for a significant section has a 60mph speed limit and feels particularly unsafe during rush hour, followed by the NCN 23. The other alternative is to use the Worthy Lane cycle route which as a dual purpose route often causes conflict, followed by Winchester's busy one way system and the NCN 23 through Winnall.</p> <p>The current proposals fly in the face of sustainable transport and carbon footprint reduction. I can see no reason not to have the proposed footpath link as a bridleway link to enable all forms of non-motorised travel.</p> <p>As a final comment, I would like to propose that the underpasses for the non-motorised traffic are actually bridges as underpasses can be scary places to travel through as they are dark and encourage crime.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. The footway / cycling route along the entirety of the A34 section will be protected by a Vehicle Restraint System (VRS).</p> <p>In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. At the proposed Junction 9 gyratory, the proposed footway/cycleway crosses the southern overbridge. At this point a vehicle restraint system is proposed to separate the pedestrian/cyclist flow from the vehicular traffic.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,7,17m in length <p>The Scheme has been designed with careful consideration to the surrounding environment (South Downs National Park). The provision of foot/cycle bridges (as opposed to underpasses) would be visually intrusive to the surrounding environment. In addition, foot/cycle bridges require shallow gradients on the approach/departure ramps to the actual bridge span. These approach/departure ramps require a considerable amount of space and due to the constrained scheme footprint and reconfiguration of the A34, foot/cycle bridges would not be feasible.</p> <p>All proposed underpasses are to be 4m in width and shall be lit. In addition, visibility to and from the underpasses will not be constrained.</p>
Local community	<p>I am content that you are making provision for non-vehicular travellers but I make the following points :</p> <p>(1). You show a spiral loop for the footway within the J9 roundabout. This will be tedious for non-wheelchair users compared with the present more direct but steeper route. Will you add in a more direct route avoiding the spiral for able-bodied walkers and cyclists?</p> <p>(2). You show a new footpath starting at the Tesco roundabout, skirting the M3 J9 roundabout, continuing alongside the A34 northbound slip, passing</p>	Y	<p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the current provisions and introduce new routes and connections. All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>underneath it, and then continuing into King's Worthy along the route of the present northbound A33 carriageway.</p> <p>Will there be a foot connection with the Itchen Way which currently passes beneath the A34+A33 northbound carriageway.?</p> <p>It is not clear to me that there will be a high demand for this route by pedestrians. Leisure walkers are likely to be deterred by its proximity to busy roads. It will be a long walk from King's Worthy to Tesco and other commercial developments in the Winnall area, and I cannot see there being a demand for people to walk this route for shopping purposes etc.. On the other hand, cycle access between King's Worthy and Winchester is appalling at present, so making this a cycle/e-scooter route could serve a really useful purpose for those heading for the Winnall area.</p>		<p>The use of tactile paving (both blister and corduroy types) is also proposed to cater for the visually impaired, and wayfinding signage will also be provided along the footway/cycleway/bridleway routes as part of the Scheme proposal.</p> <p>Furthermore, the loop on the western side of Junction 9 provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved. This has been reduced in size as the design has developed and the provision of steps has been incorporated within the loop enabling a more direct and quicker route for pedestrians.</p> <p>A footway connection to the Itchen Way is also proposed.</p>
Local community	<p>I'm really disappointed that the most recent version of the plans has downgraded provision for cycling and for the planned bridleway. I'm always sceptical about road improvement projects because in the long run they have always ended up generating even more congestion. In this case I was ready to be persuaded because the plans included measures that would have made cycling easier, by opening access to the Itchen Valley and to Kings' Worthy that is currently really tricky.</p> <p>The original shared cycle-footpath to Kings' Worthy has been downgraded to a footpath; this will save a tiny, tiny amount from a massive budget and yet produce something of a white elephant: it's hardly going to be a beautiful place for a stroll but would be a fantastic commuter route for bikes. Therefore, please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths.</p> <p>I do believe that road improvements can be mitigated by trying to make moving around as easy as possible for those of us who cannot drive, or who do not have access to a car. That means paying as much attention to cycle routes as to motorway lanes. To this end, please also ensure that the upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 meets the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20) on this.</p> <p>The changes to Jcn 9 will largely benefit people from outside the area, who are rushing through it to get to somewhere else. There are no advantages to anyone having to live close to a huge junction. However, if there are measures that think carefully about everyone, not just a token gesture to pedestrians, the impact can be mitigated. Please restore the cycle route and bridleway!</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p>
Local community	Please provide safe, convenient (i.e.no cyclists dismount signs) cycling and walking routes from Winchester to Kings Worthy and Easton. Please also	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	provide a bridleway through the fields to Long Walk. The proper design and implementation of these routes would surely be a fraction of the cost of the project so please, please design and implement these to the latest and highest government standards.		
F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.			
Local community	Leave that to landscapers and engineers	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
Local community	There shouldn't be any - leave it all as it is and revisit your plans. A different approach to these works may well result in a different requirement for what you were to do with the soil.	Y	
Local community	The only logical place is to use excess earth to help build up sides of roads to act as further sound barriers. Better still why not cut and cover all the roads affected this returning the land to a natural state without the expense of a tunnel?	Y	
Local community	I would rather you did not create enormous amounts of spare soil, by not widening the motorway in the first place.	Y	
General commentary			
Local community	The design of the scheme appears to have continuously improved with each iteration, to the point that the latest proposal is a really good one that is not compromised. As mentioned, I feel some very minor tweaks to the non-motorised user provisions are needed, but this scheme will be a major improvement both for local and long distance users.	Y	The Applicant has noted the support for the Scheme in principle. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has revised the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions to include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,7,17m in length
Local community	This has very clearly been well considered and planned. There is a desperate need for the junction to change and ensure smooth traffic flow and I would commend the work that has gone into this scheme and hope that work will commence as soon as possible.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	Mainly, we should be looking again at traffic volumes and how we reduce them. I agree that we need a scheme for the A34/M3 interface, but the rest of it feels over engineered, as a result the programme is too long and likely too expensive. The construction programme should start in 2022 and be completed in 2 years maximum in order to reduce disruption to the local economy and in order to realise the benefits more quickly.	N	The preliminary design builds upon concept designs previously undertaken with a view to reduce congestion at Junction 9 and improve journey times. The proposed layout shown has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. Whilst the focus is Junction 9, this serves several connecting routes (providing connectivity for the A33, A34, A272 and Easton Lane into Winchester), all of which require careful consideration and inclusion into the junction layout. The DCO application was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in November 2022. If the application is accepted for examination, the Applicant expects a decision to be made by the Secretary of State in Q2 2024. Following development consent, the

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>Applicant would be required to discharge a number of requirements associated with the Development Consent Order (Document Reference 3.1) and undertake detailed design (including all necessary technical approvals) prior to construction. The construction phase is estimated to commence in early 2024.</p> <p>The current estimated construction programme has been developed based upon the current presented Scheme, which includes several structures. The construction programme (including expected temporary traffic management during the works), will be carefully planned and developed to minimise delay to the travelling public during the works.</p>
Local community	<p>The roundabout giving access to the HE depot should be a T-junction. Forcing all traffic to slow down to negotiate the roundabout then speed up again is worse for the environment than a T-junction where the vast majority of traffic can pass through at a steady speed.</p>	N	<p>Consideration was given to the proposed roundabout to the National Highways depot during the preliminary design and a 'left in, left out' junction configuration was considered. The main clear routes for vehicles entering and leaving the depot are the A34 and the M3. The provision of a 'left in, left out' junction arrangement has the following disbenefits:</p> <p>Disbenefit 1 – The introduction of a 'left in, left out' junction could encourage higher speeds within the proposed A33 link road, leading to enforcement issues.</p> <p>Disbenefit 2 – With the 'left in, left out' arrangement, vehicles exiting at Junction 9 wishing to enter the depot would need to travel to the proposed A33 roundabout and back on themselves. This is an additional 1200 metres (0.7 mile) journey for vehicles. If a 'left in, left out' junction was introduced, a form of central reserve would be required to prevent vehicles from attempting to make a right turn into the depot (avoiding the need to travel to the proposed M3 northbound onslip roundabout and back), which would increase (widen) the scheme footprint within this area.</p> <p>Disbenefit 3 - In addition, vehicles exiting from the depot intending to travel north via the M3, would need to circumnavigate the proposed J9 gyratory and travel back on themselves. This is an additional 1025 metres (0.6 mile) journey for vehicles and would be pertinent for maintenance vehicles (undertaking winter salt runs, etc).</p>
Local community	<p>The image of the roundabout contains a number of issues that I hope are just in the illustration.</p> <p>Firstly, the filter lane that turns left from the M3 southbound to Spitfire Link is dangerous. The snaking alignment encourages vehicles to speed up, and they will not be expecting it to end with a 'give way'. If there is not enough room to provide a normal merge - and there probably is if you really wanted one - it would surely be better to do without the filter lane.</p> <p>Secondly, the image shows that the M3 that runs underneath the roundabout will have 4 lanes when travelling northbound, but only 3 lanes when travelling southbound. If 4 lanes are needed - and I agree that they are - then they are</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p> <p>In the existing junction layout, all traffic travelling northbound on the M3 wishing to join the A34 northbound, must exit the motorway and use the main Junction 9 gyratory. This is the same for traffic travelling southbound via the A34 wishing to travel south via the M3. These flows of traffic currently lead to congestion on the M3 Junction 9 gyratory and all approaches (including Spitfire Link). With the proposed Scheme layout, these traffic movements are separated away from the gyratory roundabout by the introduction of a dedicated lane drop/lane gain arrangement (M3 to A34 and A34 to M3). This enables a smaller M3 Junction 9 (unsignalised) gyratory</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>surely needed on both sides. It won't work if everyone has to merge into 3 lanes and then it opens out into 4 after the old slip road joins.</p> <p>Thirdly, the image shows that the widened M3 southbound will have a hard shoulder through the junction. This is a strange investment seeing as Highways England are currently spending billions removing hard shoulders, telling motorists that they do more harm than good. This is especially odd seeing as the smart motorway team will be removing the hard shoulder from the M3 at the very same time!</p>		<p>to be constructed. The revised layout has been assessed using transport modelling, which predicts that queuing on the Spitfire Link will reduce.</p> <p>The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. DMRB CD 122 (Geometric Design of Grade Separated Junctions), defines several options for merge and diverge layouts. These options are dependent upon forecasted traffic flows. Using a combination of the annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) in vehicles per hour (VPH) for a mainline flow of traffic and the AADT in VPH for a merge flow of traffic, a required layout option type for a merge / diverge layout can be determined within DMRB CD 122. From an assessment of the forecasted traffic flows (contained within the Scheme transport model), the layouts currently shown, follow the requirements of DMRB CD 122. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p>The Scheme is not an All Lane Running scheme and hence hard shoulder provision is proposed.</p>
Local community	Well done - really positive scheme and much improved since 2019 consultation. Look forward to it being built.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of comments received.
Local community	Looks good and long overdue	N	
Local community	My initial impression was not favourable as the extent of new tarmac, and civil engineering structures seemed extensive, however with so much conflict between local and regional transit movements it seems unavoidable.	N	
Local community	I think you've done a fantastic job of addressing all of the problems with the original proposal and it all seems to work very well from the fly-throughs, just don't cut back on anything and let's hope reality is as good as virtuality.	N	
Local community	Thank you for listening to the comments of local residents for trying again to get it "right". I think this is an excellent, creative, 3-dimensional scheme which will make it safer for everyone who drives through M3 Junction 9. I like the proposed footpaths and cycleways too and think you have made great efforts to minimise environmental disruption.	N	
Local community	This excellent plan is what should have been done 30 years ago. It should go a long way to alleviate the congestion at the junction caused by traffic from the A34 and M3. The plan should enable the traffic lights to be removed from the junction. In order to minimise accidents, southbound vehicles from the A34 should be funnelled into a single lane before merging with the M3	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	The link to A33 is much improved over original proposal	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	<p>I'm disappointed that you've gone against your promises on providing decent and safe transport links for active and alternative transport- especially as the government aims to double cycling activity and reduce deaths and injuries on UK roads by 2025. Please can you restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths. This way we could encourage young children and students to cycle into Winchester for school, shopping and socialising. For adults it would be ideal for reducing the amount of traffic that is caused by short journeys for commuting and leisure. In Holland these routes between smaller settlements and cities are very common and they serve the population well. Children gain a sense of independence, improved physical fitness, mental health and wellbeing. It's also a great opportunity for walkers and horse riders to gain a quiet route away from the traffic too.</p> <p>As well as this, I would like to remind you that your upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 should meet the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20).</p>	Y	<p>The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has revised the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,7,17m in length
Local community	You don't need the A33 complicating things. This is a largely roundabout, a little hard road.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	The new design looks much better with direct access from the M3 to the A34 without forcing the A33 traffic to cross over the A34 traffic	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	Thank you very much for listening to the views expressed by the community previously and for putting forward a much safer and workable scheme.	N	
Local community	A nice feature or 'art installation' would be some sort of historical plaque on the old A33 flyover which tells the history of the original Winchester bypass and this junction. The original bypass was one of the first in the country and pre-dates the Motorway network. I believe the short stretch of dual carriageway from Winnall to Kingsworthy is all that remains of the original bypass and if these plans proceed the last section will have largely been removed.	N	
Local community	The A33 scheme takes a different route than in the first scheme but it doesn't take into account the effect of the new traffic and road layout on the workings of the junction at the B3047 and A33 (Cart and Horses junction) I flag this up as the new plan has some jeopardy: I have safety concerns, and traffic flows concerns. Despite the introduction to this consultation, I can see nothing within it to reduce the congestion on Spitfire Link. The congestion often has up to 1km	N	The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>of queue which is unacceptable. The solution to traffic flows on this junction must include improvements which reduce congestion from the Spitfire Link at least in line with other routes onto the junction. It is the principle way that traffic travelling from the A3, A31 reach the A34 and M3, as well as for local traffic. There is nothing asking opinion of noise in this consultation. I'd like to see noise reduction along the full length of the scheme, including on the 'old parts' of the A34 going north from the junction being created up to Three Maids Hill.</p>		<p>In regards to the Spitfire Link, in the existing junction layout, all traffic travelling Northbound on the M3 wishing to join the A34 Northbound, must exit the motorway and use the main Junction 9 gyratory. This is the same for traffic travelling Southbound via the M3. These flows of traffic currently lead to congestion on the M3 Junction 9 gyratory and all approaches (including Spitfire Link). Within the proposed Scheme layout, these traffic movements are separated away from the gyratory roundabout by the introduction of a dedicated lane drop / lane gain arrangement (M3 to A34 and A34 to M3). This enables a smaller M3 Junction 9 (unsignalised) gyratory to be constructed. The revised layout has been assessed using transport modelling, which predicts that queuing on the Spitfire Link will reduce.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p>
Local community	<p>Whilst I am broadly in agreement with the current proposal for Junction 9, and in particular the removal of the lane-drop onto the A33 northbound, I am concerned about the designation of the new footpath that will run from the Winnall roundabout to Kings Worthy. It is inevitable that this 'footpath' will be used by cyclists, regardless of the signage. Personally, I feel that cycling is to be strongly encouraged and that this route should be for shared use by pedestrians and cyclists. This may mean that headroom for the new underpass where this path goes under the A34 should be to the same height as will be provided for the NCN cycle route. This footpath should also share the same tarmac surface and be clear of obstructions such as bollards</p>	Y	<p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p>In the early stages of preliminary design, a walking, cycling and horse-riding optioneering exercise was carried out by the Applicant and the contractor to assess the buildability, routing feasibility against the existing site constraints which include the River Itchen SSSI and floodplain. The outcome of this exercise clearly defined the optimum route as illustrated within the 2021 statutory consultation.</p> <p>The route level will be at existing ground where feasible. Information on proposed and existing levels for the Scheme are shown in the Engineering Plans and Sections (Document Reference 2.6). The footway / cycling route along the entirety of the A34 section will be protected by a Vehicle Restraint System (VRS).</p>
Local community	<p>It's not clear how you join the M3 northbound from Easton Lane. I assume you take first left then across both new roundabouts then the road heading north is a filter lane onto M3. If I am correct I think this is a neat solution to previous issue of how to join A33 from Easton Lane.</p>	N	<p>The description of joining the M3 northbound from Easton Lane is correct.</p>
Local community	<p>In the roundabout from Winnall, how will that Junction be easier to navigate in, as there are blind spots, turning into the roundabout heading towards the A34 and the other one that joins the old A33. The Junction that goes straight across is confusing and the junctions around the roads from the A34 towards the roundabout and the ones that go to the A272 and on the directions to the roads, leading to Chandlers Ford and Southampton are easily missed and are potential black spots.</p>	N	<p>Clear route signage will be provided across the Scheme. Visibility splays for all proposed junctions have been designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.</p>
Local community	<p>Following receipt of the M3 J9 junction improvement flyer and a review of the Scheme, I do have one observation. I feel there would be much better traffic flow if there were 3 lanes rather than 2 from the point the A33 is currently shown merging into the A34 southbound to where there is the exit for Winchester just after the A34 passes under the M3.</p>	N	<p>The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. DMRB CD 122 (Geometric Design of Grade Separated Junctions), defines several options for merge and diverge layouts. These options are dependent upon forecasted traffic flows. Using a combination of the annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) in vehicles per hour (VPH) for a mainline flow of traffic and the AADT in VPH for a merge flow of traffic, a required layout option type for a merge / diverge</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The A34 is heavy south bound traffic both lanes and think that the A33 looking to merge with the A34 would cause restriction on the A34/still result in tail backs as A34 traffic slows allowing A33 traffic to merge.</p> <p>I feel the majority of traffic on the A33 from Basingstoke is local Winchester traffic (as would otherwise be on the M3) so would be better to have a dedicated lane it can stay in allowing southbound A34 traffic to move across over a prolonged distance if needed.</p>		<p>layout can be determined within DMRB CD 122. From an assessment of the forecasted traffic flows (contained within the Scheme transport model), the layouts currently shown, follow the requirements of DMRB CD 122. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p>
Local community	<p>The plans for the improvement look better, there are a few things that could further improve it. Could the proposed walking route between Junction 9 and Kings Worthy be a mixed use path to allow access for bikes as well, there are very few cycle routes into Kings Worthy that avoid busy roads, especially for kids.</p> <p>The other would be to make beneficial user of the soil and to use this to create a mountain bike or BMX pump track in the central or Southern spoil locations. This could then be a benefit to the community after the works and would be good for encouraging kids and others to cycle the South downs way. This would be accessible from the national cycle way too.</p> <p>It isn't very clear from the plans where access to the north bound M3 from the Easton Lane is, presumably this is from the A33 route?</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route • The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length. <p>The footway/cycleway through Junction 9 and along the entirety of the A34 section will have a form of separation by means of a Vehicle Restraint System.</p> <p>In relation to the deposition areas, since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant decided to remove all three deposition areas from its proposals. In re-profiling the landform between Easton Lane and Long Walk, in response to South Downs National Park Authority and Natural England's comments, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>The description of joining the M3 northbound from Easton Lane is correct, via the A33.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>I cannot clearly see the route from Easton Lane to the A33 northbound. The drive through video M3 to A34 appears to show traffic merging from the left, presumably from Winnall, and exiting on the right, presumably towards Basingstoke. However, the map mentions a new underpass.</p> <p>If the drive through and my interpretation of it are correct, the dangerous situation remains unchanged from before. The moderate speed, spacing and density of the traffic in the animation understates the volume and velocity of HGVs currently hammering through the junction northbound, and someone will be killed trying to cross over and exit from what will be effectively the fast lane of a nonstop motorway. However if a new underpass is planned, and I have somehow missed this, the danger is avoided. In this case a drive through is needed of the route from Winnall to the A33.</p>	N	From Easton Lane, the A33 Northbound is accessed via a revised slip road from the proposed M3 Junction 9 gyratory.
Local community	The inclusion of an underpass under the A34 so that it is possible to drive from the Winnall roundabout to the A33 without having to cross several lanes of fast moving traffic is a vast improvement, which may well prevent accidents.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	The first iteration was perfect, the second iteration was OK, and I understand that you have to take on board some feedback, but now, this latest proposal is a total disaster for anyone in the Itchen Valley wanting to join the M3 (southbound) or return from the M3 (from the south). Before you would merge onto the A34 from the A33 and take advantage of the join straight onto the M3. Same coming back, it was smooth as anything. Now, it appears that you have completely split the A34 and A33, and now to get to the M3 one will have to negotiate 3 (yes three) roundabouts. Seriously? Before, everyone benefited and now only the A34 traffic gets the benefit of the scheme with any A33 traffic having a WORSE situation than we have currently. I implore you to go back to one of the first two proposals.	N	<p>From the previous public consultation, concerns were strongly raised over the merge detail from the A33 to the A34. As a result, the proposals have been amended to separate out the A34 and A33 traffic flows, hence making the proposal safer. It should be noted that the majority of traffic travels via the A34 / M3 and these routes will be completely separated by means of a lane gain/lane drop arrangement. As a result, the traffic flows on the A33 are expected to lower, making this route easier to navigate.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14), the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	<p>I have just been looking at the latest proposals for the improvements. Whilst I am no expert, it looks as though you have listened to the earlier comments from local people and come up with a new proposal which is vastly superior and makes the possibility to go from Tesco across to the A33 in safety.</p> <p>My only comment is that there will need to be very clear signage at the roundabout for the A34 slip road as many drivers could assume that it is the M3 on slip because of its position.</p>	N	The Applicant acknowledges the views expressed, including support for the A33 proposals. Clear route signage will be provided as part of the Scheme proposals.
Local community	What would it take to support the installation of a cycle way to Kings Worthy? I believe the attached papers show that Winchester City Council, and indeed also HCC's commitment to the addition of a cycle route to the incomplete footway route that exists at present. The R123 list was shared and operational between both councils.	Y	The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Following a petition many years ago, the need for a cycle route from Kings Worthy to Winnall was established and listed on the R123 list. The Reg 123 lists were superseded by the Infrastructure Funding Statements in 2020, but the principle of the needs identified are there for all to see and should be used as a basis to identify infrastructure needs by the city and county councils. The cycle route is highlighted. You will see a little further down the junction itself!</p> <p>I'd like to discuss the footway routes in more detail. It is my understanding that any Highways NSIP must consider fully the needs of NMU. Highways England will always consider the vehicles- it is up to us as local residents to consider the rest!</p> <p>At what point does the A34 gain motorway status? And could we meet with HCC officers to discuss the implications of the new road changes to the area around and at the Cart and Horses junction?</p>		<p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.</p> <p>The A34 southbound gains motorway status after the diverge (directly after exiting the proposed M3 underpass) which leads to the M3 southbound / Gyratory.</p>
Local community	<p>The Winchester Movement strategy work suggests that improvements to the capacity of and flow through this junction will have a positive impact on the city's traffic issues, air pollution, carbon footprint etc. I remain unconvinced, because in many cases, the issues are caused by accidents on the M3 or A34 outside the proposed plan area. I do not see any data in the consultation report to show expected movements, % of non polluting vehicles by 2035, etc in the papers. This leads to build up of traffic which is avoided by going through Winchester instead. Unless these plans reduce accidents on the feeder trunk roads (the M3 and A34,) the traffic build ups will still occur, all too often as traffic levels are returning to pre pandemic levels.</p> <p>These are my specific points for your consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The layout is better for local people using the A33 who were worried about crossing heavy traffic, but it now means that all local users will have to use the new junction every time (which wasn't the case in the previous design). This may lead to congestion so it has not served our needs as well as we would hope. The north exit from the A33 on to the M3 north brings faster traffic movements closer to the communities that I represent- hence potentially noisier, which is unacceptable. • The positioning of the soil deposits has been done to suit HE/landowners. It is a missed opportunity to mitigate the noise of the road in operation all along the route from south to north. (see also point 12) Princes Mead has concerns about the setting of the listed building too. There is no assessment of flood risk when these soil heaps are in place. • The omission of the cycle route to Kings Worthy when it was so clearly described in the first proposal is a failure in this design. It is a need that is clearly described in the WCC/HCC Infrastructure Funding Statement 	N	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments and sets out its response to the matters relating to design below. Other matters raised in this response are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p> <p><i>Responding to point 1:</i></p> <p>In the existing junction layout, all traffic travelling northbound on the M3 wishing to join the A34 northbound, must exit the motorway and use the main Junction 9 gyratory. This is the same for traffic travelling southbound via the A34 wishing to travel south via the M3. These flows of traffic currently lead to congestion on the M3 Junction 9 gyratory and all approaches. With the proposed Scheme layout, these traffic movements are separated away from the gyratory roundabout by the introduction of a dedicated lane drop/lane gain arrangement (M3 to A34 and A34 to M3). This enables a smaller M3 Junction 9 (unsignalised) gyratory to be constructed. From the previous public consultation, concerns were strongly raised over the merge detail from the A33 to the A34. As a result, the proposals have been amended to separate out the A34 and A33 traffic flows, hence making the proposal safer. It should be noted that the majority of traffic travels via the A34 / M3 and these routes will be completely separated by means of a lane gain/lane drop arrangement. As a result, the traffic flows on the A33 are expected to lower, making this route easier to navigate.</p> <p><i>Responding to point 4:</i></p> <p>The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling with a forward forecast to 2047, which indicated that traffic signals are not required. Most of the traffic using the existing gyratory roundabout is vehicles exiting the M3 to travel via the A34 northbound and A34 southbound traffic utilising the gyratory to travel south via the M3. These flows are to be removed from the gyratory via the proposed dedicated lane gain and lane drop arrangements. Hence, the predicted traffic flows for the</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>(previously the R123 list) which I have already sent to the design/project team. I believe it is a duty to consider the needs of Non Motorised Users to be taken into account in any NSIP scheme, so this omission is disappointing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of traffic lights may be ok initially, but inevitably, there will be a need to control traffic flows in years ahead. Please include electricity schemes to enable traffic lights to be fitted later. • Failure to show signage and gantries in the scheme means that we cannot tell what views these will present to local people, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area. Already, the traffic lights of the junction can be seen from miles away in my division, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area, and cross motorway gantries can be viewed from Martyr Worthy in the national park. • If this country is to embrace walking and cycling for local commuting use, then the 3m wide cycle routes are inadequate to pass and should be wider. This includes actually on the roundabout where at one point, the walk/cycle way is alongside the main road. The Winnall area will continue to provide employment opportunities as well as retail etc. Other larger lorries go into the city from this junction. The paths created should not be shared for walkers and cyclists on planned bridleway that connect and to the NCN 23 where cyclists can be riding faster than is safe for walkers sharing the same surface (all should be at least to LTN1/20). • Impact on Cart and Horses junction traffic going onto the A33 from the B3047 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The design has no traffic breaks in traffic moving north on the A33 from Junction 9. Currently, there are traffic breaks (traffic lights create this) which create gaps in traffic to allow people to exit from the Cart and Horses junction, allowing it to function. This is particularly important at peak times when traffic entering and leaving Winchester is heavy on both routes. The new arrangement may create congestion, reduce safety and even more confusion at this junction. (It is also an opportunity to improve the gateway into the National Park at this point.) ○ The road layout of the A33 is changing, with one lane in each direction, and a bike lane coming into/through the junction. Currently there are sections of two lanes for filtering etc. These changes will impact on the junction itself which will need redesign to ensure it is safe, congestion doesn't occur and ideally actually improves for traffic going south (Morning Basingstoke traffic into Winchester), and Worthys /Winchester traffic going north and south at all times of day, but particularly at peak times, and traffic from the B3047 east going north. 		<p>revised gyratory roundabout are lower than existing. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p><i>Responding to point 5:</i></p> <p>Proposed signage and gantries are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14). These have considered within the Scheme Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p><i>Responding to point 7:</i></p> <p>The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.</p> <p><i>Responding to point 8:</i></p> <p>Spitfire Link – In the existing junction layout, all traffic travelling Northbound on the M3 wishing to join the A34 Northbound, must exit the motorway and use the main Junction 9 gyratory. This is the same for traffic travelling Southbound via the M3. These flows of traffic currently lead to congestion on the M3 Junction 9 gyratory and all approaches (including Spitfire Link). Within the proposed scheme layout, these traffic movements are separated away from the gyratory roundabout by the introduction of a dedicated lane drop / lane gain arrangement (M3 to A34 and A34 to M3). This enables a smaller M3 Junction 9 (unsignalised) gyratory to be constructed. The revised layout has been assessed using transport modelling, which predicts that queuing on the Spitfire Link will reduce.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project statement states that one aim is to reduce Spitfire Link congestion, which severely impacts drivers there. There is no evidence in the project plan that the team have provided that shows how the new design will reduce congestion. At present, large traffic accelerates from a stop slower than smaller vehicles which results in no gaps for Spitfire Link traffic. There is no evidence provided that this will improve, because although much of the heavy traffic will be on the through road, not all of it will take that route; daytime traffic in particular, includes a considerable amount of large and small vehicles into Winnall. • The levels on the project plans are difficult to follow, and I asked HCC to seek more traffic data, and full levels plan to see the implications for views, noise, pollutants fall out. • The drive through video is poor, and difficult to follow : I requested an improved version but was told this was impossible. • There is a considerable amount of biodiversity work to be considered: which includes interconnectivity between areas being 'managed' for biodiversity. I am leaving this to the experts at WCC, HCC and to SDNPA, but I do have concerns about the long term management of the water areas, set within the road system. • The DEFRA 2016 noise map showed that improvement to noise mitigation were desirable at points through Winchester and for the A34 at the Headbourne Worthy site. A noise reference along Willis Waye is included in your scheme. Anything worse, even by a slight margin would be unacceptable in planning terms 'for the enjoyment of the property' and other properties affected in this way. Since Willis Waye was built, a considerable number of properties have been built in this area, alongside the A34 margins and I am seeking noise defence for these residents. Original tree planting is unsatisfactory: acoustic fencing is necessary here to mitigate noise. • I must also express my regret that an 'open air' event wasn't organised for this consultation. With many other events taking place, this was a missed opportunity to engage the public face to face. 		
Local community	Please can you advise if there are any proposals or plans to redirect traffic from the motorway, during this work, through Winchester city centre and along North Walls? I'm a resident on north walls and when there is ever a divert from the motorway through north walls; the heavy lorries literally shake the house as they pass through on a 20 mph limit road, causing disturbance to sleep & safety concerns.	N	No temporary diversions of traffic are proposed to be diverted through Winchester City Centre and North Walls. All proposed diversions shall remain on the National Highways network, where possible. Diversion Plans will be set out in the Traffic Management Plan. An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been prepared for the DCO application.
Local community	Your proposal states that you will increase the number of lanes around junction 9 to help traffic flow more easily. Does this mean the creation of a smart motorway? I sincerely hope not, as these are very dangerous. Anyone who breaks down has nowhere to wait and be safe.	N	The Scheme is not a smart motorway project and hard shoulder provision will be provided as part of the Scheme proposals.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>My company is in the centre of Winchester and driving to and from work for all of my colleagues is essential. We employ specialists in combustion engineering from near and far, not just locally. Many of my colleagues use this area of the M3 daily and I need to be able to reassure them that safety has been considered in your improvements.</p>		
Local community	<p>Overall the scheme looks good. However, I have some areas of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The M3/A34 merge should be 4 lanes in total, rather than 4 merging into 3. This is supported by your stated traffic flows now, with the M3 and A34 having roughly the same traffic flows. The lane gain south of Junction 9, from the roundabout would not be required, instead just merging into a 4 lane M3 • The access to the Highways depot on the future A33 would be better served by a simple T-Junction with a turn lane provided northbound. • The free flow link between the M3 south slip and the A272 should have a form of physical segregation between the link and the roundabout, rather than hatching. This link should also have an appropriate merge onto the A272, rather than a give-way. 	N	<p>The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. The modelling suggests that 4 lanes are not required.</p> <p>Consideration was given to the proposed roundabout to the National Highways depot during the preliminary design and a 'left in, left out' junction configuration was considered. The main clear routes for vehicles entering and leaving the depot are the A34 and the M3. The provision of a 'left in, left out' junction arrangement has the following disbenefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disbenefit 1 - The introduction of a 'left in, left out' junction could encourage higher speeds within the proposed A33 link road, leading to enforcement issues. • Disbenefit 2 – With the 'left in, left out' arrangement, vehicles exiting at Junction 9 wishing to enter the depot would need to travel to the proposed A33 roundabout and back on themselves. This is an additional 1200 metres (0.7 mile) journey for vehicles. If a 'left in, left out' junction was introduced, a form of central reserve would be required to prevent vehicles from attempting to make a right turn into the depot (avoiding the need to travel to the proposed M3 northbound onslip roundabout and back), which would increase (widen) the scheme footprint within this area. • Disbenefit 3 - In addition, vehicles exiting from the depot intending to travel north via the M3, would need to circumnavigate the proposed J9 gyratory and travel back on themselves. This is an additional 1025 metres (0.6 mile) journey for vehicles and would be pertinent for maintenance vehicles (undertaking winter salt runs, etc). <p>The Applicant reassessed the dedicated left turn lane and traffic flows. The traffic modelling assessment indicated that the dedicated left turn lane to the A272 was not required and has therefore been removed from the Scheme's proposals.</p>
Local community	<p>My main concern is losing the hard shoulder Can you confirm the extra lane will not be at the expense of the hard shoulder anywhere along the m3?</p>	N	<p>The Scheme is not a smart motorway project and hard shoulder provision will be provided as part of the Scheme proposals.</p>
Local community	<p>I am not at all certain, at this point that I understand the layout of the scheme; particularly how the traffic flow is to be managed, especially the separation of local roads from the through traffic to the M3 and A34. Today I returned from Southampton and left the M3 at Junction 10 (The Junction before Junction 9). In</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted the range of views expressed. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>front of me were three lanes of traffic approaching capacity. On the inside lane was a row of articulated lorries coming, I assume, mainly from Southampton container port and Portsmouth container port. This traffic was going to the A34 which is the main South-North route from the south. It is totally inadequate. I have occasion to drive to Scotland starting on the A34 and I know, from experience, that the A34 is often at capacity or over capacity. The lorry traffic is mostly going north to such places as Birmingham, Manchester and eventually, Scotland. I am sure you have figures for this.</p> <p>It is a statement of the obvious that Junction 9 should have been improved years ago. In any event Improvements to this junction will not solve the real problem which is that the south of England desperately needs an A34 motorway linking with the M40, M42, M5, M6 and other motorway routes to the north both east and west. Junction 9 improvement is essential but should be part of a project to turn the A34 into a motorway as far as the M40. The improvement of this junction has 'knock-on' effects for the A31 which is now funnelling a massive amount of traffic from the East onto the A34 and the M3 so the A31 also needs to be upgraded to motorway. I realise that the environmentalists will say these improvements will only bring more traffic. It may be that in 25 to 50 years that travel options and needs will have changed and it might even be there will be less traffic but that is probably a rather fanciful wish laden projection. The reality is that we need to manage traffic now and for many years to come.</p> <p>The overall situation is further complicated by the M3 exits to Southampton which cannot, at peak times, cope with the volume of local traffic and holiday traffic to the west. When 500,000 went to Bournemouth last summer the M3 and M27 west were completely blocked. When the M27 was stopped last year for a bridge repair the whole of Southern Hampshire and Southampton was gridlocked. Basically the density of population in this part of the south of England has overwhelmed the whole traffic system!</p>		<p>Further details in relation to the layout of the Scheme, are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p>The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling, which demonstrates how traffic flows are to be managed. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p>
Local community	<p>Recently the new plans for the Winnall roundabout M3/A34 junctions have come out. Although I'm very happy that things are changing, I feel that a very simple fix can be completed in the mean time that would reduce any congestion heading to the A34 from the roundabout. I'm not sure why this wasn't done already. Is there any chance of splitting the slip road so both lanes go to the A34 rather than 1? There is plenty of room to have both lanes go there and the right lane split off at the end to go to Kings Worthy. It would be a bit of paint and some signage. It's been an issue for merging traffic from the right lane and is the only cause of congestion extending back through the round about.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. In the existing scenario, two lanes are present for the A34 on the M3 Northbound offslip. Details of the construction phasing of the works are presented in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
Local community	<p>I think the latest design with its direct safe link from J9 to the A33 Kings Worthy is a great improvement and I am pleased that you are now proposing this design. Some points of detail:</p> <p>1. It is of critical importance that the road route between Kings Barton development and J9 through the Cart and Horses junction be improved in</p>	Y	<p><i>In response to point 1:</i></p> <p>The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>order to meet the requirement, stated at the Barton Farm Public Inquiry, that this would be the route rather than a route through the City Centre. I ask that you work closely with HCC to provide improvements to the A33 Cart and Horses junction to achieve this.</p> <p>2. The footway proposed between Kings Worthy and J9 should be a joint shared footway and cycleway to provide a direct route between Kings Worthy and Winnall and onward destinations. A cycle route requiring cyclists to use the J9 gyratory is not safe and is not acceptable.</p> <p>3. The shared footway and cycleway through J9 should have a pedestrian barrier on the at-grade section immediately adjacent to the gyratory roadway to prevent pedestrians and cyclists accidentally moving onto the roadway.</p> <p>4. There should be an approved Diversion Plan published by Highways England for when sections of the A34 and/or M3 are closed for maintenance or due to accidents. This Plan should ensure that traffic is not diverted through Winchester City Centre or along Andover Road and through the Kings Barton residential area.</p>		<p>along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.</p> <p><i>In response to point 2:</i></p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p><i>In response to point 3:</i></p> <p>The footway/cycleway through Junction 9 will have a form of separation by means of a Vehicle Restraint System.</p> <p><i>In response to point 4:</i></p> <p>Diversion Plans will be set out in the Traffic Management Plan. An outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been prepared for the DCO application.</p>
Local community	<p>3D flythrough lacks detail on the proposals for the A33 and the cycle lanes albeit it seems ok. Lack of detail in the plans also means that it's not clear what will be happening at the Cart & Horses Junction on the northern end of the A33. Other than that, the proposals are fine from my point of view the only trouble is the delay in construction - it's now quite late and HE seems quite happy to keep on kicking the can down the road rather than getting the work completed. The work is required NOW not in 'X' years time.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p> <p>In relation to the Cart and Horses Junction, the junction is not within the scope of the Scheme and the existing junction is within Hampshire County Council ownership.</p>
Local community	<p>As a frequent user of the M3 Junction 9 roundabout taking the A34 exit and then the A33, I am greatly relieved that you have removed the A33 filter from the fast lane of the A34. I have two questions on the revised scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the roundabout, the two exits after the Easton Lane exit are the A33/M3(N) exit, closely followed by the A34 exit. Have you considered a single A34/A33/M(N)3 exit with a slip road to join the A34 and the remaining traffic to proceed to the new A33/M3(N) roundabout. The new A33/M3(N) roundabout is shown as having an exit that I assume eventually joins the M3(N). But the map also shows a road joining the roundabout from the north. Is this correct and, if so, where does the traffic come from? 	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p> <p>It is not possible to provide a slip road link from the A33 to the A34 as described. This is due to the existing National Highways Depot which severs a possible connection. There is also a considerable level difference, which would cause a constraint, hence the proposed layout shown.</p> <p>The new A33 / M3 (N) roundabout has an exit which consists of the M3 Northbound onslip. The road joining this roundabout from the north is the realigned A33 link road.</p>
Local community	<p>I was surprised that your scheme still seems to have the right hand filter to A33 Northbound, despite there being an alternative route (if I have read it correctly) via the Winnall roundabout. I think this is dangerous and unexpected for drivers who have accelerated after the junction, despite the extra distance from the junction. Slip roads should be on the left.</p>	N	<p>The right-hand filter does not form part of the Scheme proposals and has been removed following previous public consultation.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>found it very hard to understand how the roads will be routed as there was very little if any local landmarks marked on the plans eg Tesco at Junction 9 and the Cart & Horses at Kings Worthy for example- this would have helped enormously in understanding the scale and routing of the proposals plus their locations etc</p> <p>One thing we currently have as a problem is the sound of the motorway AND/or the A34 in North Winchester - from Kings Worthy all the way into Abbots Barton and other Northerly parts of Winchester.</p> <p>We have a consistently loud background noise in Abbots Barton especially in winter when the trees have no leaves and the atmosphere is very wet and humid however even in the summer when the windows have to be left open to sleep comfortably the sound can almost appear deafening which given the distance seems highly strange, although a temperature inversion may account for some of this</p> <p>We would very much welcome some investigation into this distractingly loud acoustic intrusion into our otherwise quiet existences so that this can be designed out of any part of the scheme in the future.</p> <p>As part of the works please can you ensure all tarmac is the low sound type and also could you please ensure the A34 ALL of the way up the hill out of Junction 9 also has a new layer of this sound attenuating tarmac.</p> <p>On another note I am unsure if your scheme will be affecting the A33 road where it connects to London Road leaving Winchester at the Cart and Horses pub. If it does or if any offsite contributions are required in the scheme this dangerous junction where many vehicle accidents take place desperately needs a roundabout to slow traffic and ensure everyone knows how to 'read' this overly complicated junction as it stands today</p>	N	<p>The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>I use the M3 jct 9 -A34 north a lot and there is always slow traffic there. Once you head north up the A34 from M3 jct 9 it splits into 2 lanes - left lane =A34 north and right lane = A33 north to Basingstoke. Can't you make both lanes A34 NORTH and right lane A34 north and A33 to Basingstoke . This will stop a lot of congestion backing up onto the M3 jct 9 and beyond.</p>	N	<p>The configuration subject to the comment is to be revised as part of the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme. The proposed realigned A34 Northbound will be 2 lanes and both lanes dedicated as A34 heading Northbound. The current northbound diverge to the A33 is being abandoned as part of the revised scheme proposals and the A33 becomes realigned as a bi-directional carriageway. Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14).</p>
Local community	<p>You will recall I objected very strongly to your 2019 proposals in August of that year. I was particularly concerned about the proposed off-side diverge off the A34 for the northbound A33 local traffic which, of course, is contrary to DMRB advice . I am very pleased you have changed that layout and now the proposal is for a separate route for northbound and southbound A33 / local traffic. I note you have also changed the previous proposal for a dumb-bell layout of the actual junction 9 that is a great improvement, although it is sad that you cannot retain</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments.</p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>the two original bridges- I understand the span is insufficient to accommodate the 10 lanes of M3 and slip roads.I have some comments on particular design details but overall comment the present proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed footway between Jg and Kings Worthy utilising part of the abandoned A33 northbound carriageway should be widened from 2m to 3.5m to become a joint footway /cycleway.. Otherwise cyclists will have to use the new local road, part of which will used by vehicles heading northbound for the M3. the southbound entry to the new Jg roundabout seems unduly complicated. Do the combined traffic flows from the southbound exiting M3 traffic and the southbound exiting A34 traffic really justify a segregated left turn arrangement ?? a tiny detail, but the proposed Easton footway /cycleway where it passes into the inside of the Jg roundabout (on the west side) where you show a 270° loop should have some pedestrian steps where it comes out of the underpass, otherwise all pedestrians will have to walk the extra 150m around the loop. Clearly cyclists and the mobility impaired will walk all around the gently sloping loop but many walkers will just climb up the bank 		<p>The proposed segregated left turn lane has been omitted as part of ongoing scheme development and further analysis of traffic flows.</p> <p>The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved. This has been reduced in size as the design has developed and the provision of steps has been incorporated within the loop enabling a more direct and quicker route for pedestrians.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	<p>We support the proposed plans, having commented in 2019. The present road layout causes huge congestion and is unsafe. It does not cater for cyclists and pedestrians in a safe environment. It will be very important for local residents to have regular updates if the scheme progresses, and to be informed of local contact details of who to contact quickly if concerned on any issues. Carrying the public with you will give them reassurance. Local liaison groups have been set up through Planning Committees in the past for larger projects, which were successful, could this be done in this case?</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. Project updates will be posted on the Applicant's Scheme webpage and the Planning Inspectorate's dedicated Scheme webpage throughout the DCO planning stages. If the Scheme is accepted for examination, members of the local community will be able to register as an 'Interested Party' and share their views about the Scheme in the examination.</p> <p>Furthermore, a Community Liaison Manager will be appointed to respond to complaints and community liaison. Further details are provided in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p>
Local community	<p>The scheme proposed is more complex and expensive than it needs to be. It also fails to realise the potential benefits the project could deliver if a wider view of the road network is taken. We can have both a better local traffic solution and a cheaper Junction 9.</p> <p>The A33 is no longer a major trunk road, made obsolete by the M3 it now carries little traffic to and from small rural communities. There is no need to weave the A33 though the new junction via an underpass and bridge.</p> <p>The project can provide a route for all local traffic by using the existing north bound carriageway of the A34 until it has crossed north of the River Itchen where a new short link can connect to the B3047 at the roundabout with Bedfield Lane (or a new roundabout further to the West). Make this a two-way local road – it is local traffic only and this simple alteration removes all local traffic from the through flow junction.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p> <p>The A33 is proposed to join the revised M3 Junction 9 gyratory via a new link road. The A34 is proposed to connect directly to the M3 Southbound carriageway via a lane gain arrangement and the proposed underpass mentioned.</p> <p>The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>It has the following advantages:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The high speed stretch of the A33 south of its junction with the B3047 can be removed allowing the restoration of valuable meadow land along the banks of the River Itchen. (ii) The A33 restored to it's pre-War route through King's Worthy will pass under the A34 using the B3407 (which was the A33 in former times) via the existing underpass. (iii) The dangerous "Cart and Horses Junction", where there have been a number of fatalities, will cease to exist. (iv) Traffic through the heart of King's Worthy will be reduced as cars from Kings Worthy and Abbots Barton/North Winchester will use the new link to access Junction 9 without having to pass through King's Worthy and use the dangerous junction. This reduction will more than offset the traffic from the A33 passing though the village. (v) The new construction can be simplified and the cost reduced. <p>Many homes in Winchester and the north of King's Worthy which currently use Lovedon or Church Lanes and the A33 to access Junction 9 will instead use the B3047 or Springvale Road and Bedfield Lane and the new link.</p> <p>Regarding Junction 9, the south bound carriageway of the A34 is now redundant as it approaches the junction so can be removed. This gives space for expansion of the depot, drainage, other services or landscape improvements. The depot does not need to have a roundabout access if this road is not carrying traffic headed north for the M3.</p> <p>The existing access road to the M3 can be widened to provide a two lane exit from the roundabout. One lane leading down to the A34 and one over the A34 to the M3. The slip road to the M3 passing over the A34 should be considerably reduced in length and there is no need for an underpass under the A34 northbound carriageway. As a result there is probably no need to alter the course of the existing riverside footpath</p> <p>By building the new link first and closing the A33 south of its junction with the B3047 there is an immediate simplification and opening up of the construction site making the whole process less painful and costly.</p> <p>This proposal is illustrated on the enclosed map. I have marked in yellow two alternatives for a short new link from the current A34 north bound carriageway to the B3047. And in blue marked the existing length of A33 (North and South bound) which can be removed and where water meadows can be restored. As far as I can see this suggestion offers a superior solution at lower cost with additional benefits.</p>		<p>The Scheme has been developed to minimise environmental impact to the surrounding area (SSI and SAC) and reduce the amount of land required to be purchased for the Scheme.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Construction works avoided or reduced include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-use of existing A34 carriageway reduces new road build for local traffic. • No underpass of A33 under North bound A34. • No overpass of the A33 over the south bound A34. • More freedom to re-align the A34 carriageways. • No roundabout for the A33 with the M3 slip road North of the Junction. • The new North bound slip road for the M3 will be greatly reduced in length as once over the A34 it can immediately reduce in height and merge with the M3. • More manageable construction site. • No need for new footpath. <p>The extra benefits include: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safety improvement by removing a known accident black spot with a history of fatalities. 2. Preserving the existing footpath route along the river. 3. Restoration of an area of water meadows and reconnecting King's Worthy to its river. 4. Less traffic through the historic heart of King's Worthy. 5. Shorter local journeys to/from Winnall to Winchester residents living in North of the City, drawing local through traffic away from the city centre. 		
Local community	As long as the access along Sustrans Route 23 to/from Easton Lane is preserved, and preferably retaining no need to stop at traffic lights, it looks like a very good plan.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	<p>In general we are in favour of improving the junction configuration to create free-flow traffic from the A34 to the M3 and vice versa. More importantly, we support the separation of local traffic and the strategic road network around the junction with the creation of a separate link road. This will make driving to Winnall from Itchen Abbas a safer and more accessible journey.</p> <p>However, there are areas of the proposals we have specific concerns about. Our feedback is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction compound Number 4 would inevitably add construction traffic to the likely traffic management routes through the construction site, namely down the A34. There are no other sensible options to build either off highway haul roads or use local lanes to avoid the A34 with this construction traffic (narrow railway underbridge on Down Farm Lane, local villages not appropriate for HGVs and LGVs). This location seems unnecessary given the scale of other potential construction compounds in the vicinity. We recommend this compound Number 4 is 	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the support of the Scheme in principle and the range of views expressed.</p> <p><i>Response to point 8:</i></p> <p>The Cart and Horses junction is outside of the Application boundary and no work is proposed to this junction as part of the Scheme. The Applicant has engaged with Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council about this area of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to points 1 to 7 elsewhere in this Appendix.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>dropped from the plans. If it is retained, we would expect to see in the DCO application/examination a detailed assessment and findings based upon how this site had been selected. This should include detailed traffic modelling results for the construction period to demonstrate minimal ill-effect from other traffic to local surrounding roads from the addition of construction vehicles leading to and from compound Number 4 and the Junction 9 site. Adding construction vehicles from this remote location up the A34, which is highly likely to be congested during extended periods of the construction phase, would compound delays on this already busy section of A34 and risk sending traffic heading south along the A34 on rat-runs using either the city of Winchester or local village roads in the Itchen Valley. This is avoidable with better choice of onsite or existing compound choice.</p> <p>2. Construction compound Number 3 is a poor choice of construction compound given the immediate proximity to the sensitive River Itchen. This ground form slopes towards the river giving direct pathway from a proposed construction compound to the internationally designated river. This would likely be a very challenging location to confirm through the DCO application/examination on Habitat Regulations Assessment grounds alone. This site should be dropped from the plans and all efforts be made to distance the construction sites from River Itchen wherever practicable.</p> <p>3. We are surprised there is no mention of using the existing R&W materials compound site situated right next to Junction 9 between the M3 SB Onslip and the Spitfire spur road. This site is run by an established Highways England contractor; it is full of potential engineering fill material that will have come from elsewhere on the strategic road network over recent years; and, now that very 'recycled' fill material is piled to its current height the plant, other machinery and lighting used in that compound is a visual eyesore on the edge of the South Downs National Park. It would be bordering on disingenuous for Highways England not to look at the opportunities this compound offers both in terms of construction compound site location (instead of compound Number 3 or 4) and the reuse of fill material borne from years of 'recycling' from other Highways England schemes. Again, as in my point 1/ I would expect to see full assessment and reasoned findings in the DCO application, as to what the selection criteria against using this location with the potential use of the engineering fill material within, all of which is quite literally already on site.</p> <p>4. Given the constrained location of the proposed development site between the historic city of Winchester and the South Downs National Park and over the River Itchen, construction mitigation would have to be</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>extremely well planned out, with best practice mitigation strategies and pollution prevention controls in place. This scrutiny over the construction phase should extend to design and logistics and include maximising off-site prefabrication of as much infrastructure as possible, delivering to site for installation in a quick and controlled manner. For example, the deck for the new footbridge over the River Itchen should be prefabricated offsite and dropped into place overnight from the adjacent A34 NB carriageway once pier footings have been installed. The underpass taking the A34 SB under the M3 could be built in square shape box sections and slid into place on rails. New junction infrastructure on Junction 9 itself ought to be prefabricated as far as possible and the onsite build be on as accelerated a timeline as possible to improve potential impacts on traffic movements during the construction phase. Prefabrication offsite would enable greater control of materials transfer and storage (reducing the potential for pollution incident) in the constrained development location between Winchester and the South Downs National Park, while having the potential to improve construction times for the overall project. With the construction site being on two significant highway routes (being the A34 and M3), there is ideal opportunity to bring in large elements of prefabricated infrastructure onsite, using appropriate abnormal indivisible load protocols, without need to go through local towns and villages.</p> <p>5. Re. landscaping, topsoil ought not be used where swathes of chalk grassland are intended. It should be made clear to landscaping contractors through means of detailed soil management plans, environmental masterplans and landscape design secured through the DCO that chalk grassland requires in part denudated substrate free of nutrients. Good case study here is the Weymouth Relief Road in Dorset where swathes of wildflowers complement the highway inclusion in the local landscape and has resulted in greatly reduced maintenance regimes according to Highways England’s own Linkedin posts (ref. Ben Hewlett’s posts). There is plenty of local expertise in this area with Butterfly Conservation (who manage the excellent Magdalen Hill Down butterfly reserve in line of sight of the M3 Junction 9 proposals), Hampshire and IOW Wildlife Trust, the Bumblebee Conservation Trust and the very local Wild Valley Verges group all in the county and who can advise appropriate design and management. Topsoil is a precious commercial resource nowadays and could be used agriculturally in the vicinity.</p> <p>6. With Biodiversity net gain for DCO consented schemes now in proposed amendments to the Environment Bill, all proposed biodiversity habitats created towards the end of construction should be maintained in line</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>with an appropriate Handover Environmental Management Plan in perpetuity, if not by Highways England then by a suitable local agent who could acquire the areas in concern. This would secure real environmental legacy for the area.</p> <p>7. I could not find any detail about operational lighting proposals in the consultation material. I would expect highway lighting to be minimal unless absolutely required for safety. This view is to contribute to the dark night skies over South Downs National Park.</p> <p>8. It is not easy to see from the indicative general arrangement plans whether the proposed M3 Junction 9 improvements scheme goes as far north up the A33 as the ‘Cart and Horses junction’. There is a most fantastic opportunity here for collaboration between Hampshire County Council, Winchester City Council and Highways England to incorporate the long needed upgrade of this awful staggered junction between the B3047 and A33 (which has seen so many road traffic accidents over many years) into the wider proposals, while Tier 1 contractors are on site. More detail on this would be welcome if it is being considered – from a local’s perspective it certainly should be.</p>		
Local community	<p>I am pleased to see that you have now dropped the contentious offside divergence of the A33 from the northbound A34. My remaining concern is with the southbound slip roads from the M3 and A34 to the main Junction 9 roundabout. Would it be possible to move the merge of these two slip roads farther north, to increase the available distance for weaving on the roundabout approach?</p>	N	<p>The layout of these slip roads is designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD 122 and the weaving lengths comply with this document.</p>
Local community	<p>I just wanted to say that this looks like a marvellous project to manifestly improve this junction (that should have been built like this originally - in the nineties was it! Any way better late than never.</p> <p>As usual you are doing your very best to deal with environmental issues. Unfortunately, also as usual, the eco people in various guises want to block/delay/change. As reported in the local media very recently. They are never happy - witness the A303 debacle.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p>
Cycle Winchester	<p>NC23</p> <p>We welcome the continued inclusion of this route in the plan. It’s a vital link between Winchester and the communities of the Itchen Valley. It also proves recreational access to the country lanes and bridleways and to the South Downs National Park more widely. It is already well-used by local cyclists, with peak time usage of up to 50 per hour¹ despite the current cyclist-hostile arrangements on the overbridge. However many local people are unaware of it</p>	Y	<p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the current provisions and introduce new routes and connections. All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT’s inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>and many others are put off by the narrow overbridge section, tight bends and poor sightlines. If the new path is properly designed, built and signed then we expect to see a substantial increase in usage.</p> <p>We are therefore concerned that the project team has declined to make a commitment to build this path to the latest LTN 1/20 standards. These standards are mandated by DfT for any project it funds (not just local authority projects). If this were a minor alteration to an existing route then there might be a case for bending the standards; as it is, it's effectively a new build and there is no reason to produce anything substandard. In the context of the overall costs of the project, the difference in cost between a to-standard cycleway and a substandard one must surely be trivial.</p> <p>At the launch presentation for this consultation round, one member of the project team suggested that LTN 1/20 conflicted with the DMRB standards in certain situations. We have not heard this claim from any other highways engineer either locally or nationally. Our offer from that presentation still stands: if the team would like to tell us what these conflicts are, we have contacts (via the Cycling UK campaign network) who may be able to approach the authors of the standards and seek a resolution.</p> <p>From the current drawings we can't see any details of what is proposed: this is disappointing considering that the project team has had more than two years since the WCH workshop to come up with a detailed plan. We would like reassurance that the path will meet LTN 1/20 standards for width, height, sealed surfacing, sightlines, turning circles and gradients based on the expected frequent usage. After looking at the latest plans we are especially concerned about several aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The overbridge above the M3, on the southern section of the roundabout. The plans show the cycleway on this bridge alongside the carriageway lanes, but there is no sign of a physical barrier between the vehicle lanes and the cycleway. This was raised in the 2019 WCH workshop and it was agreed that a physical barrier here was very important: (a) for physical protection should a driver swerve off the vehicle lane or decide to use the cycleway as a place to pull over (not unusual elsewhere!) and (b) for psychological protection, ensuring that non-motorised users feel adequately shielded from the heavy traffic on the roundabout. We should also note that our view is coloured by experience from 2009, when HE's predecessor (the Highways Agency) decided it needed another lane on the roundabout and simply removed the buffer zone between the cycleway and the carriageway to make room for it. If there is no physical barrier in the new design, the implication will be that HE is once again treating the gap between 		<p>The use of tactile paving (both blister and corduroy types) is also proposed to cater for the visually impaired, and wayfinding signage will also be provided along the footway/cycleway/bridleway routes as part of the Scheme proposal.</p> <p>NCN Route 23 would be upgraded. On both sides of the gyratory (east and west), the existing walking and cycling route which links both parts of Easton Lane, would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders would be improved with a widened 3m route (with 4m wide underpasses), which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway to enable rider dismounting for leading horses through to continue the route to the existing bridleway extent (which currently ceases within the existing roundabout). Future provision for horse-riders is allowed for (beyond the existing cessation point within the roundabout) by providing a wider 3m width bridge over the M3, and space for future mounting block provision either side of the western subway which would be sufficient to lead horses through.</p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. The route runs parallel to the west of the A33 with the route to be constructed within the existing verge. A signalised (unlit) Toucan crossing is proposed adjacent to the proposed National Highways depot roundabout, to provide a link to this route through the north-western side of the gyratory roundabout. The route then transitions to utilise the existing A34 northbound and A33 carriageways which are to be abandoned as part of the Scheme. The existing informal link to the existing PRow would also be upgraded from its connection to the A33.</p> <p>For the first River Itchen crossing (i.e. most northern), the route follows the existing A33 and is accommodated on the existing bridge deck abandoned carriageway. For the second river crossing (i.e. most southern), the Scheme includes a new cycle/footbridge to be constructed across the River Itchen, with the route extending south along the east of the new A34 alignment, crossing under the A34 in a new 4m wide subway which would then traverse around new attenuation basins, then progressing to the existing depot junction and towards NCN Route 23 via a new subway under the northern arm of the gyratory roundabout. The new cycle/footbridge would be approximately 3.5m wide.</p> <p>Four proposed subways would be required to accommodate existing and improved provision of routes in the area. The two new subways at the gyratory roundabout would cater for existing users of NCN Route 23, one additional subway would link with the western walking and cycling route, while a subway under the A34 northbound catering for the pedestrian/cyclist users of the new route.</p> <p>The new subways would comprise of in-situ or precast reinforced concrete box structures. In-situ or precast reinforced concrete splayed wing walls are proposed on corners of the new subways. Lengths vary but the longest subway is approximately 28m in length with a clear width of 4m with clear site lines to the exit to maximise user</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>carriageway and cycleway as a “spare” vehicle lane, to be pressed into use when required. There is also a history of highways contractors using the path on the existing overbridge as a dumping-ground for their equipment and supplies. A physical barrier would make it harder for them to obstruct the path in this way.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The entrance to the southern underpass, coming towards the junction from Tesco and passing beneath the roundabout. This appears to have a sharp bend in it, something that was avoided in the 2019 proposals. It’s vital that there are clear sightlines when approaching the tunnel. 3. The circular loop at the south end, evidently put in place to raise the level of the cycleway to the overbridge. While the loop is a sensible way to ensure a gentle gradient for cycling and for wheelchair, mobility scooter or pushchair use, it was agreed in 2019 that this was a very long way round for pedestrians and that there should be a short-cut route (probably steps) allowing pedestrians to bypass that section. If a short cut isn’t provided then pedestrians will create their own along the obvious desire lines, scrambling up and down the embankment. There is no sign of a pedestrian short cut in the new plan. 4. Path width. We understand that the plan is to provide a 3m-wide path. This is the “absolute minimum” allowed by current standards and is not adequate for a well-used shared path, especially in the underpasses and overbridge where useable width is reduced because of walls and barrier. The “desirable minimum” in the standards is 5m. Again as this is a new build, the marginal cost difference between a 3m and 5m path will be small. 5. Termination of bridleway halfway across. In the plan, provision for equestrians starts on the east side of the junction and extends under the eastern underpass before stopping dead just before the overbridge, where a turning area for horses is proposed. This makes no sense at all. We understand from the designers that this is because “the current bridleway stops there.” As Highways England are aware, the current bridleway is the result of a dispute between the Highways Agency (later HE) and Hampshire County Council over the status of the path. HCC’s rights-of-way committee formally designated the entire path across the junction as a bridleway. HE challenged this and the matter went to public inquiry. The inspector’s decision was that there was sufficient evidence to designate part of the route as bridleway, but the status of the remaining part was not clear. The result was an awkward compromise that satisfied no-one. Now is not the time to slavishly replicate that pointless compromise: this is a chance for HE to improve the facilities available to non-motorised users by ensuring that the entire 		<p>comfort and safety. Furthermore, all subways are to be appropriately lit during day time and night time hours.</p> <p>An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. The bridleway has been designed to a gradient of no more than 1:20. The route would be an unbound surface (i.e. crushed basalt or similar) to allow for a free draining surface which is suitable for the range of users. A swale would be included adjacent to the path (on the upward side of the landform), to informally collect surface water (following heavy rainfall) to ensure the bridleway remains accessible. The route would provide for a varied visual experience for users accessing the South Downs National Park and connect to the wider rights of way network within improved access via the M3 Junction 9 gyratory.</p> <p>The Applicant has reduced the size of the loop on the western side of the gyratory and incorporated the provision of steps within the loop to enable a more direct and quicker route for walkers. The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved. The footway/cycleway through Junction 9 and along the entirety of the A34 section will have a form of separation by means of a Vehicle Restraint System.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>length of the crossing is not only designated as a bridleway but is usable as such.</p> <p>The Kings Worthy Path (the non-motorised route from Junction 9 (or nearby) to Kings Worthy, specifically the Cart & Horses junction on the A33)</p> <p>In the previous plans this was a cycle route. In this plan it has been downgraded to a footpath. This makes no sense at all. It should be restored to being a utility cycling route This was originally proposed as a utility cycle route by cycling advocates way back in the first consultation round. At the WCH workshop in 2019 the project team agreed that a cycle route to Kings Worthy should be an integral part of the project, with the caveat that – at that time – the project boundary stopped at the Itchen river. The project team undertook to bid for a feasibility study to extend the scope of the project all the way to the Cart & Horses junction on the A33. From the new plans it's evident that the extension was agreed, but the reason for it seems to have been completely forgotten.</p> <p>This path can provide a direct, reasonably level cycle route between the large residential areas of Kings Worthy and the large business and retail areas of Winnall. Beyond Winnall it can form part of a cycle route that will link through to the new sports & leisure centre on the south side of the city. This is especially important as the old leisure centre was much closer to Kings Worthy; if we are to avoid substantial increases in motor traffic through the city centre and on the A33, it's important to provide ways that Kings Worthy residents can travel into and through town without using their cars. (The current main route from Kings Worthy into the city, Worthy Road, is both hilly and hazardous for cyclists, with high levels of traffic and an inadequate cycleway that's too narrow for two cyclists or pedestrians to pass each other safely.)</p> <p>The DfT's Propensity to Cycle Tool (PCT) suggests that in the "e-bike" scenario, provision of safe, direct cycle routes from Kings Worthy to Winnall could result in a 660% increase in the number of people commuting by cycle between these two locations.² This path is key to providing these routes (and in fact the PCT maps highlight the existing footway from Kings Worthy to Junction 9 as the most direct, convenient route for a cyclist, even though it's currently illegal to cycle on it)</p> <p>This path is about 2 miles long. That's an easy 10-15 minute ride for a regular cyclist and even easier for an e-bike user – an important factor given the explosion in e-bike ownership and use. However it makes little sense as a footpath: 2 miles is a long walk on a path that (in the latest plans) is sandwiched between major trunk roads. It's not a quiet stroll in the countryside.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The route only makes sense as an all-year-round utility route for cycling as well as walking.</p> <p>The new route for this path seems almost to have been chosen to add to the cost of building it. Our original proposal involved upgrading the existing footway along the eastern side of the southbound A33/A34 slip road and providing a new underpass at the redesigned roundabout, to minimise the cost and provide the most direct route. In the new plans, the Winnall-to-A33 link road provides another opportunity: an off-carriageway cycleway could be built alongside that link road, sharing its bridges and underpasses. This would surely be more cost-effective than a separate path with its own bridges. It would also be safer as a commuter route, being overlooked by passing traffic and benefiting from any lighting.</p> <p>In the 2019 WCH discussions the idea was raised of a footpath to the west of the A34 to connect Winnall to the existing Nuns' Walk path by the Itchen. The project team promised to look into it. This had merit as a recreational path, but it seems to have got mixed up with the cycle route proposals. The current plan provides neither a functional cycle route nor an attractive pedestrian route, but a mixture of the two that provides the benefits of neither and even manages to route itself right down the middle of the A34, between the carriageways.</p> <p>The Long Walk connecting path from Easton Lane</p> <p>In the previous plans this was shown as a bridleway. The latest plans have downgraded it to a footpath without explanation. It should remain a bridleway.</p> <p>This route was introduced specifically as a bridleway by the Highways England project team in the 2019 sessions. We understand that it was put in at the request of the South Downs National Park Authority specifically for the benefit of horse riders, who are deriving very little of value from the rest of the scheme</p> <p>Given the amount of engineering work required to build the path, the marginal cost of widening it to bridleway width must be very small by comparison. The main point of the path was to provide a pleasant, low-traffic circular route for horse riders starting from Easton village. As a side effect it also delivers a pleasant recreational route for walkers and offroad cyclists, but the main objective was always to provide an equestrian facility. We know that SDNPA has not changed its view and was not aware of the change of plan prior to the latest public consultation. Unless HE has some as-yet-unrevealed reason for downgrading it, it should be restored to being a bridleway.</p> <p>Closure/diversion arrangements during construction.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>This is a major project lasting several years and we understand that closures and diversions of the existing cycle route will be required from time to time. However we were surprised that at this advanced stage – the third round of consultations – the project team was still unable to give us any information about the possible duration of such closures or the plans for diversions. We understand that the draft plans will only be prepared after the consultation period has finished.</p> <p>The NCN23 route across Junction 9 is one of only four practical options available to cyclists wanting to travel east from Winchester. Two of the others are suitable for offroad biking only – and one of those includes a section that runs within inches of a busy bypass. The third involves use of the relatively busy B3047 and a crossing of the A33 at Kings Worthy – viable for experienced cyclists, but a major disincentive to less-confident riders and family groups. (The B3404 Alresford Road is not considered a practical option here as it is busy and narrow with fast traffic and is therefore rarely used by cyclists.)</p> <p>The route across Junction 9 is therefore of huge importance in providing an active travel link between Winchester and the Itchen Valley and the South Downs. It needs to be kept open as much as possible</p> <p>We would like to be able to see and comment on the closure/diversion plans well before they are finalised. We have the local knowledge to assess their impact and suggest alternatives where possible. We hope and expect that the project team will treat the subject of diversions for cycling with the same seriousness that it would treat diversions for motorists, with plans to minimise disruption and provide clear signage</p>		
Local community	<p>I have reviewed the new proposal and comments as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am very pleased to see the new proposal for the safety of the route from the Junction 9 roundabout to the A33, Kings Worthy. 2. I note that the A33/Kings Worthy B3049 (Cart and Horses) junction lies within the scheme boundary. I therefore comment that this junction is already very dangerous, a point I have made many times. It is incapable of handling the present traffic volume. This traffic will be greatly increased with the link from Junction 9 encouraging the use of this route for access to the city centre as well as for North Winchester, Barton Farm etc. This junction must be improved! 3. The footway/cycletrack system must encourage increased cycling. All paths must allow for this growth of cycling safely. 	N	<p>The Applicant welcomes the comment regarding the removal of the A33 merge/diverge. The Applicant had amended the design for the 2021 statutory consultation to address concerns raised about road safety at the 2019 consultation.</p> <p>In regards to the Cart and Horses junction, this junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme. It is not considered a requirement within this Scheme to undertake improvements at this junction. The Applicant has engaged with Hampshire County Council regarding the Cart and Horses junction.</p>

K.2.O Safety

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	Much better and safer layout than the previous consulted proposal, primarily as local connections to and from the A33 King's Worthy have been fully segregated from long distance trunk road traffic.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	Winnall roundabout to and from A33 a great improvement over previous scheme. Much safer. Provision for traffic light and possibly lighting at the Winnall roundabout should be made.(ie ducting for cabling). Should it be decided at a future date it will cause less disruption and be cheaper in the long term.	N	
Local community	As a regular user of the A33 in both directions to and the M3/A272 and the Junction 9 roundabout for going into Winchester the new proposals for the A33 are a big improvement on the original proposals and much safer.	N	
Local community	This junction needs an urgent change and redesigned as a matter of urgency, very dangerous to people's lives.	N	
Local community	Please consider how the A33 'Cart and Horses Junction' at Kingworthy can be made safer.	N	<p>The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.</p> <p>The scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. DMRB CD 122 (Geometric Design of Grade Separated Junctions), defines several options for merge and diverge layouts. These options are dependent upon forecasted traffic flows. Using a combination of the annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) in vehicles per hour (VPH) for a mainline flow of traffic and the AADT in VPH for a merge flow of traffic, a required layout option type for a merge / diverge layout can be determined within DMRB CD 122. From an assessment of the forecasted traffic flows (contained within the Scheme transport model), the layouts currently shown, follow the requirements of DMRB CD 122. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p>
Local community	The Cart and Horses Junction of the A33 and B3047 is dangerous and although I know it is different authorities this would be a perfect opportunity to show that joined up government IS possible and to change this at the same time while the contractors and machinery is nearby. A roundabout I think would be best.	N	
Local community	It's not clear how to access A33 from Worthy Road in Kingsworthy (the dangerous Cart & Horses junction).... currently SO unsafe, and needs improving - or at the very least not to be made any worse by the new plans. Can't see the long promised cycle route from Jn9 to Kingsworthy - is it now only a footpath? A cycle route is critical to make it safer for cyclists in this area, and reduce the level of cycling in to Winchester along the Worthy Road.	N	
Local community	Congestion does occur at the junction, but purely at peak times. You should optimise the existing infrastructure by encouraging certain traffic at off-peak times. Most congestion occurs on the southbound carriageway of the A34 heading to the M3. There is also a lack of enforcement of driving standards which cause accidents - people going through red lights and ignoring the junction boxes. Once traffic has accessed the M3 southbound, further congestion also occurs (probably more frequently) at junctions 10-11 and 12-13 - your modelling will have provided evidence of this.	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Your proposals are unlikely to reduce congestion at peak times, but simply to move it to another part of the network during busy times. Presumably there is no intention to further destroy the area south of Winchester for motorway widening - which means you are always going to be constrained by merging traffic from a two-lane motorway and a two-lane A road into the capacity of a two-lane stretch of motorway south of junction 9.</p> <p>Your proposals does not really address the root cause - you will still be merging the 4 lanes from the A34 and M3 into the 3 and then 2 of the southbound M3.</p> <p>From my local knowledge congestion occurs: 1. At peak times when people are traveling to work 2. Because of holiday traffic in the summer heading to Bournemouth and the New Forest</p> <p>For (1) surely we should be encouraging modal shift - local commuter car journeys should not be facilitated at public expense when we are attempting to reduce pollution and wok to Net Zero. We should focus on encouraging walking and cycling by providing safe infrastructure at a fraction of the cost and encouraging public transport use.. For (2) holiday traffic on busy weekend is essentially stop-start all the way down to the coast on busy weekend - again you are simply moving the problem further south.</p> <p>I cannot see how this will reduce noise - is it not an established fact that road 'improvements' such as this actually result in increases in journeys?</p> <p>Connections from the M3 to the A33 appear to miss the main incident hotspot - local residents have been campaigning for years for junction improvements at the Cart and Horses turn in Kings Worthy where there have been a number of fatalities - this doesn't appear to be in scope.</p> <p>The changes you propose will take another large amount of our local environment and cover it in concrete. It will become an even less usable area for pedestrians and cyclists. The fact that you are putting pedestrians and cyclists in what appears to be a length subway shows how little priority is given to active travel - I never use subways even in daylight in town centres as they are intimidating places.</p> <p>I'm not sure why I have participated in this consultation - no doubt the decisions have been made and local residents are unlikely to have their voices considered against the well-funded and extremely vocal freight and motoring lobbies which are skewing the debate.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	I'm conscious of the safety problems especially with northbound M3 to A34 traffic. I have reservations about the effects of building for anticipated demand without exploring every possible way of reducing that demand, and don't think I know enough to balance the benefits of the highway aspects of the scheme, hence a neutral answer on some aspects.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Assessment of Scheme safety impacts are reported in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) . The safety analysis indicates there is predicted to be a reduction in accidents with the Scheme in place.
Local community	I think this is a much more creative scheme than the previous version. I particularly like that you've made use of the existing hillside to accommodate the crossing over of the various parts of A33, A34 and M3 at different heights. It is a great improvement that traffic for the A33 and local traffic from Tesco's towards Kings Worthy and Itchen Abbas gets an underpass to avoid having to cross several lanes of fast-moving traffic. I think this is a much safer solution.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	I am very disappointed by the latest proposal that no longer significantly improves walking and cycling routes across the junction and seems to have abandoned the proposed additional walking and cycling route from and to the junction from Kingsworthy. The public are being cajoled to improve their health and well being by increasing exercise generally and particularly for short journeys adopting walking and cycling instead of car travel. This development is a once in 50 years opportunity to make a significant improvement to non-vehicular routes between Winchester and Kingsworthy, and Easton. I'm no traffic expert but the design for the connection to the A33 still looks unsafe.	N	Assessment of Scheme safety impacts are reported in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) . The safety analysis indicates there is predicted to be a reduction in accidents with the Scheme in place.
Local community	Need to get on with it - back up queue on M3 is dangerous.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	Connections to and from A33 have additional roundabouts to negotiate from the current arrangement although now safer than previously as no mixing with A34 traffic.	N	Assessment of Scheme safety impacts are reported in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) . The safety analysis indicates there is predicted to be a reduction in accidents with the Scheme in place.
Local community	The new arrangement for traffic to travel to and from Kings Worthy to Junction 9 appears to be planned to be safer than was previously proposed, albeit that it is a more complex journey (in terms of number of junctions to manoeuvre through, and possibly longer journey times).	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	Although the changes to the A33 route improve safety concerns for those who were concerned about crossing traffic at 70mph, the new plan forces everyone going southbound to use the new junction, rather than pass under it. This is regrettable since the aim was to reduce traffic actually on the junction. There is little about implication of noise, pollutants on the changes.	N	The majority of traffic using the existing gyratory roundabout is vehicles exiting the M3 to travel via the A34 Northbound and A34 southbound traffic utilising the gyratory to travel south via the M3. These flows are to be removed from the gyratory via the proposed dedicated lane gain and lane drop arrangements. Hence, the proposed traffic flows for the revised gyratory roundabout will be lower than existing.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	J9 roundabout not safe in its current configuration	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	The dangerous layout of the A33/London Road junction at Kings Worthy	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Cart and Horses Junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies out the Application Boundary, therefore changes to the Cart and Horses Junction have not been considered as part of the Scheme.
Local community	Suggestion that the proposals should incorporate animal crossings, animal tunnels or an animal overpass. There should also be a harder shoulder for the entire stretch of the M3/A34 as many accidents occur from short merge junctions.	N	A hard shoulder is proposed adjacent to the M3 carriageway for the entire length within the Application Boundary. Current design standards do not require provision of a hard shoulder on all-purpose trunk roads (A34). Provision of a hard shoulder for the A34 would require additional land take and create significant cost increase to the Scheme.
Local community	There have been discussions on and off around the safety of the Cart & Horses Junction at the entrance to Kings Worthy, B3049 (London Road) as it meets the A33 and then across towards Alresford. Some years ago it was suggested that when Junction 9 was redeveloped would be the time that there may be the finances available to improve this junction properly	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Cart and Horses Junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary, therefore changes to the Cart and Horses Junction have not been considered as part of the Scheme.
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure.			
Local community	<p>Delighted Boris Johnson committed to '30 at 30' ie a 30% increase in biodiversity by 2030 and also to carbon reduction targets for the UK.</p> <p>These policies are completely incompatible with road upgrades such as the Junction 9 works on the M3.</p> <p>Furthermore, the A34 is at full capacity and already has a high accident rate. Pushing more volumes of traffic onto this road is simply unsafe.</p> <p>I would like to register my objection to these works going ahead, as we need to focus on stopping climate change and the collapse of the ecology on our country.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p> <p>Transport modelling has been undertaken for the Scheme, providing a forward forecast to 2047, this assessment demonstrates capacity within the A34 as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme is designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). The DMRB embodies the collective experience of the Overseeing Organisations, their agents, supply chain members and industry bodies. It provides requirements and advice resulting from research, practical experience of constructing and operating motorway and all-purpose trunk roads, and from delivering compliance to legislative requirements.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p>
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	Delighted Boris Johnson committed to '30 at 30' ie a 30% increase in biodiversity by 2030 and also to carbon reduction targets for the UK.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>These policies are completely incompatible with road upgrades such as the Junction 9 works on the M3.</p> <p>Furthermore, the A34 is at full capacity and already has a high accident rate. Pushing more volumes of traffic onto this road is simply unsafe.</p> <p>I would like to register my objection to these works going ahead, as we need to focus on stopping climate change and the collapse of the ecology on our country</p>		<p>Transport modelling has been undertaken for the scheme, providing a forward forecast to 2047, this assessment demonstrates capacity within the A34 as part of the scheme proposals.</p> <p>The scheme is designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). The DMRB embodies the collective experience of the Overseeing Organisations, their agents, supply chain members and industry bodies. It provides requirements and advice resulting from research, practical experience of constructing and operating motorway and all-purpose trunk roads, and from delivering compliance to legislative requirements.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p>
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			
Local community	<p>Turning the leftover end of the A33 dual carriageway into a single carriageway is an excellent idea that will have huge safety benefits. A footway is a much better use of that space, even if I'm not sure who would use it.</p>	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	<p>I often run to / from Winchester via the A34 and the current access is not very good. Your proposal safely separates vehicle and other users. This has been needed for a long time and I am very pleased that you have found a workable solution.</p>	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	<p>This is difficult. Clearly people must be able to cycle or walk close to a motorway junction and any provision needs to be as safe as possible.</p>	N	<p>At the proposed Junction 9 gyratory, the proposed footway/cycleway crosses the southern overbridge. At this point a vehicle restraint system is proposed to separate the pedestrian/cyclist flow from the vehicular traffic. Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14)</p>
Local community	<p>The removal of the cycle routes from the schemes original proposal is very disappointing. The shared footpath from Kingsworthy to the junction at Winnall is not a safe proposal for either bicycles or pedestrians</p>	N	<p>The footway / cycling route along the entirety of the A34 section will be protected by a Vehicle Restraint System (VRS).</p>
Local community	<p>Safe cycle and footpaths are essential for anyone traversing this area of development</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. The footway / cycling route along the entirety of the A34 section will be protected by a Vehicle Restraint System (VRS).</p> <p>In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. At the proposed Junction 9 gyratory, the proposed footway/cycleway crosses the southern overbridge. At this point a vehicle restraint system is proposed to separate the pedestrian/cyclist flow from the vehicular traffic</p>
Local community	<p>The proposed footpaths should be upgraded to cycle paths. A lot of people use the area for cycling and more people want to cycle, but the link from the Itchen</p>	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	Valley requires the negotiation of the notoriously tricky Cart and Horses junction on the A33 and/or Winnall roundabout. Upgrading the footpaths to cycle paths would give a safer link to promote cycling, as well as for those with reduced mobility and parents with small children.		The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.
Local community	Motorised transport is prioritised over cyclists and walkers, hence it is not safe for the latter groups	Y	The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. The footway / cycling route along the entirety of the A34 section will be protected by a Vehicle Restraint System (VRS).
Local community	There is no legal and safe cycling connection between Easton Lane and Kingsworthy	Y	
Local community	<p>The Consultation Summary document states that there were supportive comments on all of the WCH routes proposed in the scheme. The main WCH route linking Kings Worthy with Winnall and the NCN 23 seems however to have been removed. Even though WCC/HCC's Infrastructure wish list clearly includes a cycle path from the Worthy's to join NCN 23 at Winnall.</p> <p>As a local cyclist I would use a cycle route from Kings Worthy to and through junction 9. To for example shop at Winnall and for onwards travel to Winchester and the NCN 23 in both directions. A cycle path would link Kings Worthy with the leisure centre and HWRC using the existing route to Highcliffe.</p> <p>The current options for the journey are the B3047 which for a significant section has a 60mph speed limit and feels particularly unsafe during rush hour, followed by the NCN 23. The other alternative is to use the Worthy Lane cycle route which as a dual purpose route often causes conflict, followed by Winchester's busy one way system and the NCN 23 through Winnall.</p> <p>The current proposals fly in the face of sustainable transport and carbon footprint reduction. I can see no reason not to have the proposed footpath link as a bridleway link to enable all forms of non-motorised travel.</p> <p>As a final comment, I would like to propose that the underpasses for the non-motorised traffic are actually bridges as underpasses can be scary places to travel through as they are dark and encourage crime.</p>	Y	<p>In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. At the proposed Junction 9 gyratory, the proposed footway/cycleway crosses the southern overbridge. At this point a vehicle restraint system is proposed to separate the pedestrian/cyclist flow from the vehicular traffic.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,7,17m in length <p>The Scheme has been designed with careful consideration to the surrounding environment (South Downs National Park). The provision of foot/cycle bridges (as opposed to underpasses) would be visually intrusive to the surrounding environment. In addition, foot/cycle bridges require shallow gradients on the approach/departure ramps to the actual bridge span. These approach/departure ramps require a considerable amount of space and due to the constrained scheme footprint and reconfiguration of the A34, foot/cycle bridges would not be feasible.</p> <p>All proposed underpasses are to be 4m in width and shall be lit. In addition, visibility to and from the underpasses will not be constrained.</p>
Local community	There needs to be a safe cycle route from the junction to Kingsworthy. Also I thought there was meant to be a new bridleway on the Easton side of the junction. I often use Long Walk/Easton lane to cycle to work at the fire station which is that end of town.	Y	
Local community	It is ridiculous that the plan for a cycle path to Kings Worthy has not been included. The current alternative path is dangerous and this was the perfect solution. Many people commute to Kings Worthy and would be able to safely use this for shopping, leisure and travel to employment. The original plan needs to be reinstated to include this and the bridle way to Long walk, with the upgrade meeting latest government guidance.	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>Please provide safe, convenient (i.e.no cyclists dismount signs) cycling and walking routes from Winchester to Kings Worthy and Easton. Please also provide a bridleway through the fields to Long Walk. The proper design and implementation of these routes would surely be a fraction of the cost of the project so please, please design and implement these to the latest and highest government standards.</p>	Y	
Local community	<p>Making people walk between the two carriageways is somewhat unpleasant and possibly dangerous from strong winds caused by high-speed lorries.</p>	N	<p>At the proposed Junction 9 gyratory, the proposed footway/cycleway crosses the southern overbridge and at this point a vehicle restraint system is proposed to separate the pedestrian/cyclist flow from the vehicular traffic.</p> <p>Furthermore, the footway / cycling route along the entirety of the A34 section will be protected by a Vehicle Restraint System (VRS).</p>
General commentary			
Local community	<p>The image of the roundabout contains a number of issues that I hope are just in the illustration.</p> <p>Firstly, the filter lane that turns left from the M3 southbound to Spitfire Link is dangerous. The snaking alignment encourages vehicles to speed up, and they will not be expecting it to end with a 'give way'. If there is not enough room to provide a normal merge - and there probably is if you really wanted one - it would surely be better to do without the filter lane.</p> <p>Secondly, the image shows that the M3 that runs underneath the roundabout will have 4 lanes when travelling northbound, but only 3 lanes when travelling southbound. If 4 lanes are needed - and I agree that they are - then they are surely needed on both sides. It won't work if everyone has to merge into 3 lanes and then it opens out into 4 after the old slip road joins.</p> <p>Thirdly, the image shows that the widened M3 southbound will have a hard shoulder through the junction. This is a strange investment seeing as Highways England are currently spending billions removing hard shoulders, telling motorists that they do more harm than good. This is especially odd seeing as the smart motorway team will be removing the hard shoulder from the M3 at the very same time!</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments</p> <p><i>In relation to point 1:</i></p> <p>The proposed filter lane has now been omitted based on scheme development and a re-evaluation of the traffic modelling.</p> <p><i>In relation to point 2:</i></p> <p>The scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. DMRB CD 122 (Geometric Design of Grade Separated Junctions), defines several options for merge and diverge layouts. These options are dependent upon forecasted traffic flows. Using a combination of the annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) in vehicles per hour (VPH) for a mainline flow of traffic and the AADT in VPH for a merge flow of traffic, a required layout option type for a merge / diverge layout can be determined within DMRB CD 122. From an assessment of the forecasted traffic flows (contained within the Scheme transport model), the layouts currently shown, follow the requirements of DMRB CD 122. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p><i>In relation to point 3:</i></p> <p>The M3 Junction 9 Improvement scheme is not an All Lane Running project and hence provision for hard shoulders is made. Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			Assessment of Scheme safety impacts are reported in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) . The safety analysis indicates there is predicted to be a reduction in accidents with the Scheme in place.

K.2.P Mitigation

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	In comparison to the 2017 design to the new 2021 design, the 2017 design is better in everyway. The 2017 design flows much better. The 2021 design with the two roundabouts are unnecessary and the M3 junction northbound moving way to far north from the junction is stupid, However I like the flow junction coming from the southbound M3 to the A272, which is an improvement I welcome, however, as a daily commuter on the Junction 9, I see no animal bridge, which are cheap to manufacture and install. I see roadkill every day I commute on the junction because there is no animal crossing bridge for the animal from the Winnall Moors to the Avington Country Park/kings worthy area. This results in damage to cars, accidents from cars swerving to avoid them, thus causing tailbacks when a serious accident occurs. All this could be avoided if an animal bridge was installed. It would be a benefit to all in the area and to the economy because there won't be truck and businesses stuck in traffic from these accidents. I'm also seriously concerned that with no hard shoulder, accident fatality will be worse.	Y	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed in this comment. New areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape during operation. Much of the additional woodland and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. The provision of areas of chalk grassland, species rich grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for wildlife in a north-south direction. Please refer to Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) . Green bridges are not proposed as there are no instances of new severance.
Local community	Due consideration must be given to the rare wildlife habitat and chalk downs of this area. Green corridors must be created to join what is left of Twyford Down and the South Downs. Previous atrocities must also be rectified. The natural world is in a downhill spiral, so it vital that any development makes good the natural habitat that is affected and improvements to what already exists. It is payback time from developers to nature. The current plans will make it extremely difficult for Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust to look after the reserves that will be cut into.	Y	
Local community	The wildlife, the environment, the surrounding area, will all be completely ripped up and destroyed. What have you in place for the wildlife and the flowers/plants/trees that you'll destroy?	Y	Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) has been developed through engagement with stakeholders to ensure appropriate landscapes and biodiversity mitigation is proposed. Species selected for the Scheme been chosen to ensure they fit with the local landscape. Further detail can be found in Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) which is to be submitted as part of the DCO Application.
Local community	It is unclear what the benefits of this system will be to traffic flow. However, it is clear this change will result in habitat loss and pressure to local chalk down land and the chalk streams/ rivers locally. What mitigation will be in place to restore these green spaces at the end of the project? As a local resident I am also concerned about the impact of increased road noise which does not appear to be considered. Again, what mitigation is in place?	Y	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed. Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) has been developed through engagement with stakeholders to ensure appropriate landscapes and biodiversity mitigation is proposed. Species selected for the Scheme been chosen to ensure they fit with the local landscape. Further detail can be found in Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) which is to be submitted as part of the DCO Application. Noise mitigation measures are

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			outlined in Section 11.8 of Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
Local community	I don't agree with any increased road building that doesn't compensate for the environmental impact and impact on habitat loss, loss of wildlife, or the increased long term irreversible impact of eating away at our countryside and what keeps Winchester clean and beautiful and protects its natural and historical identity.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports.	Y	A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity and the water environment are set in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) . The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies. Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.
Local community	Inadequate consideration for preservation of wildlife and the need to reduce journeys on road.	Y	
Local community	You need to sort the mess you made when cutting through Twyford Down, we need more conservation and wildlife corridors, more wildlife friend options, add in wildlife bridges, plant areas so they encourage insects, it's not all about people, without our insects and biodiversity humans will die out.	N	The Applicant has received several comments in relation to the impacts on the Twyford Down. The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. Further details are provided in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
Local community	Do not damage our wildlife and countryside any more than it already has been.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Strongly disagree with public spending on road widening and 'improvement' schemes, which will allow for and encourage greater road traffic, at a time of climate emergency when spending on local and national public transport is woeful. However many 'mitigations' and 'appeasements' are put in place, this move is in the wrong direction.	N	This objection has been acknowledged. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) , which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	Hugely disruptive and expensive project that will, within a short period of time be congested again if you continue with an approach of accommodating traffic. Increased capacity leads to increased demand. The current environmental mitigation plans from extremely limited and lack any ambition to make the	N	The Scheme proposals achieve a positive biodiversity net gain which will support the variety of wildlife and habitats within the South Downs National Park. Green bridges are not proposed as there are no instances of new severance.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>project a net gain for nature. It is a farce that the South Downs National Park is split by the M3 and Junction 9. Twyford Down continues to be a landscape disaster and road widening and lack of routes for wildlife across the road (eg a green bridge), will make this worse.</p>		
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	<p>Concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased noise - day and night Increased pollution Negative Impact on health and well being Lack of effective mitigation actions regarding noise and pollution Impact on wildlife eg. Skylarks and yellowhammers along the South Downs way - impacted by infill and construction, loss of habitat, fracturing habitats <p>Therefore, if this plan goes ahead mitigation plans need to be much more effective than those planned and their effectiveness needs to be monitored and where needed extended, changed.</p>	N	<p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures relevant to air quality, noise, health and biodiversity are set in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), Section 5.8 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Section 11.8 of Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), Section 12.8 of Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Details of the impacts of the Scheme on noise, air quality, health and biodiversity are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p>
Local community	<p>Suggestion that the proposals should incorporate animal crossings, animal tunnels or an animal overpass. There should also be a harder shoulder for the entire stretch of the M3/A34 as many accidents occur from short merge junctions.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>Wildlife and SSSIs should be preserved. The original M3 cutting at St Catherine's has never been made good with a green bridge linking over the M3.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts on SSSIs and species (including; bats, hazel dormice, otter, breeding birds and wintering birds) within the study area as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Following the inclusion of mitigation measures set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), potential impacts from construction activities would result in no change or negligible impacts to the River Itchen SSSI. St Catherine's Hill SSSI is located approximately 500m south of the Scheme and therefore no direct or indirect impacts on the SSSI are anticipated during the construction phase due to the distance and physical separation.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>Following the implementation of mitigation measures set out in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), potential impacts from construction activities on bats, hazel dormice, water voles, otters and breeding birds and wintering birds are not significant.</p> <p>No significant effects on SSSIs and species within the study area are predicted as a result of the Scheme's operation.</p> <p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme</p>
Local community	Proper environmental management. This project should not take place and restoration of the downland needs to be a priority for wildlife and natural resources of the chalk landscape and reservoir affected.	N	A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
Local community	More tree planting and passes for animals	N	
Local community	It is essential that nature and the protection of the environment is at the core of all your decision making.	N	
Local community	Conservation of the environment should be your primary concern.	N	
Local community	Focus on eating into the countryside as little as possible, build a wildlife bridge to enable wildlife to move freely over the downs and to reduce their preventable loss of life via road kills and being trapped in small habitats, invest and plant native and appropriate hedges, trees, and plants to support wildlife and reduce noise and air pollution. Now build more roads when we should be making trains cheaper, especially now the Government has already said tracks will be re-nationalised. Realise humans need to coexist with the world, not senselessly dominate and destroy everything just because we can, to have more conscience.	Y	<p>At the foremost the Scheme proposals look to avoid impacts and the Scheme retains as much existing vegetation as possible, with landscape mitigation measures including extensive areas of native woodland planting, linear planting, roadside tree planting, species rich grass verges, and areas of chalk grasslands creation (which all complement biodiversity and respond to the key characteristics of the landscape in which the Scheme is located). There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape.</p> <p>New areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape during operation. Much of the additional woodland and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. The provision of areas of chalk grassland, species rich grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for wildlife in a north-south direction. Please</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			refer to Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) . Green bridges are not proposed for the Scheme as there are no instances of new severance.
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.	Y	A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity and the water environment are set in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies. Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.
Local community	Not to use Winnall Moors land. To make a green bridge To stop destroying precious habitat for our wildlife	Y	A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details). Therefore, the provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.
Local community	Yes - a green bridge for wildlife. Improve rather than downgrade cycle paths.	N	
Local community	Green bridges, hedgerows and tree planting, putting the long-term health of the environment before short term economic gain.	N	Furthermore, the Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.
Local community	Reparations should be made for the past damage to our wildlife habitats by providing green corridors to connect the remaining wildlife areas and not taking any more land for car use. All protected nature reserves should be untouched and remain for the use of Winchester residents. They are not a pool of land ready and waiting to be used for development when you think the need arises. Road 'improvement' only leads to more traffic, climate change and the degradation of the natural environment which we all rely on to live. This makes no sense.	N	
Local community	The destruction your proposed plans create, with no consideration of a green passage!	N	
Local community	Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme and the historical severance of the landscape.	Y	The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The Mitigation Design Plan contains very little detail on the mitigation and focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, I urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and net gain, aiming for at least 20% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>As part of this, I would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done.</p> <p>The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. I want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>I want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature's recovery in modern transport development.</p>		<p>River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1)) providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision set out on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of areas of chalk grassland, species rich grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Appendix 8.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) assesses that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Scheme would provide a net increase of approximately 9.6 ha of chalk grassland, which is appropriate to the local area. The protection and enhancement of this habitat is a key theme within the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i> (adopted July 2019) and has been a key theme within consultation responses from stakeholders. However, the use of this habitat type suppresses the overall result of the metric, due to risk factors associated with this habitat type. For example, if 'other neutral grassland' was provided in place of chalk grassland then the overall biodiversity net gain score for the Scheme would change from +4.14% to +14.93%. This demonstrates that the Scheme can comfortably deliver over 10% biodiversity net gain. However, whilst a change from chalk grassland to other neutral grassland would be technically feasible, given the wider benefits, chalk grassland has been taken forward as being most appropriate habitat for the Scheme.</p> <p>Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p>
Local community	Minimising environmental impact and trying to redress damage M3 has caused to Twyford Down.	N	The Applicant has received several comments in relation to the historical impacts on the Twyford Down. The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. Further details are provided in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
Local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing the environmental damage the proposals will cause. Incorporating plans for proper, real, substantial biodiversity net gain. Build in large scale habitat creation and build a green bridge to link St Catherine's Hill with the land to its east, to mitigate some of the damage the Twyford Down cutting has done. 	N	Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.
Local community	The natural environment needs to be considered. Our flora and fauna is taking a hammering and mitigations must be put in place to minimise long term disturbance to wildlife. Pre work-start surveys should be taken to establish wildlife populations in the construction zone and movement of small mammals to a safe habitat should be undertaken as required.	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Any lost flora should be replaced and the loss of valuable habitat at Winnall Moors must be avoided at all costs.</p> <p>The construction of a Nature Bridge or Nature Underpass should be made a priority to help repair damage done to habitat pathways and links by the Twyford Down cutting.</p> <p>This is also a good opportunity to erect a noise screen on the Northbound side of the M3 between junction 11 Winchester South and junction 9. This would help lessen the incessant traffic noise which blights South Winchester and surrounding areas.</p>		
Local community	Environmental impact - not just mitigating this but to every possible extent, preventing it - even if this requires a radical re-think of or withdrawal from these plans.	N	<p>The Applicant has applied the mitigation hierarchy to the Scheme. This is outlined in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) includes habitat creation and enhancement measures which provide substantial additional areas of biodiversity rich habitats. In addition, Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) shows further mitigation measures such as wildlife fencing, along with provision of habitats for specific species.</p>
Local community	<p>Any proposed scheme must include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Large scale habitat creation. Significant new areas of chalk downland could be restored, utilising chalk excavated during construction. 2. Restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. 3. A green bridge across the motorway, re-uniting the severed down of St Catherine's Hill and the 'dongas' and establishing a proper gateway to the South Downs National Park. 4. A commitment to investing in sustainable transport for the future, improving public transport. 	Y	<p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) includes habitat creation and enhancement measures which provide substantial additional areas of biodiversity rich habitats. New planting has been proposed adjacent to new elements of road infrastructure to provide visual screening and green infrastructure connectivity, as shown on the Figure 2.3.</p> <p>A green bridge is not proposed as part of the Scheme because no existing ecological corridors are being severed by the Scheme. In addition, the Application Boundary does not extend south of Junction 10.</p> <p>Revised proposals since statutory consultation provide greater opportunities for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders to access the South Downs National Park. In addition, the route from Winnall to Kings Worthy has been revised to include cyclists. This has been discussed with stakeholders.</p>
Local community	Landscaping and wildflower seed used on embankments and surrounding areas. Deterrent measures for deer crossing. A34 has shocking roadkill toll.	N	<p>New areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and wider landscape during operation. Much of the additional woodland and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. The provision of areas of chalk grassland, species rich grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for wildlife in a north-south direction. Please refer to Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2). Green</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			bridges and animal crossings are not proposed as there are no instances of new severance.
Local community	Strongly disagree with public spending on road widening and 'improvement' schemes, which will allow for and encourage greater road traffic, at a time of climate emergency when spending on local and national public transport is woeful. However many 'mitigations' and 'appeasements' are put in place, this move is in the wrong direction.	N	This objection has been acknowledged. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) , which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	Not causing any impact on the environment and biodiversity of the area such as compulsory purchase of any part of Winnall Moors nature reserve, which is already a vital flood defence for Winchester. I would prefer to see the millions of pounds being spent going towards a greener economy and protecting and enhancing the nature of the area than creating an opportunity to encourage more road users to not seek alternatives to driving.	Y	This comment has been noted. The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals.
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure.			
Local community	It's really important to minimise impact on flora and fauna in the area. Please take every step you can to do this. I also think it's really important to plant appropriate trees, shrubs and wildflowers – please work with the Hampshire and IOW Wildlife Trust and other local stakeholders to do this.	N	In terms of landscape design, measures such as landscape earthworks and substantial woodland, tree and hedgerow planting would be included in the Scheme to integrate and visually screen the route. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) . The Applicant has engaged with the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust and other stakeholders, including South Downs National Park Authority, throughout the pre-application process.
Local community	There is no animal crossing.	N	The provision of an animal crossing is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.
Local community	Get a tree expert to advise on types, numbers and locations of trees to be planted.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	I don't believe you are giving enough thought to the environment, particularly the sensitive site of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve which is a SSSI. This will increase disturbance for wildlife that is already squeezed by the city. It will also require habitat destruction which has happened here before, but local people have been lied to time and again about how this will be mitigated and the structures agreed to be put in place such as the wildlife bridge never appeared.	Y	The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals. The Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is also considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	This is a big scheme and there must necessarily be significant changes, the generality of which is one of the prices to be paid if we want a working junction. Whether the proposed mitigation measures are adequate, I can't yet be sure.	N	This comment has been noted. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
Local community	Mitigation plans are extremely limited and lack any ambition to make the project a net gain for nature. They also fail to address the legacy of damage from the creation of the M3 at Twyford Down, one of the most controversial road schemes in English history. The landscape around Winchester is already severely fragmented by the road network. The motorway construction in the early 90s cut a vital link between the South Downs and nature reserves and green space in Winchester, severely impacting wildlife and people. The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded.	Y	A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity and the water environment are set out in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.	Y	The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies. Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.
Local community	<p>The environmental plan seems very short sighted and narrow minded. Given that the government is currently pushing for more considerate construction and that the site goes through both local nature reserves and the South Downs National Park the mitigations seem pathetically inadequate.</p> <p>Although not part of the scheme area, it is very visible to see the impact of past decisions on this area just by looking at former road space that has been managed poorly and of course the severing of Twyford Down with the construction of the Winchester bypass on the M3 in the 1990s. During the pandemic, it became very apparent the impacts of this as many more visitors wanted to visit places local to them without the need for car travel and were all contained within the small space of St Catherine's Hill without being able to cross to access the rest of the South Downs NP.</p> <p>If wildlife is to survive, they need access to wider areas and wider gene pools so cannot be forced into smaller spaces, as proposed by the cutting of the Winnall Moors nature reserve in this scheme.</p> <p>Please look at this again, include more mitigations and include them over a wider area. Signal that you're willing to listen by including other bodies like the national park authority, wildlife trust in meaningful discussion. Include land bridges in your scheme or even better right the wrongs of the past with a land bridge across</p>	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Twyford down so walkers and wildlife have a much better link that connects it all together for once!</p>		
Local community	<p>Lack of effective mitigation actions and unconvincing baseline data.</p> <p>The adverse impact of the existing M3 in terms of noise along Petersfield Road is considerable and has got considerably worse over the last 10 years - where noise from lorries and traffic at night is dire! No effective mitigating actions have been taken to address this impact (no sound barriers, no planting, road resurfacing provided a very short term slight improvement) so I have serious reservations about your plans that will deliver a 25% + increase in traffic and do not believe your comments that there will be no significant increase in noise and pollution! The reality is there are no clear mitigating actions and no promise to monitor the effectiveness of any mitigating actions.</p> <p>Sound barriers/ pollution mitigation measures should be put along the Winchester side of the M3 between the pedestrian bridge/South Downs Way and the Alresford Road B3404 bridge in any case and especially if this scheme goes ahead given the significant traffic increase you anticipate.</p> <p>We should not be considering a scheme that increases traffic volume to this extent - we should be looking at alternatives.</p>	N	<p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures relevant to noise is set out in Section 11.8 of Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
Local community	<p>Your proposals are weak with no green corridor links.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant also acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape (see Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details).</p>
Local community	<p>The current environmental mitigation plans are extremely limited and lack any ambition to make the project a net gain for nature.</p> <p>It is a farce that the South Downs National Park is split by the M3 and Junction 9. Twyford Down continues to be a landscape disaster and road widening and lack of routes for wildlife across the road (eg a green bridge), will make this worse.</p>	Y	<p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision set out on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of areas of chalk grassland, species rich grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction.</p>
Local community	<p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme and the historical severance of the landscape.</p> <p>The Mitigation Design Plan contains very little detail on the mitigation and focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, I urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of</p>	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>environmental mitigation and net gain, aiming for at least 20% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>As part of this, I would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done.</p> <p>The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. I want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>I want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature’s recovery in modern transport development.</p>		<p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Appendix 8.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) assesses that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity. The Scheme would provide a net increase of approximately 9.6 ha of chalk grassland, which is appropriate to the local area. The protection and enhancement of this habitat is a key theme within the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i> (adopted July 2019) and has been a key theme within consultation responses from stakeholders. However, the use of this habitat type suppresses the overall result of the metric, due to risk factors associated with this habitat type. For example, if ‘other neutral grassland’ was provided in place of chalk grassland then the overall biodiversity net gain score for the Scheme would change from +4.14% to +14.93%. This demonstrates that the Scheme can comfortably deliver over 10% biodiversity net gain. However, whilst a change from chalk grassland to other neutral grassland would be technically feasible, given the wider benefits, chalk grassland has been taken forward as being most appropriate habitat for the Scheme.</p> <p>Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p>
Local community	It looks fine to me, can't think of anything else to consider except for wildlife bridges or tunnels	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	<p>NO to cutting through Winnall moors; NO to carving out yet more greenfield sites; NO to the greenwash displayed in your proposals. Rethink entirely. Any proposed scheme must include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Large scale habitat creation. Significant new areas of chalk downland could be restored, utilising chalk excavated during construction. 2. Restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. 3. A green bridge across the motorway, re-uniting the severed down of St Catherine’s Hill and the ‘dongas’ and establishing a proper gateway to the South Downs National Park. 4. A commitment to investing in sustainable transport for the future, improving public transport. 	Y	<p>The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals. The Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) includes habitat creation and enhancement measures which provide substantial additional areas of biodiversity rich habitats. New planting has been proposed adjacent to new elements of road infrastructure to provide visual screening and green infrastructure connectivity, as shown on the Figure 2.3.</p> <p>A green bridge is not proposed as part of the Scheme because no existing ecological corridors are being severed by the Scheme. In addition, the Application Boundary does not extend south of Junction 10.</p> <p>Revised proposals since statutory consultation provide greater opportunities for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders to access the South Downs National Park. In addition, the route from Winnall to Kings Worthy has been revised to include cyclists. This has been discussed with stakeholders.</p>

D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	They look fine	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Only strict management of any agreed proposals will mitigate environmental impact.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	It's just a last-minute decision, wasn't it??	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Fundamentally, the work is unnecessary. This is a climate crisis and the last thing the government should be doing is encouraging car and road usage. Any destruction of plants, animals and their habitats is not worth the cost. How are you going to stop the increasingly wide roads killing more wildlife. Are you going to invest money in wildlife bridges this time as would be desperately needed if you get your way?	N	The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme. An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on landscape and biodiversity is set out in Chapters 7 and 8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme. Further detail on the mitigation proposed is provided within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) .
Local community	It would be folly indeed to pretend that your proposed measures will entirely remove any impact, and so some adverse effect must be accepted if the scheme is to go ahead. I'd like to think you are getting an appropriate balance between the major factors of achieving an adequate engineering/traffic solution and minimising the accompanying detriment.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme and the historical severance of the landscape. The Mitigation Design Plan contains very little detail on the mitigation and focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, I urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and net gain, aiming for at least 20% biodiversity net gain. As part of this, I would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done. The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. I want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.	Y	The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. Habitat provision set out on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction. The Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Appendix 8.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) assesses that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity. The Scheme would provide a net increase of over 9.6 ha of chalk grassland, which is appropriate to the local area. The protection and enhancement of this habitat is a

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	I want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature's recovery in modern transport development.		key theme within the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i> (adopted July 2019) and has been a key theme within consultation responses from stakeholders. However, the use of this habitat type suppresses the overall result of the metric, due to risk factors associated with this habitat type. For example, if 'other neutral grassland' was provided in place of chalk grassland then the overall biodiversity net gain score for the Scheme would change from 4.14% to +14.93%. This demonstrates that the Scheme can comfortably deliver over 10% biodiversity net gain. However, whilst a change from chalk grassland to other neutral grassland would be technically feasible, given the wider benefits, chalk grassland has been taken forward as being most appropriate habitat for the Scheme.
Local community	It currently does not go far enough and lacks ambition. The Mitigation Design Plan contains very little detail on the mitigation and focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Further improvements on and off site should also be investigated and added to this plan. As part of this plan, I would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done and link the fragmented habitats around Winchester.	Y	Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.
Local community	The mitigation is far too weak and small focused. More habitat creation is needed that is managed better for longer to ensure the habitat is established successfully and thrives in the long run. Land bridges to link nature both on this scheme and in future schemes (or even righting the wrongs such as Twyford Down) are key to show you are putting the environment at the heart of the scheme rather than creating wasteland that is environmentally useless for the future.	Y	
Local community	Your 'Preliminary Environmental Mitigation Design Plan' is based on flawed assumptions.	N	A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3)
Local community	Don't think you've done enough	N	
Local community	Doesn't go far enough and has not been properly thought through, seems like an afterthought	N	
Local community	Insufficient.	N	
Local community	Nowhere near enough being proposed	N	
Local community	I haven't looked at these elements in detail so don't have a strong opinion either way	N	
Local community	There is no mitigation in the plan.	N	
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.</p>		<p>ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies. Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p> <p>The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals. The Applicant has considered the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p>
Local community	I have listed to the published consultation videos and am happy with what is proposed.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Greenwashing 'mitigations' are nowhere near sufficient for the scale of the environmental destruction of road-expansion programmes like this.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	This seems to be well in hand.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	It is too large.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The scheme should not go ahead, so the measures should not be needed.	N	This objection has been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	<p>Are you even taking mitigation seriously? The proposal contains barely any detail on mitigation.</p> <p>And surely shouldn't we be going beyond mitigation and seeking to restore and improve those habitats and corridors that will be damaged by this development and those destroyed by the extension of the M3 back in the 90s?</p> <p>It would be nice, for once, for developers to seek to improve what is there already rather than just lessen the damage a bit.</p>	N	<p>This objection has been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. Further details are</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	I do not think that the development will result in significant improvements to travelling times and I do not believe we should be encouraging yet more traffic when we are trying to achieve net zero carbon emissions. Don't go ahead with it and you will reduce the environmental impacts considerably.		provided in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
Local community	It is not sufficient	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The devil will be in the detail.	N	This comment has been noted.
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	The South Downs National Park should be protected - not just have building roads on it 'mitigated' for - and I think this ought to be obvious.	N	This comment has been noted. The Applicant has engaged with South Downs National Park Authority throughout the development of the Scheme.
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.	Y	<p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity and the water environment are set in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies. Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p> <p>The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals. The Applicant has considered the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.			
Local community	The chalk should be used to restore the existing damage to vital chalk downland working with the wildlife trust to formulate a plan of best fit.	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
Local community	Rather than just dumping soil anywhere, need a clear restoration plan, a clear statement of the habitat that will subsequently be created, a roadmap to getting there and regular monitoring to demonstrate biodiversity gain.	Y	
Local community	It's a waste of the spoil to simply add it to arable land with an assumption for return to arable again later - these could be used for extensive chalk grassland restoration or well-designed mitigation features including banks or a chalk 'amphitheatre' off site (e.g. on farmland at Easton Down or Chilcomb Valley) that could be a valuable feature for both people and wildlife.	Y	
F.4: Please let us know the reasons for your response to question F3 and any other views about the locations we've identified			
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.	Y	A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity and the water environment are set in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) . The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies. Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.
Local community	You are not making the most of your opportunities to improve the land for nature.	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	You have to put the compound somewhere, I am sure post project mitigation will leave no trace as was the case with the A34/M4 improvements	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The details as part of this scheme protecting the areas of natural beauty and protected conservation sites are weak. More needs to be considered regarding the lasting environmental impact of this work and how this can be done more harmoniously with the wildlife around it. The bridge across the M3 needs to have a wildlife bridge considered so to join an area brutally split in the 90's. Our waterways at Winnall need to be protected as this area has seen huge recovery of natural species in the last 20 years. This proposal only considers the problems with the traffic and is eating away at the habitat used by many local residents for walking, other exercise, and the wildlife it supports. Please consider this more carefully.	Y	<p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Mitigation measures relevant to biodiversity and the water environment are set in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Section 13.8 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Scheme incorporates measures that have been embedded into the design to mitigate adverse effects on important biodiversity features and compensate for the loss of habitats by the creation of new areas of habitat within the Scheme. It also includes working practices which would avoid impacts and provide mitigation for important biodiversity features during construction and operation. These measures have been identified and developed through the assessment process, including consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies. Green bridges are not part of the Scheme design because there are no instances of new severance produced by the proposed works that would cause them to be needed.</p> <p>The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals. The Applicant has considered the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p>
General commentary			
Local community	<p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme and the historical severance of the landscape.</p> <p>The Mitigation Design Plan contains very little detail on the mitigation and focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, I urge Highways England</p>	Y	The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and net gain, aiming for at least 20% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>As part of this, I would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done.</p> <p>The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. I want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>I want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature's recovery in modern transport development.</p>		<p>Habitat provision set out on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Appendix 8.2 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) assesses that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Scheme would provide a net increase of approximately 9.6 ha of chalk grassland, which is appropriate to the local area. The protection and enhancement of this habitat is a key theme within the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i> (adopted July 2019) and has been a key theme within consultation responses from stakeholders. However, the use of this habitat type suppresses the overall result of the metric, due to risk factors associated with this habitat type. For example, if 'other neutral grassland' was provided in place of chalk grassland then the overall biodiversity net gain score for the Scheme would change from +4.14% to +14.93%. This demonstrates that the Scheme can comfortably deliver over 10% biodiversity net gain. However, whilst a change from chalk grassland to other neutral grassland would be technically feasible, given the wider benefits, chalk grassland has been taken forward as being most appropriate habitat for the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>The proposals are long overdue. What is currently proposed appears to be an improvement over the previous proposals. Further detailed information is needed to be able to comment more meaningfully - as a number of key areas are still subject to further detailed work and assessment, with mitigation currently not finalised. It is not currently possible to conclude on the extent to which the proposals comply with the relevant National Policy Statement</p>	N	<p>This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Further details on the mitigation proposed is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p>
South Downs Network	<p>Objection</p> <p>The South Downs Network objects to the proposed M3 Junction 9 Development in its present form.</p> <p>Executive Summary: Move over to Sustainable Transport</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges South Downs Network's objection to the Scheme. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>We respectfully suggest that this £180+ million road scheme should be referred back to be replaced by a sustainable transport version that will help us meet our climate change commitments, providing better bus services, bus and rail infrastructure, integrated green cycle and walking routes, safe crossing for active travel, green (car free) bridges, safer paths for access to schools and access to rail stations.</p> <p>Secretary of State for Transport guidance</p> <p>We would take this opportunity to remind Highways England of the words used by the Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps when launching the Government's 'Decarbonising Transport: Setting the Challenge,' said in the foreword that: "public transport and active travel will be the natural first choice for our daily activities" and that "We will use our cars less and be able to rely on a convenient, cost-effective and coherent public transport network".</p> <p>More roads - more traffic</p> <p>More roads equals more traffic - when a new road is built, new traffic will divert onto it. Many people may make new trips they would not otherwise make just because of new roads. This well-known and long-established effect is known as 'induced traffic'</p> <p>Increase of emissions and global warming gases</p> <p>The Highways England proposal will increase CO2 emissions by attracting more cars onto the roads! Highways England's own report admits a significant increase in carbon emissions as a result of the project - some 534,628 tonnes of CO2 for user emissions. This doesn't include the emissions from the construction which doesn't seem to be reported on.</p> <p>How are we going to meet the Government's commitment to net zero emissions in less than 30 years with road schemes like this? Highways England say the project will be completed in 2026 so the timeline is even shorter at less than 25 years to achieve net zero! Wouldn't it be better to cancel the project and spend the £180 million on sustainable transport solutions?</p> <p>In 2020 transport accounted for 29.8% of all CO2 emissions. The majority is from road transport! How can Highways England advance a road scheme that will actively increase CO2 emissions?</p> <p>It is likely that there will still be 40 million petrol and diesel cars and vans on the roads in 2030 plus diesel HGVs!</p>		<p>Response in relation to environmental mitigation:</p> <p>Full details of the mitigation and monitoring measures proposed for the Scheme are presented in the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1), the Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. Opportunity for maximising biodiversity benefit has also been provided for with the use of scrub planting throughout the Scheme and species rich grasslands (including chalk grassland).</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been included as part of the application to deliver any mitigation required, including proposed management and monitoring. A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan will be secured through a DCO requirement.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to a green bridge:</i></p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the proposal for a green bridge as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design. New areas of woodland and scrub within the landscape design have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Scheme and wider landscape. Much of the additional woodland and scrub planting is adjacent to existing woodlands, or provides habitat links, which would enhance their ecological function. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for wildlife in a north-south direction. See Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) for further details.</p> <p>The provision of a green bridge is not required or within the scope of this Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The UK's new climate target to cut our emissions by 78% by 2035 was passed into law in June 2021 - the Highways England plan is out of step with this. The proposal does not include a landscape strategy. Road developments are not excluded from the UK's legally adopted climate commitment. The UK Government has a commitment to tackle climate change.</p> <p>Nature</p> <p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation Design Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that this design plan consists of just one page! We are concerned that there is no landscape strategy or detailed plan. The Mitigation Design Plan contains simply focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, we urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and biodiversity net gain. As part of this, we would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done. The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. We want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</p> <p>Whilst the actual road design plan seems to be very firm there seems to be a lack of commitment by Highways England to the environment, an EIA and a landscape and biodiversity/habitats plan. Words such as 'ongoing' and "is being developed" keep cropping up. One gets the impression that the natural world is not important to Highways England.</p> <p>We are concerned that Highways England seemed to be avoiding a commitment to the production of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). In Para 1.5.4 of the PEIR Highways England says "It should be noted that at this stage the information is preliminary. An iterative process of scheme development and EIA is ongoing". Surely a draft EIA should be available for public consultation now, and not be delayed until the DCO application? Indeed there seems to be a fudging of the commitment even at that stage to the production of an EIA. Highways England says "The final EIA work will be reported in the ES."</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Indeed further fudging of commitment to environmental assessment is contained in the response to Natural England's submission of 9 November 2020. They highlighted that the impact of emissions to designated ecological sites is required. Highways England response was "Ongoing EIA work will include the assessment of the impacts of emissions from traffic on designated habitats."</p> <p>Avoiding say yes to Natural England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England said "The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies." Highways England said "ongoing EIA work is to be reported." • Natural England said they would welcome the opportunity to comment on the landscape, biodiversity and access enhancement plan. Highways England responded "A biodiversity and landscaping mitigation package is being developed." But when? • Natural England advised that "the potential impact of the proposal upon features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for habitat creation/enhancement should be included within this assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance on such matters." Highways England responded ""The Biodiversity chapter of the ES will identify all potential impacts on identified biodiversity features"" Further fudging." <p>SDNPA Nature Investment Areas</p> <p>The road site is where the South Downs National Park has identified one of its 12 nature investment areas. These nature recovery areas are part of a hub of an interconnected 'nature network.' The Highways England intrusion flies in the face of nature recovery and will destroy and fragment important protected habitats. This scheme affects the local nature reserve which is home to rare and notable wildlife, and a SSSI site.</p> <p>Previous environmental damage</p> <p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust's nature reserve at St Catherine's Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally. "</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>SSSI and Special Area of Conservation</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network.</p> <p>Government Environmental Policy</p> <p>Highways England need to take on board Government policy on the environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government's Final Report of the Independent Review on the Economics of Biodiversity led by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta. Amongst other things he says "Human demands on nature must be curbed • We say - road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government 'Dasgupta Review' says, 'Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).' We should no longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to urbanisation pressures. • Also please bear in mind the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this scheme. <p>Green Bridge</p> <p>We support the Hampshire and IoW Wildlife Trust's proposal for a green bridge to the National Park which would reunite wildlife habitats that became disconnected by the 1990s M3 construction.</p> <p>We want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature's recovery despite modern transport development.</p> <p>Spoil</p> <p>The Highways England report says "We have not yet completed our junction design, so we do not know exactly how much material may need to be placed in these areas, or whether we will need all three areas". Surely after at least two and a half years of preparation such civil engineering detail should be known?</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The amount of spoil will affect the landscape design. This should be known now; before Highways England applies for a Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>2019 consultation</p> <p>We have serious concerns about the previous stages of public consultations.</p> <p>Highways England says “There was a high level of support for the Proposed Scheme”. “We received 526 responses to our consultation”. Other than a few meaningless and valueless paragraphs the Public Consultation Summary Report does not provide any substantive information on exactly what those 526 respondents said. What organisations responded and what did they say? How many of the 526 comments were from individual members of the public. How many were car, commercial and HGV vehicle owners/drivers? Did horse riding, walking and cycling groups respond? Indeed were they invited to respond?</p> <p>References are made to ‘stakeholders.’ It is understood they were invited to workshops to give their input. Exactly who were they? and how were they selected? We hope it wasn't a question of selecting the appropriate stakeholders so that it assisted in giving the right answer to suit Highways England.</p> <p>Walking and Cycling Proposals Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that there is little substance to walking and cycling provision. The plan just consists of one page. There seems to be very little reference to provision for horse riders.</p> <p>Walkers, cyclists and horse riders to be put in a ‘subway’! Underground? Highways England say “On both sides of the motorway, the existing walking and cycling route links both parts of Easton Lane, which would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders will be improved with a widened 3m route, which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway...”</p> <p>This is unacceptable. This proposal is fraught with all sorts of problems. Who is going to police the subway to ensure the safety of users? Who will maintain it and how will it be lit? Will there be security cameras? Will there be traffic separation to ensure safety of different users such as horse riders and cyclists?</p> <p>Instead of hiding these active travel users away below ground highways England should provide a green bridge out in the fresh air above the pollution from the motorway style road.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>In any event Highways England should ensure that cycle provision is compliant with Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20 Published last year by the Government).</p> <p>Highways England must take account of latest Government policy</p> <p>The business case for this project should be rewritten taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Gov policy paper - A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment (pub Jan 2018) • DfT's policy paper - Decarbonising transport: setting the challenge (pub March 2020) • UK Gov policy paper: Gear change: a bold vision for cycling and walking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Gov policy paper: Bus Back Better: national bus strategy for England 		
Local community	<p>In general we are in favour of improving the junction configuration to create free-flow traffic from the A34 to the M3 and vice versa. More importantly, we support the separation of local traffic and the strategic road network around the junction with the creation of a separate link road. This will make driving to Winnall from Itchen Abbas a safer and more accessible journey. However, there are areas of the proposals we have specific concerns about. Our feedback is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction compound Number 4 would inevitably add construction traffic to the likely traffic management routes through the construction site, namely down the A34. There are no other sensible options to build either off highway haul roads or use local lanes to avoid the A34 with this construction traffic (narrow railway underbridge on Down Farm Lane, local villages not appropriate for HGVs and LGVs). This location seems unnecessary given the scale of other potential construction compounds in the vicinity. We recommend this compound Number 4 is dropped from the plans. If it is retained, we would expect to see in the DCO application/examination a detailed assessment and findings based upon how this site had been selected. This should include detailed traffic modelling results for the construction period to demonstrate minimal ill-effect from other traffic to local surrounding roads from the addition of construction vehicles leading to and from compound Number 4 and the Junction 9 site. Adding construction vehicles from this remote location up the A34, which is highly likely to be congested during extended periods of the construction phase, would compound delays on this already busy section of A34 and risk sending traffic heading south along the A34 on rat-runs using either the city of Winchester or local village roads in the Itchen Valley. This is avoidable with better choice of onsite or existing compound choice. • Construction compound Number 3 is a poor choice of construction compound given the immediate proximity to the sensitive River Itchen. This 	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the support of the Scheme in principle and the range of views expressed.</p> <p><i>Response to point 4:</i></p> <p>A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The assessment within the ES (Document Reference 6.1) includes a number of engineering design measures that have been designed to avoid or reduce significant adverse environmental effects arising, where practicable. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Reuse of earth arisings to facilitate construction of the Scheme where possible to minimise fill material being needed to be brought on to site or taken offsite 2) Reuse of excess earth arisings to facilitate landscape mitigation within the Application Boundary 3) Design of the new bridge over the River Itchen to be a clear span structure with abutments set back from the river channel 4) Use of underpasses where possible rather than bridges to reduce visual impact of the Scheme 5) Use of low noise road surface finishing where new roads surfaces are to be laid 6) Non-intrusive temporary construction measures within the River Itchen to facilitate cleaning of an existing headwall, and installation of two new headwalls to serve the operational drainage strategy

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>ground form slopes towards the river giving direct pathway from a proposed construction compound to the internationally designated river. This would likely be a very challenging location to confirm through the DCO application/examination on Habitat Regulations Assessment grounds alone. This site should be dropped from the plans and all efforts be made to distance the construction sites from River Itchen wherever practicable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are surprised there is no mention of using the existing R&W materials compound site situated right next to Junction 9 between the M3 SB Onslip and the Spitfire spur road. This site is run by an established Highways England contractor; it is full of potential engineering fill material that will have come from elsewhere on the strategic road network over recent years; and, now that very 'recycled' fill material is piled to its current height the plant, other machinery and lighting used in that compound is a visual eyesore on the edge of the South Downs National Park. It would be bordering on disingenuous for Highways England not to look at the opportunities this compound offers both in terms of construction compound site location (instead of compound Number 3 or 4) and the reuse of fill material borne from years of 'recycling' from other Highways England schemes. Again, as in my point 1/ I would expect to see full assessment and reasoned findings in the DCO application, as to what the selection criteria against using this location with the potential use of the engineering fill material within, all of which is quite literally already on site. Given the constrained location of the proposed development site between the historic city of Winchester and the South Downs National Park and over the River Itchen, construction mitigation would have to be extremely well planned out, with best practice mitigation strategies and pollution prevention controls in place. This scrutiny over the construction phase should extend to design and logistics and include maximising off-site prefabrication of as much infrastructure as possible, delivering to site for installation in a quick and controlled manner. For example, the deck for the new footbridge over the River Itchen should be prefabricated offsite and dropped into place overnight from the adjacent A34 NB carriageway once pier footings have been installed. The underpass taking the A34 SB under the M3 could be built in square shape box sections and slid into place on rails. New junction infrastructure on Junction 9 itself ought to be prefabricated as far as possible and the onsite build be on as accelerated a timeline as possible to improve potential impacts on traffic movements during the construction phase. Prefabrication offsite would enable greater control of materials transfer and storage (reducing the potential for pollution incident) in the constrained 		<p>7) Retention of existing pavements where possible to provide efficiencies and reduce the need for construction of new pavements</p> <p>8) The drainage strategy has been designed to reduce the opportunity for pollutants from road drainage to be discharged to the sensitive chalk aquifer by restricting infiltration of captured drainage water until after pollutants have been removed</p> <p>9) The concurrent works to install new drainage outfalls and the new bridge over the River Itchen, resulting in reduced duration for associated PRow closures</p> <p>10) Use of warm rolled asphalt for installation of road surfacing, not hot rolled asphalt (resulting in reduced carbon emissions and energy requirements)</p> <p>Further mitigation measures are contained within the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) and in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>development location between Winchester and the South Downs National Park, while having the potential to improve construction times for the overall project. With the construction site being on two significant highway routes (being the A34 and M3), there is ideal opportunity to bring in large elements of prefabricated infrastructure onsite, using appropriate abnormal indivisible load protocols, without need to go through local towns and villages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re. landscaping, topsoil ought not be used where swathes of chalk grassland are intended. It should be made clear to landscaping contractors through means of detailed soil management plans, environmental masterplans and landscape design secured through the DCO that chalk grassland requires in part denudated substrate free of nutrients. Good case study here is the Weymouth Relief Road in Dorset where swathes of wildflowers complement the highway inclusion in the local landscape and has resulted in greatly reduced maintenance regimes. There is plenty of local expertise in this area with Butterfly Conservation (who manage the excellent Magdalen Hill Down butterfly reserve in line of sight of the M3 Junction 9 proposals), Hampshire and IOW Wildlife Trust, the Bumblebee Conservation Trust and the very local Wild Valley Verges group all in the county and who can advise appropriate design and management. Topsoil is a precious commercial resource nowadays and could be used agriculturally in the vicinity. • With Biodiversity net gain for DCO consented schemes now in proposed amendments to the Environment Bill, all proposed biodiversity habitats created towards the end of construction should be maintained in line with an appropriate Handover Environmental Management Plan in perpetuity, if not by Highways England then by a suitable local agent who could acquire the areas in concern. This would secure real environmental legacy for the area. • I could not find any detail about operational lighting proposals in the consultation material. I would expect highway lighting to be minimal unless absolutely required for safety. This view is to contribute to the dark night skies over South Downs National Park. • It is not easy to see from the indicative general arrangement plans whether the proposed M3 Junction 9 improvements scheme goes as far north up the A33 as the 'Cart and Horses junction'. There is a most fantastic opportunity here for collaboration between Hampshire County Council, Winchester City Council and Highways England to incorporate the long needed upgrade of this awful staggered junction between the B3047 and A33 (which has seen so many road traffic accidents over many years) into the wider proposals, while Tier 1 contractors are on site. More detail on this 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	would be welcome if it is being considered – from a local's perspective it certainly should be.		

K.2.Q Land ownership

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	<p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust's nature reserve at St Catherine's Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally.</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network, as well as potentially impacting the ability of Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust to manage the nature reserve.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has received several comments relating to concerns surrounding the potential compulsory acquisition of the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is located to the west of the Scheme, and west of the Winnall Industrial Estate. The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals. At its northern extent, the reserve boundary lies parallel to the Application Boundary along the existing alignment of the A34, however the Nature Reserve boundary does not interact with the Application Boundary and is not required for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p>
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure			
Local community	<p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust's nature reserve at St Catherine's Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally.</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has received several comments relating to concerns surrounding the potential compulsory acquisition of the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is located to the west of the Scheme, and west of the Winnall Industrial Estate. The Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals. At its northern extent, the reserve boundary lies parallel to the Application Boundary along the existing alignment of the A34, however the Nature Reserve boundary does not interact with the Application Boundary and is not required for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network, as well as potentially impacting the ability of Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust to manage the nature reserve.		through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.
Local community	Not to compulsorily purchase Winnall Moors land. Leave it untouched. Build a green corridor bridge.	Y	
Local community	We do not agree to all of the spare soil from the works being deposited on to land owned by Winchester College or the land infilled. We have not yet been provided with detailed information on where all of this spare soil will go and how much there will be which will need accommodating somewhere.	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	For local landowners it will be a pain wherever it is I guess	N	This comment has been noted.

K.2.R Consultation

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	<p>Scheme looks good now the A33 traffic is separated. Free flowing traffic between M3 and A34 will be a great improvement in many ways, reducing delays, accidents and pollution. Many of us said it should have been built like that originally!</p> <p>I like the displays, video, etc. Someone's had a lot of fun designing those.</p>	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed, including those received in support of the 2021 statutory consultation materials.
Local community	Overall the proposals seem thought out from a traffic flow point of view. I must say that when looking at the plans it is very difficult to identify the impact of the changes as there is no easy way of comparing to what is presently there and where the impact is, such as if new surrounding land is needed. It is therefore difficult to comment on the merits of the scheme on this level alone.	N	The Applicant has acknowledged this comment. The Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) provides an overview of the location of the Scheme, the proposals and presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme.
Local community	We have not been provided with specific enough information in order to submit a constructive response to the consultation. At this time we do not feel that there is enough information currently in the public domain for us to make any decisions or either agree or disagree with the proposed works.	N	This comment has been noted. If the application is accepted for examination, the full suite of application documents will be made available on the Planning Inspectorate's website: M3 Junction 9 Improvement National Infrastructure Planning (planninginspectorate.gov.uk) .
Local community	<p>Congestion does occur at the junction, but purely at peak times. You should optimise the existing infrastructure by encouraging certain traffic at off-peak times. Most congestion occurs on the southbound carriageway of the A34 heading to the M3. There is also a lack of enforcement of driving standards which cause accidents – people going through red lights and ignoring the junction boxes.</p> <p>Once traffic has accessed the M3 southbound, further congestion also occurs (probably more frequently) at junctions 10-11 and 12-13 – your modelling will have provided evidence of this.</p> <p>Your proposals are unlikely to reduce congestion at peak times, but simply to move it to another part of the network during busy times. Presumably there is no intention to further destroy the area south of Winchester for motorway widening – which means you are always going to be constrained by merging traffic from a two-lane motorway and a two-lane A road into the capacity of a two-lane stretch of motorway south of junction 9.</p> <p>Your proposals does not really address the root cause - you will still be merging the 4 lanes from the A34 and M3 into the 3 and then 2 of the southbound M3.</p> <p>From my local knowledge congestion occurs:</p>	N	The Applicant has had regard to relevant matters raised in response to the 2021 statutory consultation and the Applicant's responses are presented in this Appendix.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>1. At peak times when people are traveling to work 2. Because of holiday traffic in the summer heading to Bournemouth and the New Forest</p> <p>For (1) surely we should be encouraging modal shift – local commuter car journeys should not be facilitated at public expense when we are attempting to reduce pollution and work to Net Zero. We should focus on encouraging walking and cycling by providing safe infrastructure at a fraction of the cost and encouraging public transport use.. For (2) holiday traffic on busy weekend is essentially stop-start all the way down to the coast on busy weekend – again you are simply moving the problem further south.</p> <p>I cannot see how this will reduce noise – is it not an established fact that road ‘improvements’ such as this actually result in increases in journeys?</p> <p>Connections from the M3 to the A33 appear to miss the main incident hotspot – local residents have been campaigning for years for junction improvements at the Cart and Horses turn in Kings Worthy where there have been a number of fatalities – this doesn’t appear to be in scope.</p> <p>The changes you propose will take a large amount of our local environment and cover it in concrete. It will become an even less usable area for pedestrians and cyclists. The fact that you are putting pedestrians and cyclists in what appears to be a length subway shows how little priority is given to active travel – I never use subways even in daylight in town centres as they are intimidating places.</p> <p>I’m not sure why I have participated in this consultation – no doubt the decisions have been made and local residents are unlikely to have their voices considered against the well-funded and extremely vocal freight and motoring lobbies which are skewing the debate.</p>		
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	At this time we do not feel that there is enough information currently in the public domain for us to be able to comment on this.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. If the application is accepted for examination, the full suite of application documents will be made available on the Planning Inspectorate’s website: M3 Junction 9 Improvement National Infrastructure Planning (planninginspectorate.gov.uk) .
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure			
Local community	The virtual room is not accessible to partially sighted people.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. In addition to digital methods, the Applicant endeavoured to consult using traditional methods, where safe and practical

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			to do so, including using post and telephone communications methods. Paper copies of the consultation documents included in the virtual room could also be requested.
Local community	The PEIR figures show an area around Three Maids intersection as being part of the where but there is no mention of it in the text. What is it?	Y	The area was included in the Indicative Application Boundary for the proposed northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation). However, since the 2021 statutory consultation, this construction compound has been removed from the Scheme proposals.
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	The virtual room is not accessible to partially sighted people.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. In addition to digital methods, the Applicant endeavoured to consult using traditional methods, where safe and practical to do so, including using post and telephone communications methods. Paper copies of the consultation documents included in the virtual room could also be requested.
Local community	Not enough detail to assess.	N	This comment has been noted. If the application is accepted for examination, the full suite of application documents will be made available on the Planning Inspectorate's website: M3 Junction 9 Improvement National Infrastructure Planning (planninginspectorate.gov.uk) .
Local community	Don't know what your mitigation plan contains.	N	Full details of the mitigation and monitoring measures proposed for the Scheme are presented in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , the Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) .
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	The virtual room is not accessible to partially sighted people.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. In addition to digital methods, the Applicant endeavoured to consult using traditional methods, where safe and practical to do so, including using post and telephone communications methods. Paper copies of the consultation documents included in the virtual room could also be requested.
Local community	It is not clear to me from the brochure as I find the information in the brochure hard to visualise.	N	As part of the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant hosted bespoke webinars which covered a range of topics and specialist areas, including the Applicant's proposed landscape design, and also offered telephone appointments to help members of the public understand the Scheme and supplement any face-to-face conversations that they would have had with the project team. Full details of the landscaping strategy is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
Local community	I have listened to the published consultation videos and am happy with what is proposed.	N	This comment has been noted.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	At this time, we do not feel that there is enough information currently in the public domain for us to be able to either agree or disagree with the landscape proposals. We do not agree to all of the spoil from the scheme to be infilled on land owned by Winchester College.	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. Full details of the landscaping strategy is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>If the application is accepted for examination, the full suite of application documents will be made available on the Planning Inspectorate's website: M3 Junction 9 Improvement National Infrastructure Planning (planninginspectorate.gov.uk).</p>
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			
Local community	Quite simply I don't trust or believe that any plan proposed will be stuck with. Rather at later stages any plans are subject to change and therefore what is the point of agreeing with a proposal that can be changed without further consultation.	N	This comment has been noted.
F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.			
Local community	The virtual room is not accessible to partially sighted people.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. In addition to digital methods, the Applicant endeavoured to consult using traditional methods, where safe and practical to do so, including using post and telephone communications methods. Paper copies of the consultation documents included in the virtual room could also be requested.
Local community	Can't find the diagrams online	N	Consultation plans could be found under the 'documents' section on the Scheme webpage which was advertised on the 2021 Section 49 Notice. Plans could also be viewed in the virtual exhibition. In addition paper copies of all consultation documents could be requested.
Local community	I've not been able to find in your plans how you will deal with the spare soil and as you've made it unclear I am unable to comment.	N	The locations of the spoil deposition areas were included on the Indicative Land Uses Plan that was part of the consultation materials and included in the Consultation Brochure.
Local community	Little detail presented. The plans show two 'area(s) of search for potential excess spoil management' and Section 7 of the Consultation Brochure adds	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	nothing to this. In short, you have yet to set out any meaningful plans for how to deal with spare soil.		whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. Full details of the landscaping strategy is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
F.4: Please let us know the reasons for your response to question F3 and any other views about the locations we've identified			
Local community	The virtual room is not accessible to partially sighted people.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. In addition to digital methods, the Applicant endeavoured to consult using traditional methods, where safe and practical to do so, including using post and telephone communications methods. Paper copies of the consultation documents included in the virtual room could also be requested.
Local community	I cannot visualise the areas. Why do you not print off OS maps with added shading?	N	The locations of the spoil deposition areas were included on the Indicative Land Uses Plan that was part of the consultation materials and included in the Consultation Brochure.
Local community	At this time we do not feel that there is enough information currently known about how much excess spoil is proposed to go in each location in order to either agree or disagree with the proposal.	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. Full details of the landscaping strategy is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
Local community	No clarity on the plans for the spare soil so it is difficult to comment.	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. Full details of the landscaping strategy is presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) .
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	The virtual room is not accessible to partially sighted people.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. In addition to digital methods, the Applicant endeavoured to consult using traditional methods, where safe and practical to do so, including using post and telephone communications methods. Paper copies of the consultation documents included in the virtual room could also be requested.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	I am leaving this conversation to HCC as experienced highways engineers. We hoped to see a long term alliance between HCC and HE working for park and ride sites within this work: I hope this is achievable.	N	The Applicant will continue to engage with Hampshire County Council as the Scheme proposals develop.
General commentary			
Local community	Do we not get to answer a question on the virtual exhibition website? It was, without a doubt, the worst website ever created. I can't fully answer these questions because I couldn't load half the documents. I spent 45 minutes inspecting a virtual gazebo and a CGI man's jeans. Did you seriously believe that reading some documents would be easier if they were obscured by a virtual woman, not mobile compatible, unable to be saved, very slow to load, difficult to zoom, not accessible to partially sighted people, with identity labels that are too small to read and won't zoom in? There are, in all seriousness, 12 year olds that can design easy-to-read websites and know how to make them accessible to all.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. In addition to digital methods, the Applicant endeavoured to consult using traditional methods, where safe and practical to do so, including using post and telephone communications methods. Paper copies of the consultation documents could also be requested.
Local community	Nothing to add at this stage. I will be interested to learn how the scheme develops as others comment on it.	N	If accepted for examination, details about how the Scheme will progress through the DCO process will be published on the Planning Inspectorate's website: M3 Junction 9 Improvement National Infrastructure Planning (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)
Local community	Please give all Hampshire residents updates on this, not just "those locally resident effected" as many people in Hampshire travel for work and will be effected everyday on there commute to work.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. If the Scheme is accepted for examination, the Applicant would be required to publish a notice in local and national newspapers to notify the public of acceptance. Furthermore, details about how the Scheme will progress through the DCO process will be published on the Planning Inspectorate's website: M3 Junction 9 Improvement National Infrastructure Planning (planninginspectorate.gov.uk) .
Local community	To date we have been communicated with very little by Highways England and not provided with specific enough information in order to submit either a positive or negative response to the consultation. At this time we do not feel that there is enough information currently in the public domain for us to make any decisions.	N	The Applicant continues to engage with landowners directly affected by the Scheme to understand the effects of the Scheme on their land interest. Specific mitigation solutions or compensation will be agreed on a case by case basis as appropriate.
Local community	I do wonder how many people, especially local Kings Worthy/Springvale, are totally aware of these proposals and how to view them....	N	Section 10.5 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) describes the consultation target area that was used for the Applicant's primary 2021 statutory consultation activities. The 2021 consultation target area was defined as a 5km radius around the Application Boundary for the Scheme. This radius was agreed in consultation with Winchester City Council, South Downs National Park Authority and Hampshire County Council as being an area proportionate to the Scheme to capture local communities who may be affected by the potential impacts arising from the construction and operation of the Scheme. Members of the public outside of the 2021 consultation target area were informed about the Scheme and consultation exercise through newspaper advertisements, social media and the Scheme webpage.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Looking at your website, showing the plans in picture form, would it not be a good idea to do before and after picture plans, both before and after shots being taken from exactly the same view point. Rather like 'spot the difference'. This would make it much clearer to see the changes being proposed.	N	This comment has been noted. The Applicant explained the key design changes since the 2019 statutory consultation at the online webinars and in the Consultation Brochure.
Local community	<p>The Winchester Movement strategy work suggests that improvements to the capacity of and flow through this junction will have a positive impact on the city's traffic issues, air pollution, carbon footprint etc. I remain unconvinced, because in many cases, the issues are caused by accidents on the M3 or A34 outside the proposed plan area. I do not see any data in the consultation report to show expected movements, % of non polluting vehicles by 2035, etc in the papers. This leads to build up of traffic which is avoided by going through Winchester instead. Unless these plans reduce accidents on the feeder trunk roads (the M3 and A34,) the traffic build ups will still occur, all too often as traffic levels are returning to pre pandemic levels.</p> <p>These are my specific points for your consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The layout is better for local people using the A33 who were worried about crossing heavy traffic, but it now means that all local users will have to use the new junction every time (which wasn't the case in the previous design). This may lead to congestion so it has not served our needs as well as we would hope. The north exit from the A33 on to the M3 north brings faster traffic movements closer to the communities that I represent- hence potentially noisier, which is unacceptable. • The positioning of the soil deposits has been done to suit HE/landowners. It is a missed opportunity to mitigate the noise of the road in operation all along the route from south to north. (see also point 12) Princes Mead has concerns about the setting of the listed building too. There is no assessment of flood risk when these soil heaps are in place. • The omission of the cycle route to Kings Worthy when it was so clearly described in the first proposal is a failure in this design. It is a need that is clearly described in the WCC/HCC Infrastructure Funding Statement (previously the R123 list) which I have already sent to the design/project team. I believe it is a duty to consider the needs of Non Motorised Users to be taken into account in any NSIP scheme, so this omission is disappointing. • The lack of traffic lights may be ok initially, but inevitably, there will be a need to control traffic flows in years ahead. Please include electricity schemes to enable traffic lights to be fitted later. • Failure to show signage and gantries in the scheme means that we cannot tell what views these will present to local people, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area. Already, the traffic lights of the 	N	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments and sets out its response to the matters relating to the consultation below. Other matters raised in this response are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p> <p><i>Responding to point 10 and 13:</i></p> <p>The Applicant developed its consultation strategy for the 2021 statutory consultation with Winchester City Council, South Downs National Park Authority and Hampshire County Council (see Chapter 10 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) for further details). Due to the uncertainties posed by COVID-19, the Applicant adopted a digital first approach to the 2021 statutory consultation. In addition to digital methods, the Applicant endeavoured to consult using traditional methods, where safe and practical to do so, including using post and telephone communications methods. The Applicant also sought to provide further publicity and promotion of the 2021 statutory consultation prior to its commencement, including posting and maintaining site notices at key locations around the Application Boundary, parking an 'Engagement Van' outside local venues and placing posters in local venues and newspapers. Paper copies of the consultation documents could also be requested. It is therefore considered that the Applicant made all reasonable endeavours to consult the community within the context of COVID-19 restrictions.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>junction can be seen from miles away in my division, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area, and cross motorway gantries can be viewed from Martyr Worthy in the national park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this country is to embrace walking and cycling for local commuting use, then the 3m wide cycle routes are inadequate to pass and should be wider. This includes actually on the roundabout where at one point, the walk/cycle way is alongside the main road. The Winnall area will continue to provide employment opportunities as well as retail etc. Other larger lorries go into the city from this junction. The paths created should not be shared for walkers and cyclists on planned bridleway that connect and to the NCN 23 where cyclists can be riding faster than is safe for walkers sharing the same surface (all should be at least to LTN1/20). • Impact on Cart and Horses junction traffic going onto the A33 from the B3047 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The design has no traffic breaks in traffic moving north on the A33 from Junction 9. Currently, there are traffic breaks (traffic lights create this) which create gaps in traffic to allow people to exit from the Cart and Horses junction, allowing it to function. This is particularly important at peak times when traffic entering and leaving Winchester is heavy on both routes. The new arrangement may create congestion, reduce safety and even more confusion at this junction. (It is also an opportunity to improve the gateway into the National Park at this point.) ○ The road layout of the A33 is changing, with one lane in each direction, and a bike lane coming into/through the junction. Currently there are sections of two lanes for filtering etc. These changes will impact on the junction itself which will need redesign to ensure it is safe, congestion doesn't occur and ideally actually improves for traffic going south (Morning Basingstoke traffic into Winchester), and Worthys /Winchester traffic going north and south at all times of day, but particularly at peak times, and traffic from the B3047 east going north. • The project statement states that one aim is to reduce Spitfire Link congestion, which severely impacts drivers there. There is no evidence in the project plan that the team have provided that shows how the new design will reduce congestion. At present, large traffic accelerates from a stop slower than smaller vehicles which results in no gaps for Spitfire Link traffic. There is no evidence provided that this will improve, because although much of the heavy traffic will be on the through road, not all of it will take that route; daytime traffic in particular, includes a considerable amount of large and small vehicles into Winnall. 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The levels on the project plans are difficult to follow, and I asked HCC to seek more traffic data, and full levels plan to see the implications for views, noise, pollutants fall out. The drive through video is poor, and difficult to follow : I requested an improved version but was told this was impossible. There is a considerable amount of biodiversity work to be considered: which includes interconnectivity between areas being 'managed' for biodiversity. I am leaving this to the experts at WCC, HCC and to SDNPA, but I do have concerns about the long term management of the water areas, set within the road system. The DEFRA 2016 noise map showed that improvement to noise mitigation were desirable at points through Winchester and for the A34 at the Headbourne Worthy site. A noise reference along Willis Way is included in your scheme. Anything worse, even by a slight margin would be unacceptable in planning terms 'for the enjoyment of the property' and other properties affected in this way. Since Willis Way was built, a considerable number of properties have been built in this area, alongside the A34 margins and I am seeking noise defence for these residents. Original tree planting is unsatisfactory: acoustic fencing is necessary here to mitigate noise. I must also express my regret that an 'open air' event wasn't organised for this consultation. With many other events taking place, this was a missed opportunity to engage the public face to face. 		
Local community	<p>This scheme is fine, is sorely needed, and the revised A33 northbound to Kings Worthy is a big improvement, albeit with increased land take and presumably cost.</p> <p>In 2019 you said the scheme would be open for traffic in 2023; now you say 2026. I sincerely hope that you will not all have retired by the time you get permission to actually build something.</p> <p>The new 3D flyover video is not as good as the 2019 one, and is much more difficult to find. The new one has too much text on it, and it doesn't show the new roundabout on the A33 at all, nor anything from the perspective of someone going north or south on the A33 or A34.</p>	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	<p>Found it very hard to understand how the roads will be routed as there was very little if any local landmarks marked on the plans eg Tesco at Junction 9 and the Cart & Horses at Kings Worthy for example- this would have helped enormously in understanding the scale and routing of the proposals plus their locations etc</p>	N	The Applicant acknowledges the comments received. As part of the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant hosted a series of online webinars via Microsoft Teams that covered different topics and specialist areas. There was a dedicated webinar titled 'our proposals – what we are planning to do' which provided details about the design, including the Scheme layout, environmental design mitigation proposals and

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>One thing we currently have as a problem is the sound of the motorway AND/or the A34 in North Winchester - from Kings Worthy all the way into Abbots Barton and other Northerly parts of Winchester.</p> <p>We have a consistently loud background noise in Abbots Barton especially in winter when the trees have no leaves and the atmosphere is very wet and humid however even in the summer when the windows have to be left open to sleep comfortably the sound can almost appear deafening which given the distance seems highly strange, although a temperature inversion may account for some of this</p> <p>We would very much welcome some investigation into this distractingly loud acoustic intrusion into our otherwise quiet existences so that this can be designed out of any part of the scheme in the future.</p> <p>As part of the works please can you ensure all tarmac is the low sound type and also could you please ensure the A34 ALL of the way up the hill out of Junction 9 also has a new layer of this sound attenuating tarmac.</p> <p>On another note I am unsure if your scheme will be affecting the A33 road where it connects to London Road leaving Winchester at the Cart and Horses pub. If it does or if any offsite contributions are required in the scheme this dangerous junction where many vehicle accidents take place desperately needs a roundabout to slow traffic and ensure everyone knows how to 'read' this overly complicated junction as it stands today</p>		<p>proposed construction activities. The webinars were recorded and retained on the Scheme webpage for those who could not attend the live version.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant offered a telephone appointment surgery to help members of the public understand the Scheme and supplement any face-to-face conversations that they would have had with the project team.</p>
Local community	<p>Traffic flows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed routing of the M3 and A34 appears to offer the opportunity of improved the traffic flows from M3 to A34 and from A34 to M3, with less risk of congestion. 2. The proposed routing of the A33 between the Cart & Horses junction and Winnall is improved compared to the previous proposal. The arrangement appears to offer a clearer route from Kings Worthy to Winnall and avoids joining the A34 and the queues that build up towards Jct 9 currently. This promises to make this route potentially easier to access the amenities just off junction 9. It also may offer a better option for people to access the new Sports & Leisure park, than driving through Winchester. If these assumptions prove correct this may reduce traffic flow along the Worthys Road and lower pressure at peak times on the City Rd junction in Winchester – we hope. 3. Referring to the A33 link to Jct 9, with one of the current lanes becoming a path, there will be changes to the A33 and how it flows through to the Cart & Horses junction. In addition, the new arrangement for accessing the M3 from Jct 9 will likely attract some proportion of 	Y	<p>The Applicant developed its consultation strategy for the 2021 statutory consultation with Winchester City Council, South Downs National Park Authority and Hampshire County Council (see Chapter 10 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) for further details). Due to the uncertainties posed by COVID-19, the Applicant adopted a digital first approach to the 2021 statutory consultation. In addition to digital methods, the Applicant endeavoured to consult using traditional methods, where safe and practical to do so, including using post and telephone communications methods. The Applicant also sought to provide further publicity and promotion of the 2021 statutory consultation prior to its commencement, including posting and maintaining 15 site notices at key locations around the Application Boundary, parking an 'Engagement Van' outside local venues and placing posters in local venues and newspapers. Paper copies of the consultation documents could also be requested. It is therefore considered that the Applicant made all reasonable endeavours to consult the community within the context of COVID-19 restrictions.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>drivers from areas such as Harestock, Kings Barton and Weeke, who will see the route through to the Cart & Horses Junction as the quickest route. This will add pressure on this junction which is a well-known trouble spot where priorities are ambiguous to many. The A33 junction with the London Rd/B3047 aka Cart & Horses junction, should be addressed within the overall scheme.</p> <p>Cycling and walking</p> <p>3. I welcome that National Cycle route 23 will continue to be in place. This route is an important route for cyclists in Winchester to head east and for people who cycle to work from the east into Winchester. Steps should be taken to ensure that this route remains open and free from mud etc during construction.</p> <p>4. It is disappointing to see that the “path” between the Cart & Horses junction and Winnall has been downgraded to a walking only path from what was a shared cycle/walking path in the previous proposal . The route proposed between the north & south bound carriageways of the A34 would be quite intimidating. Proximity to some traffic is inevitable, but better options are available, with zero or very marginal change in costs:</p> <p>a. The path should be designated as a shared walking and cycle path. I’d have no objections to it being a bridleway, but I’d be surprised to see the horse riding community using it as such. The route is likely to be used by people using it to get between the Worthys & Winnall, and perhaps beyond, rather than as a nice leisurely walk. In addition to providing access to Winnall for people in the Worthys, this could link to other paths - current & future – to give a cycle route to the new Sports & Leisure complex. This route would be flatter than cycling along the Worthy Road.</p> <p>b. Routing – This shared path should be routed to minimise the proximity to the fastest traffic. The current routing of the path does the opposite. I can envisage two possible better routings:</p> <p>i. A path that runs alongside the north-bound A34 on the south side of the road, to join in with Nuns Walk. Nuns walk could be upgraded to a shared cycle path / footpath from the point where they join, into the Worthys. The Nuns walk route could be extended alongside the A34 all the way until this path meets the London Road in Headbourne Worthy. This would be a welcome improvement in amenity to residents in Headbourne Worthy</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>ii. The shared path could be designed into to follow the same route between Winnall and the Cart & Horses Junction as the A33. This would use the same under-passes as the road.</p> <p>There are pro's and con's to each of these two options, but both options are better than the route proposed"</p> <p>Noise mitigation A reduction in the frequency of major congestion between the A34 and the M3 at junction 9 will be welcomed by many from well beyond the Worthys and indeed for many in the Worthys. It is reasonable to anticipate that, on average, there will be an increase in road noise generated. One of the "benefits" of the Southbound A34 being jammed is that traffic speed is much reduced which reduces the noise levels which are intrusive for many who live in Headbourne Worthy and Kings Worthy either side of the A34. I'd particularly highlight residents of Willis Waye and The Dell, but there are plenty of others for whom noise levels are intense. The scheme plan should make clear what measure are being put in place to limit the noise levels to ensure that they do not increase and preferably that they decrease by at least 3dB – preferably more. I believe there are noise survey sensors in place in several back gardens in some houses in Willis Waye. The environmental services team at Winchester City council could provide details and data.</p> <p>Environmental concerns</p> <p>The webinars on this were scheduled for while I was on holiday, so I have been unable to get enough insight into these areas to make well informed comments. But it is clear that this project would be a major undertaking in a fragile environmental area. In addition, the volume of material used will have an associated impact in terms of CO2 and other emissions. It is critical that any impact is mitigated and that an "environmental" business case analogous to a financial business case is conducted.</p> <p>Consultation with public</p> <p>While I understand the approach chosen was done so to be able to navigate the restrictions placed on all of us by the Covid Pandemic, the On-Line consultation process is quite different to that which people are used to before, as exemplified by the consultation in Tubbs Hall, Kings Worthy for the previous iteration of the proposed junction. The Online process has some advantages for some people, but it could be onerous for many. Indeed, I was unable to attend any of the briefings on the mitigations of the environmental impact for example. Many people are unfamiliar with "online" meetings and many more still are not familiar</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>enough to be able to get as much insight from the Online resources as they would from an “in person” consultation. Given that we have a significant easing of the Covid rules from 19th July 21, I strongly recommend that to ensure better stakeholder engagement, that a series of in person consultations be added into the process. While clearly, this will take time, it will pay back in terms of stakeholder engagement.</p>		
Local community	<p>We support the proposed plans, having commented in 2019. The present road layout causes huge congestion and is unsafe. It does not cater for cyclists and pedestrians in a safe environment. It will be very important for local residents to have regular updates if the scheme progresses, and to be informed of local contact details of who to contact quickly if concerned on any issues. Carrying the public with you will give them reassurance. Local liaison groups have been set up through Planning Committees in the past for larger projects, which were successful, could this be done in this case?</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. Project updates will be posted on the Applicant’s Scheme webpage and the Planning Inspectorate’s dedicated scheme webpage throughout the DCO planning stages. If the Scheme is accepted for examination, members of the local community will be able to register as an ‘Interested Party’ and share their views about the Scheme in the examination.</p> <p>Furthermore, a Community Liaison Manager will be appointed to respond to complaints and community liaison. Further details are provided in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p>
South Downs Network	<p>Objection</p> <p>The South Downs Network objects to the proposed M3 Junction 9 Development in its present form.</p> <p>Executive Summary: Move over to Sustainable Transport</p> <p>We respectfully suggest that this £180+ million road scheme should be referred back to be replaced by a sustainable transport version that will help us meet our climate change commitments, providing better bus services, bus and rail infrastructure, integrated green cycle and walking routes, safe crossing for active travel, green (car free) bridges, safer paths for access to schools and access to rail stations.</p> <p>Secretary of State for Transport guidance</p> <p>We would take this opportunity to remind Highways England of the words used by the Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps when launching the Government’s ‘Decarbonising Transport: Setting the Challenge,’ said in the foreword that: “public transport and active travel will be the natural first choice for our daily activities” and that “We will use our cars less and be able to rely on a convenient, cost-effective and coherent public transport network”.</p> <p>More roads - more traffic</p> <p>More roads equals more traffic - when a new road is built, new traffic will divert onto it. Many people may make new trips they would not otherwise make just</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges South Downs Network’s objection to the Scheme. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to the 2019 consultation:</i></p> <p>The Applicant’s approach to the 2019 consultation, including the identification of stakeholders and a summary of responses received, is provided in Chapters 8 and 9 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1).</p> <p>Please note, as a result of the design changes and refinements to the Application Boundary that was consulted on during the 2019 consultation stage, the Applicant determined that a further consultation pursuant to Section 42, Section 46, Section 47 and Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 was required for the Scheme. Accordingly, the Applicant undertook a further statutory consultation with prescribed bodies, local authorities and the local community, superseding the previous 2019 consultation, in summer 2021.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>because of new roads. This well-known and long-established effect is known as 'induced traffic'</p> <p>Increase of emissions and global warming gases</p> <p>The Highways England proposal will increase CO2 emissions by attracting more cars onto the roads! Highways England's own report admits a significant increase in carbon emissions as a result of the project - some 534,628 tonnes of CO2 for user emissions. This doesn't include the emissions from the construction which doesn't seem to be reported on.</p> <p>How are we going to meet the Government's commitment to net zero emissions in less than 30 years with road schemes like this? Highways England say the project will be completed in 2026 so the timeline is even shorter at less than 25 years to achieve net zero! Wouldn't it be better to cancel the project and spend the £180 million on sustainable transport solutions?</p> <p>In 2020 transport accounted for 29.8% of all CO2 emissions. The majority is from road transport! How can Highways England advance a road scheme that will actively increase CO2 emissions?</p> <p>It is likely that there will still be 40 million petrol and diesel cars and vans on the roads in 2030 plus diesel HGVs!</p> <p>The UK's new climate target to cut our emissions by 78% by 2035 was passed into law in June 2021 - the Highways England plan is out of step with this. The proposal does not include a landscape strategy. Road developments are not excluded from the UK's legally adopted climate commitment. The UK Government has a commitment to tackle climate change.</p> <p>Nature</p> <p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation Design Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that this design plan consists of just one page! We are concerned that there is no landscape strategy or detailed plan. The Mitigation Design Plan contains simply focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, we urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and biodiversity net gain. As part of this, we would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done. The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. We want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</p> <p>Whilst the actual road design plan seems to be very firm there seems to be a lack of commitment by Highways England to the environment, an EIA and a landscape and biodiversity/habitats plan. Words such as 'ongoing' and "is being developed" keep cropping up. One gets the impression that the natural world is not important to Highways England.</p> <p>We are concerned that Highways England seemed to be avoiding a commitment to the production of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). In Para 1.5.4 of the PEIR Highways England says "It should be noted that at this stage the information is preliminary. An iterative process of scheme development and EIA is ongoing". Surely a draft EIA should be available for public consultation now, and not be delayed until the DCO application? Indeed there seems to be a fudging of the commitment even at that stage to the production of an EIA. Highways England says "The final EIA work will be reported in the ES."</p> <p>Indeed further fudging of commitment to environmental assessment is contained in the response to Natural England's submission of 9 November 2020. They highlighted that the impact of emissions to designated ecological sites is required. Highways England response was "Ongoing EIA work will include the assessment of the impacts of emissions from traffic on designated habitats."</p> <p>Avoiding say yes to Natural England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England said "The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies." Highways England said "ongoing EIA work is to be reported." • Natural England said they would welcome the opportunity to comment on the landscape, biodiversity and access enhancement plan. Highways England responded "A biodiversity and landscaping mitigation package is being developed." But when? • Natural England advised that "the potential impact of the proposal upon features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for habitat creation/enhancement should be included within this assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance on such matters." Highways England responded ""The Biodiversity chapter of the ES will identify all potential impacts on identified biodiversity features"" Further fudging." 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>SDNPA Nature Investment Areas</p> <p>The road site is where the South Downs National Park has identified one of its 12 nature investment areas. These nature recovery areas are part of a hub of an interconnected 'nature network.' The Highways England intrusion flies in the face of nature recovery and will destroy and fragment important protected habitats. This scheme affects the local nature reserve which is home to rare and notable wildlife, and a SSSI site.</p> <p>Previous environmental damage</p> <p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust's nature reserve at St Catherine's Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally. "</p> <p>SSSI and Special Area of Conservation</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network.</p> <p>Government Environmental Policy</p> <p>Highways England need to take on board Government policy on the environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government's Final Report of the Independent Review on the Economics of Biodiversity led by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta. Amongst other things he says "Human demands on nature must be curbed • We say - road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government 'Dasgupta Review' says, 'Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).' We should no 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to urbanisation pressures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also please bear in mind the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this scheme. <p>Green Bridge</p> <p>We support the Hampshire and IoW Wildlife Trust’s proposal for a green bridge to the National Park which would reunite wildlife habitats that became disconnected by the 1990s M3 construction.</p> <p>We want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature’s recovery despite modern transport development.</p> <p>Spoil</p> <p>The Highways England report says “We have not yet completed our junction design, so we do not know exactly how much material may need to be placed in these areas, or whether we will need all three areas”. Surely after at least two and a half years of preparation such civil engineering detail should be known? The amount of spoil will affect the landscape design. This should be known now; before Highways England applies for a Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>2019 consultation</p> <p>We have serious concerns about the previous stages of public consultations.</p> <p>Highways England says “There was a high level of support for the Proposed Scheme”. “We received 526 responses to our consultation”. Other than a few meaningless and valueless paragraphs the Public Consultation Summary Report does not provide any substantive information on exactly what those 526 respondents said. What organisations responded and what did they say? How many of the 526 comments were from individual members of the public. How many were car, commercial and HGV vehicle owners/drivers? Did horse riding, walking and cycling groups respond? Indeed were they invited to respond?</p> <p>References are made to ‘stakeholders.’ It is understood they were invited to workshops to give their input. Exactly who were they? and how were they selected? We hope it wasn't a question of selecting the appropriate</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>stakeholders so that it assisted in giving the right answer to suit Highways England.</p> <p>Walking and Cycling Proposals Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that there is little substance to walking and cycling provision. The plan just consists of one page. There seems to be very little reference to provision for horse riders.</p> <p>Walkers, cyclists and horse riders to be put in a 'subway'! Underground? Highways England say "On both sides of the motorway, the existing walking and cycling route links both parts of Easton Lane, which would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders will be improved with a widened 3m route, which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway..."</p> <p>This is unacceptable. This proposal is fraught with all sorts of problems. Who is going to police the subway to ensure the safety of users? Who will maintain it and how will it be lit? Will there be security cameras? Will there be traffic separation to ensure safety of different users such as horse riders and cyclists?</p> <p>Instead of hiding these active travel users away below ground highways England should provide a green bridge out in the fresh air above the pollution from the motorway style road.</p> <p>In any event Highways England should ensure that cycle provision is compliant with Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20 Published last year by the Government.</p> <p>Highways England must take account of latest Government policy</p> <p>The business case for this project should be rewritten taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Gov policy paper - A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment (pub Jan 2018) • DfT's policy paper - Decarbonising transport: setting the challenge (pub March 2020) • UK Gov policy paper: Gear change: a bold vision for cycling and walking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Gov policy paper: Bus Back Better: national bus strategy for England 		
Local community	<p>It's very disappointing that you only provide a downloadable PDF form which most people would find hard or impossible to edit, even in Word format. Very wasteful having to print out then post (or rescan and email). Why on earth isn't there also an editable Word document as well as a web form?</p>	N	<p>A copy of the questionnaire was available online at the Scheme webpage and paper copies could be sent upon request for consultees to submit their comments about the Scheme. Completed questionnaires and/or separate comments from consultees were accepted through the following methods:</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The derogation of the original cycle provisions is appalling and these all need to be reinstated. This is a once in a life time opportunity to actually provide improved cycle infrastructure at a time when ebike use is growing (as is cycling in general) and the needs of climate change should be prioritised over short term cost. That allegedly is gov policy - as well as scientific need - and it's quite appalling that the Treasury can be so short sighted as to reduce rather than enhance cycle provision.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completing the online response form (this included an editable online form) • Completing a paper copy of the response form and returning it using the Freepost address • Emailing a digital copy of the response form to M3junction9improvements@highwaysengland.co.uk • Emailing or posting separate comments <p>The Applicant included a telephone number on publicity materials that consultees could contact for further support to access the documents. Furthermore, the Applicant offered a telephone appointment surgery to help members of the public understand the Scheme and supplement any face-to-face conversations that they would have had with the project team.</p>
Local community	<p>Letter setting out basis of the representation:</p> <p>These representations are submitted in specific response to one element of the proposed works at Junction 9 of the M3, notably the proposed areas of land identified as potential deposition sites for surplus soil from the works.</p> <p>The OBJECTION in the strongest terms is submitted on four principal grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Process and Procedure b) Landscape Impact c) Heritage Impact d) Access Implications <p>The order of the objections should not be regarded as conveying any order of significance to the objections being raised.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Process and Procedure <p>Despite the stated intention by Highways England that this is the final round of consultation prior to the submission of the formal application to government, it is our understanding that this is the first consultation that any consideration has been given to the important issue of how to deal with surplus soil generated from the works. This is clearly a critical matter that should have been addressed much earlier in the development of the scheme.</p> <p>Even at this stage, the proposals for the deposition of surplus soil are extremely vague and lacking in any detail. All that can be gleaned from the available consultation material is that three potential sites have been identified and that the land levels may be increased by 4m at two of them, with no detail of intent for the third northern site. However, if the 4m increase represents the envisaged level of excess soil requiring deposition, it would seem plausible that a similar amount of deposition may be envisaged for the northern site, potentially leading to an infilling of the natural valley. It is also not yet known</p>	Y	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to deposition areas:</i></p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, all three deposition areas have been removed for the Scheme. In re-profiling the landform between Easton Lane and Long Walk, in response to South Downs National Park Authority and Natural England's comments, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>As a highly sensitive building the potential impacts upon Princes Mead School have been fully considered within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). No significant impacts have been identified. A programme of archaeological investigation to inform the baseline consisting of geophysical surveys and trial trenching was carried out to inform the assessment and no remains associated with the Morn Hill camp have been identified within the Application Boundary.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to walkers, cyclists and horse-riders:</i></p> <p>The effects on existing PRowS during construction are outlined in Chapter 12 (Population and Human health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The impacts of the construction of the Scheme on these routes are considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted an outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) as part of its DCO application. The Traffic Management Plan</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>whether 1, 2 or 3 of these sites might be required; the actual landfill requirements; the proposed profiles of the land after deposition and future uses apart from a vague indication of returning to agriculture.</p> <p>There is therefore no basis upon which the impact can be properly assessed and therefore a considered response made and submitted.</p> <p>There is also no understanding of how these sites have been selected; this should be compared with the earlier consultation versions on alternative options for the junction works themselves. It is assumed, but it is not clear, that a range of potential sites have been considered and analysed. It is also hoped that discussions have been held with local authorities and organisations who have a detailed knowledge of the local area and would most probably be able to identify potential sites for soil deposition and subsequent enhancement works.</p> <p>Whilst we understand that the process can be ongoing from now onwards, up to and during the application process, there is limited opportunity for individual landowners, local residents and organisations to be directly involved, notwithstanding that they will be directly affected by the proposals.</p> <p>An OBJECTION must therefore be raised to the unfair and unsound process and it is requested that the opportunity be provided for a further round of consultation when the proposals for the deposition of surplus soil have been properly addressed and refined, taking into account the representations received from this stage of consultation.</p> <p>The following objections are therefore necessarily based on the limited information available and apply directly to the proposed northern area identified as a potential site for soil deposition. This site actually has the most limited information available; the flythrough of the scheme touches upon the central and southern sites but does not even refer to the northern site. The potential for the northern site is really only picked up from the site plans showing areas of land, which appear largely unrelated to the actual existing landforms.</p> <p>b) Landscape Impact</p> <p>Please refer to the attached assessment undertaken by the terra firma Consultancy Ltd. Terra firma are a well-respected firm of landscape architects advising on a local and national basis and who have advised the Trust on a number of projects over many years.</p> <p>The report concludes that there is the potential for significant harm on landscape character of and visual amenity within the SDNP, as well as on the setting of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>c) Heritage Impact</p>		<p>(Document Reference 7.8) provides details of how the construction works will be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measure, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase. The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p>Due to the removal of the deposition areas, the existing walking, cycling and horse-riding routes within the vicinity of the Scheme would not be affected.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to cultural heritage:</i></p> <p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). The assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies outlined within the DMRB LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (National Highways, 2020) and the DMRB LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (National Highways, 2020) and agreed with key heritage stakeholders.</p> <p>It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to Worthy Park House:</i></p> <p>Worthy Park House is recognised as a designated built heritage asset in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). An assessment of the impact on this receptor is provided in the chapter. It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p> <p>Specifically, a very small part of the area between the A34 and M3 is visible in long distance views from the listed building and overall, it is considered that construction activities are unlikely to be visually or audibly noticeable from the listed building and the current character experienced from the listed building would be retained. Therefore, the impact of magnitude would be negligible to Worthy Park House, resulting in a temporary slight adverse effect which is not significant.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Please refer to attached Heritage Impact Assessment from LJE Planning Ltd. This concludes the potential for significant harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* designated heritage asset of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>d) Access Considerations</p> <p>The northernmost site is within an existing agricultural field with very limited access. Existing access to the site is via narrow country lanes, most of which have to go through the very attractive and historic village of Easton. These existing routes cannot be contemplated as any means of access to the northern site.</p> <p>Looking at the plans that have been submitted it can only be deduced that the intention would be to create a new haul route parallel to the south side of the M3. This is not shown on any of the plans; only the final environmental improvements along this land. Its potential use as a haul route would need its own environmental assessment given the proximity to the River Itchen SSSI and there is no indication that such work has been undertaken. Noise, contamination and air quality issues in such a sensitive environment must also be considered.</p> <p>On the basis of the access limitations and considerations which would apply to the introduction of a new haul route, the access to this northern identified site would seem unrealistic and impractical.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>Significant OBJECTION must necessarily be raised to the proposals in so far as they relate to the deposition of excess soil as a result of the J9 changes. There is just insufficient information available to enable a proper assessment to be made of potential impacts, which is a major objection in itself to the process and procedures.</p> <p>However, and even on the limited information available, there would be significant landscape, heritage and access impact issues arising from the proposed use of the northern site. These are sufficient that this site should not be progressed any further as a potential soil deposition site. The site would be returned to agricultural use but leaving an irreversible impact on landscape and heritage which could and would not be mitigated by environmental measures.</p> <p>The enhancements along the line of the haul road, if indeed this is the intended means of access cannot be construed to be enhancements as they would appear to being promoted generally as part of the overall enhancement works and not specific to the deposition of soil at the northern site.</p> <p>There may be other sites (and not necessarily the other two identified sites) which would be much better suited with less adverse impacts and where there could be environmental benefits to be secured. It is understood that other objectors, including the South Downs National Park Authority have</p>		<p>Furthermore, the LVIA concludes that the construction phase will have a slight effect that is also not significant on Worthy Park House during construction. By summer year 15, there will be no change of effect on Worthy Park House. See Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) for further details.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to landscape and visual:</i></p> <p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on landscape and visual amenity and likely significant effects following implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>At the foremost the Scheme proposals look to avoid impacts and the Scheme retains as much existing vegetation as possible, with landscape mitigation measures including extensive areas of native woodland planting, linear planting, roadside tree planting, species rich grass verges, and areas of chalk grasslands creation (which all complement biodiversity and respond to the key characteristics of the landscape in which the Scheme is located). There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape.</p> <p>The Scheme also includes re-profiling of existing landform to create sympathetic features and reinforce existing characteristics and aid visual screening together with improving the network of public rights of way and new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes). These mitigation measures are presented in detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been included as part of the application to deliver any mitigation required. This describes the proposed outline management and monitoring of the landscape and ecological mitigation elements with detail of the objectives, and success criteria for the establishment to achieve its environmental function. This would be updated into a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) during detail design and would include further detail on the long-term management.</p> <p><i>Response in relation Landscape Character Areas:</i></p> <p>Landscape Character Areas considered in the study area for the Scheme are outlined in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Scheme and study area lies within three of the landscape character areas (LCAs) identified in the <i>South Downs Landscape Character Assessment (South Downs National Park Authority, 2020)</i>. These are LCA A5, LCA F5, LCA G5. The study area, as described in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), extends up to 3km from the Application Boundary, has been informed through consultation with stakeholders, visibility analysis and site survey. The published national, county and local character areas within the study area are</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>recommended other sites for consideration, where tangible and long lasting enhancements can be achieved.</p> <p>It is very much hoped that the next stages of the process will not only take account of these objections but also find a way to involve all those parties, including individual residents and landowners who will be directly impacted by these proposals.</p> <p>Summary of report on Landscape Impact:</p> <p>The element of the proposals that is covered by this report is the deposition of spoil, in particular to the potential northern site as identified on the extract below from the 'Indicative Land Uses' plan. The PEIR states at section 7.7.2 that 'The landscape of the areas of search for potential excess spoil management is defined by undulating arable farmland bounded by hedgerows and hedgerow trees. These areas of search for potential excess spoil management lie within the boundary of the SDNP' and at 7.7.6 that 'post construction the 'landscape east of the M3 within the SDNP would continue to exist as arable farmland with associated crop and land management changes.'</p> <p>PEIR states at 2.4.42 that 'The construction process would re-use excavated materials as fill (where possible) to reduce the number of construction vehicles travelling on the network.'</p> <p>There are three areas being considered for spoil deposition from the construction works. Our response concerns the northern area.</p> <p>The potential extent of the northern spoil deposition site is included within the Indicative Application Boundary on the proposals plans. However there is limited further information; on viewing the flythrough of the scheme it is clear that, whilst this covers the central and southern spoil deposition sites and a raising of levels by approximately 4m to accommodate spoil, it does not refer to the northern site.</p> <p>The northern boundary line of the site runs immediately adjacent to the bridleway that links the western edges of Easton village with the subway below the M3 linking through to the Itchen Way and the Itchen Valley to the west of the M3.</p> <p>The site lies across a dry valley on the side of the downland, with the northern extent set at between approx. 50m AOD at the north-west corner rising to approx. 60m AOD at the north-east corner. The southern boundary at set at approx. 70m AOD at the south-west corner, dropping down to approx 66m AOD before rising up again to 80m to the south-east boundary.</p> <p>Worthy Park House is listed Grade II* and its Coach House separately listed Grade II; its grounds are listed on the Hampshire Register of Gardens Parks and Landscapes of Historic Interest.</p> <p>The site is located to the east of Abbots Worthy between the A33 and the M3 road corridors. The buildings, which include Worthy Park House, are set to the</p>		<p>shown on Figure 7.3.1 (Landscape Character Areas) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p><i>Response in relation to viewpoints:</i></p> <p>View Locations are shown on Figure 7.4 (View Locations) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2). Baseline photographs (winter and summer) are presented on photo sheets at Figure 7.12 (Photosheets (Daytime Winter and Summer)) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>In Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) view location 23 is recorded to have a negligible adverse magnitude of effect during construction. This is due to the fact that the deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme and the Application Boundary has been revised to reflect this change.</p> <p><i>Points in relation to South Downs National Park and its special qualities:</i></p> <p>The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Scheme design avoids introduction of tall bridge structures or elevated embankments and instead the Scheme is positioned within cutting with structures and associated headwalls set within the landform at as low an elevation as possible. Views of the Scheme from the designated landscape have been considered with the aim where possible to minimise any adverse effects.</p> <p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>north of the B3047 beyond intervening agricultural land and school playing fields. Vehicular access is from a private drive that runs from the B3047 I and also serves adjacent residential properties to the east of the site. To the west and north of the site lie areas of deciduous woodland, with the northern woodland within the ownership of our client. Sports pitches and courts are situated to the south and southwest of the school buildings.</p> <p>The site lies on ground falling towards the southern boundary with the B3047 on the north side of the River Itchen valley floor. The building is set at approximately 64m AOD, with the road set at approx 51m AOD. On a direct line between the House and the northern deposition site the Itchen Valley falls to a low point of approx 42m AOD.</p> <p>With reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011), the northern spoil deposition site lies in the Landscape Character Area (LCA) A5 East Winchester Open Downs.</p> <p>Relevant key characteristics of this character zone include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the open character of the East Winchester Open Downs, there are expansive views over Winchester and the Itchen Valley. • Open rolling upland chalk landscape of rolling Downs reaching 176m at Cheesefoot Head. • Dominated by large 18th and 19th century fields of arable and pasture, bounded by sparse thorn hedgerows creating a very open landscape supporting a range of farmland birds. • Large open skies ensure that weather conditions are a dominant influence creating a dynamic, moody landscape, particularly on higher ground e.g. at Cheesefoot Head. • A strong sense of remoteness and tranquillity away from the major transport routes (M3, A31, A272) which cross the landscape. • Other characteristics to note are: • Transport routes carve up the area – the M3 runs along the western boundary and the A31/A272 cut across the character area in an east-west direction. The sense of tranquillity and remoteness of this character area is diminished in the vicinity of these major transport routes. Also associated with the major transport routes out of Winchester is ribbon development, as seen along the B3404. • Of particular sensitivity is the remote and tranquil character of the East Winchester Open Downland which is threatened by its proximity to Winchester and numerous transport routes. • Given the proximity to, and views over, Winchester, this area is also sensitive to changes in the urban area and on the urban fringe beyond the South Downs study area. Also of particular sensitivity are the prominent scarps and open undeveloped skylines. • Observable changes in the past have included the introduction and upgrading of major roads, including the M3, A272, and A31 which have 		<p>Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the special qualities of the South Downs National Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p><i>Response in relation to public consultation:</i></p> <p>As part of the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant presented a variety of plans and figures (including; the Indicative Application Boundary, a General Arrangements plan and environmental baseline figures). A 'red line' was included on all figures to illustrate the proposed site boundary of the DCO application.</p> <p>The 2021 PEIR and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the information presented in 2021 PEIR and supporting figures aligns with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements and the Infrastructure EIA Regulations 2017.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to construction:</i></p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) present assessments in relation to air quality, contamination and noise, respectively.</p> <p>As part of the DCO Application, Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) has been produced to show the haul roads and temporary construction compounds.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>severed the landscape and created some incongruous cuttings and bridges.</p> <p>Development considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent further fragmentation of the East Winchester Downs by roads and development. • Seek opportunities to reduce the visual impact of existing visually intrusive elements such as the infrastructure and traffic associated with the M3, A272, and A31, and prominent built elements on the edge of Winchester. • Maintain the open and undeveloped scarps and skylines – avoid siting of buildings, telecommunication masts, power lines and wind turbines on the sensitive skyline. • With reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011), Worthy Park House lies in the adjacent LCA E4 Itchen Valley. Characteristic points to note include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This character area includes the rural part of the valley of the River Itchen in two locations north east and south of Winchester. The boundaries are strongly defined by the topography and are drawn along the apparent skyline of the valley sides as seen from the valley floor. ○ Crossed by the M3 and A roads which interrupt the otherwise tranquil landscape. A sequence of settlements occur along the lower valley sides. ○ Although the valley has an overall tranquil quality this is disrupted in place by the audible ‘hum’ of traffic. <p>Key landscape sensitivities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The smooth form of the intact valley sides which reveal dramatic chalk landforms. • The setting of, and uninterrupted views to churches tower/spires, which are often seen against the rising downland backdrop of the valley sides are also important. • Designed landscapes which provide evidence of gentry houses and landscape parks of the wealthy population of the past. • The woodlands and • hedgerows generally limit visual sensitivity of these valley landscapes. However, the visibility of the chalk valleys from the adjacent downs increases their visual sensitivity. From within the valleys, the valley crests are seen against an open sky and are particularly visually sensitive. <p>Landscape management considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve the intact smooth form of the valley and its dramatic chalk landforms. 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conserve historic designed landscapes, and their settings, which provide evidence of gentry houses and landscape parks of the wealthy population of the past. <p>Development management considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor the effects of incremental change to buildings and land, and minimise such change by providing design guidance and encouraging applicants to enter into discussions at an early stage in the preparation of their proposals. Conserve the open skylines of the valley crests which are particular sensitive in views from the valleys. Consider views from the adjacent downs in relation to any change in the chalk river valleys. <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House are on the southern facade, with all the rooms, including the key internal spaces, looking out over the landscape to the south across the top of the lower level Itchen Valley, much of which is hidden in the intervening woodland on the valley floor, along with the M3 corridor. The eye is drawn beyond to the open arable downland above the valley floor where the rolling nature is clearly visible in the views from Worthy Park House, accentuated by the presence of the characteristic valley, central to views, which give rises to a distinctive contouring of the landform. The presence of the valley is also accentuated by the patterns of the arable farming landscape with straight lines seemingly folding and curving around the contours of the landform.</p> <p>The PEIR Heritage Chapter includes at section 6.8.13 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) states 'Worthy Park House is located to the north of the IAB. Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape including south across land within the IAB. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding landscape, which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped retaining part of the views described in the nineteenth century and contributes towards the historic interest of the listed building. The construction of the Proposed Scheme, particularly areas of search for potential excess spoil management, potential construction compound areas and areas proposed for environmental mitigation on the eastern side of the M3 are likely to be prominent in views from the listed building introducing construction traffic and further eroding the character of the surrounding landscape which are part of the wider setting of the listed building. As part of the wider setting that has already been extensively altered the construction of the Proposed Scheme is likely to result in an impact of minor magnitude and a temporary slight or moderate adverse effect. This assessment will be reviewed in ongoing EIA work and reported in the ES</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>following the decision on which areas of search for potential excess storage will be included and once further details about construction activities in this area are available.'</p> <p>Section 7.4.4.sets out the relevant landscape character areas, stating these cover all the relevant areas - but there is no mention of the LCA to the north that Worthy Park House lies within: SDLICA LCA E4 Itchen Valley.</p> <p>Topography is described as 'a key characteristic of the undulating hills in the nationally designated SDNP. It is also important to the wider distinctive landscape of the River Itchen valley' and is 'therefore considered to be of medium to high value (sensitivity) depending on location relative to the SDNP and its setting'. Effects on topography are stated to be as follows: 'Construction: Temporary adverse landscape effects are anticipated for the topography within the IAB as a result of construction activities and land reprofiling' and 'Operation: Adverse effects on topography are anticipated to remain during operation as result of the earthworks required to enable the Proposed Scheme. However, earthworks have been designed to sympathetically tie into existing levels and surrounding landform within the SDNP.'</p> <p>Vegetation is described as 'The surrounding landscape contains numerous copses, blocks of trees, hedgerown trees and hedgerows alongside lanes, tracks and field boundaries. The area of the IAB contains fields of both arable and pastoral farmland, typically bounded by hedgerows' and 'is a key characteristic of the nationally designated SDNP and is fundamental to the distinctive landscape of the River Itchen valley. It is an important part of the green infrastructure of the area and it is therefore considered to be of high value (sensitivity).' No effects on vegetation are noted as being relevant to the northern spoil deposition site.</p> <p>Whilst Registered Parks and Gardens are assessed in this section, Heritage Statutory designations are not assessed as part of the landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>Landscape Statutory Designations include 'The SDNP covers around 117ha of the area of the IAB, principally around its northern and eastern lengths (see Figure 7.1, Appendix 7.1). The SDNP incorporates the more intimate local landscape of the River Itchen to the north-west, the north-east of the area of the IAB and also covers the downland to the east. Consideration will be given to both the direct and indirect effects upon this designated landscape, including effects upon its special qualities and representative views. Special qualities of the SDNP are defined by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA); those special qualities which have the potential to be affected by the Proposed Scheme are as follows: Diverse, inspirational landscapes and breath-taking views. This is in part a function of the downland topography, and tranquil; and unspoilt places.' and is stated to be 'a nationally designated landscape resource of very high value (sensitivity).</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Points on perceptual aspects include ‘Noise, lighting, vehicle movement and the presence of infrastructure, all associated with the urban fringe of Winchester and the transport routes including the M3, A34/Winchester bypass and A272/Spitfire Link all erode tranquillity in the area’ and that ‘Built development and transport corridors have also affected the pattern and texture of the landscape over time’ and that tranquillity ‘is a perceptual quality of the landscape, and is influenced by things that people can both see and hear in the landscape around them’ and that ‘Tranquillity and a sense of remoteness are important aspects of the nationally designated SDNP and the River Itchen valley and are of high value (sensitivity).’</p> <p>The PEIR states that relevant landscape character assessments will also be examined and used to inform the landscape assessment.</p> <p>The assessment methodology states that the assessment of the magnitude of impacts on landscape receptors, the evaluation of the significance of landscape effects and the reporting of residual landscape effects for each landscape receptor are all to be reported in ES.</p> <p>Table 7-11 sets out the 24 viewpoints selected and the potential visual effects. There are two that are likely to include views of the northern spoil deposition site: 23 and 24, both from public rights of way. No photographs are available at this stage for review.</p> <p>There are no views from Worthy Park House included.</p> <p>The assessment methodology states that assessment of the magnitude of visual impacts, evaluation of the significance of visual effects and reporting of residual visual effects are all to be reported in ES.</p> <p>Effects during operation for Viewpoint 23 area noted ‘Adverse effects would reduce over time as the landscape mitigation takes effect. Longer term beneficial effects are expected as a result of the landscape mitigation.’</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Mitigation Design Plan makes no reference to mitigation proposals for the northern spoil deposition site .</p> <p>The section states that ‘Anticipated further assessment relevant to landscape and visual matters, which will be submitted with the ES to accompany the Development Consent Order (DCO) process is as follows: A full assessment of landscape and visual effects on receptors and reporting of significance will be undertaken as part of the ES’ alongside continuing design work.</p> <p>The public consultation is being held with a considerable lack of information for review; proposals are diagrammatic, indicative and in some aspects simply not available. This gives very little scope for a full understanding of the nature of the proposals by the public. This information provided is not a full landscape and visual impact assessment and is subject to design development. Therefore the full proposals cannot be properly reviewed and commented on.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The figures included in the information include a red line that covers the entirety of the proposals for the construction and operational stages. This gives rise to difficulties in reviewing specific areas of the proposals and their effects.</p> <p>The statement that the ‘earthworks have been designed to sympathetically tie into existing levels and surrounding landform within the SDNP’ is not backed up by any proposals available for review. The information on the spoil deposition sites is very limited. The amount of spoil being relocated to the northern spoil deposition site will determine the final ground levels, however this is not known at this stage and therefore the form of the proposals cannot be determined. It should be noted that the central and southern spoil deposition sites are far more level in nature than the northern site which dips considerably in the middle and the blanket spreading of a 4m layer of spoil may give rise to significant adverse effects in a valley situation. Indeed, without clarity on the proposals for the northern spoil deposition site, if there is considerable spoil to be deposited on the northern site then this may in effect be used to ‘fill’ the valley, giving rise to significant adverse effects on one of the main key characteristics of the landscape identified in the SDILCA.</p> <p>The PEIR notes that, as mitigation, the adverse effects on Viewpoint 23 will reduce over time, however the raising of levels and changes to topography are permanent and will remain constant over the long term. With the key landscape characteristics for the spoil deposition site noted as the ‘open rolling chalk’ downland with ‘sparse hedgerows, the nature of the landscape character gives little opportunity for mitigation or enhancement.</p> <p>Any change in levels will affect the nature of the view from Worthy Park House. Regarding Worthy Park House, the PEIR Heritage section states that ‘Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape including south across land within the IAB. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding landscape, which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped retaining part of the views described in the nineteenth century and contributes towards the historic interest of the listed building.’</p> <p>It is exactly these views that have been identified as contributing to the historic interest of the House that will be affected by potentially significant adverse effects to the landscape character of the SDNP, identified by the PEIR as very highly sensitive.</p> <p>On the basis of the points raised above, this report concludes that there is the potential for significant harm on landscape character of and visual amenity within the SDNP, as well as on the setting of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>Report on Heritage Impact:</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>LJE Planning Ltd was instructed to consider the impact of the Scheme on the significance of the designated heritage asset, Worthy Park House (Grade II*) with particular regard to the impact on its setting. The assessment is undertaken with particular regard to the inclusion of proposals for identified sites for the deposition of excess spoil, one of which would be on the south side of the Itchen Valley, directly 'opposite' Worthy Park House and its grounds.</p> <p>There is regrettably very limited information available about the precise details of the proposed scheme for this potential deposition site. All that can be gleaned from the available consultation material is that three potential sites have been identified and that the land levels may be increased by 4m at two of them, with no detail of intent for the third northern site. However, if the 4m increase represents the envisaged level of excess soil requiring deposition, it would seem plausible that a similar amount of deposition may be envisaged for the northern site, potentially leading to an infilling of the natural valley.</p> <p>In the absence of any more precise details and analysis of the proposals, this assessment has necessarily had to be made on the basis of this extremely limited information; namely the location of the site as identified by the overall extent of the application site for the proposed works including the deposition sites, the suggestion in the consultation material that land levels may be raised or changed by 4m and that the land would revert to agricultural use in the longer term.</p> <p>Client's land occupies a 5.68 hectare site on the northern side of the B3047 approximately 1km to the east of the junction with the A33 and within the countryside and South Downs National Park. The main building is Worthy Park House, a Grade II* listed, former residential house within a parkland setting, designed by Sir Robert Smirke and dating from the 1820s. The School has recently been successfully extended to the side facing the Coach House, but this extension is not generally visible from the southern side of the building.</p> <p>There are a small number of other buildings within the site, including the Coach House, which is separately listed Grade II to the immediate north-east of the house, and thought also to be by Smirke, as well as the much more recently built sports hall to the west. There is a hard surfaced play area / netball court to the immediate west of the main house and the main grassed playing fields, hard surfaced tennis courts/netball courts and play areas lie to the south.</p> <p>The grounds are also included on the Hampshire County Council's register of Historic Parks and Gardens (No 1550).</p> <p>There is a Scheduled Monument (Saxon Cemetery) in the woodland area to the west of the Site.</p> <p>In the 18th century, Worthy Park belonged to William Evelyn who constructed a mansion in 1722. The Worthy Park estate passed to Kingston's second wife</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Isabella, whose son by a previous marriage, Sir Chaloner Ogle, inherited in 1761.</p> <p>Sir Charles Ogle, grandson of Sir Chaloner Ogle constructed the present Worthy Park House in 1820 to a neo-classical design by Sir Robert Smirke. The layout of the property plot was redeveloped at this time. The west wing of the existing 1722 mansion was demolished and the new house built over its foundations (Butchart 1989). The existing rectangular plan building was retained and incorporated into 1820 house as the east wing and used as a service range. The stable block and stable yard wall were constructed at this time, also believed to be by Smirke.</p> <p>Ogle sold the Worthy Park Estate to Samuel Wall in 1825; it remained with his descendants (the Rivers, Fryer and Butchart families) until the late 1950s. During WWII it was used as the southern command headquarters for the Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers and accommodation for the Auxiliary Territorial Service.</p> <p>Following WWII, Worthy Park House was still owned by the Butchart family, although they did not live there. In the late 1950s it was sold to Currys Ltd and became their regional office and staff training centre. Currys left the property in 1985 and the house stood vacant for four years until T. S. Frobisher Ltd. bought it to use as a business centre. Prince's Mead School took over the Site in 1999 and continue to occupy the site.</p> <p>There is a statutory duty to have regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any special architectural or historic features that they possess.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) defines the setting of a heritage asset as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral. <p>Worthy Park House is listed Grade II* and its significance relates to both features of special architectural interest as well as historic interest relating to the design by Sir Robert Smirke. In addition, and of particular relevance to this issue under consideration, the setting adds to the overall significance of the listed building.</p> <p>Country houses defined their owners' relative social standing and the setting of a country house, in the landscape, was of considerable consequence. The site for an nineteenth century house was most particularly chosen for its potential views across parkland and where there might be some view of water or a water feature created.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>With respect to Worthy Park House, commentary in “Selected Illustrations of Hampshire” published in 1834 describes the importance of the southerly view from the house. ‘Below the south front of the mansion winds the river Itchen, on the opposite banks of which rise beautiful eminences, partly covered with wood, beyond, are the more romantic downs.’ The historical relationship between the house and the landscape should therefore not be underestimated.</p> <p>Worthy Park Hose, in its elevated position on the north side of the Itchen Valley gives it a commanding location over the valley. This relationship has not largely changed in character and appearance since the house was first built despite the changes to the use of the building and intervening development. The setting of Worthy Park House and its relationship to the landscape remains an essential part of the significance of the designated heritage asset.</p> <p>The setting of Worthy Park House, both in terms of views out from the house and its south facing grounds as well as views of the house from the surrounding area largely comprise the rolling downlands of the River Itchen valley.</p> <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House and the landscape setting for the Grade II* listed building are described more fully at paragraph 6.2 of the report by the terra firma Consultancy on the landscape and visual effects of the M3 J9 proposals:</p> <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House are on the southern facade, with all the rooms, including the key internal spaces, looking out over the landscape to the south across the top of the lower level Itchen Valley, much of which is hidden in the intervening woodland on the valley floor, along with the M3 corridor. The eye is drawn beyond to the open arable downland above the valley floor where the rolling nature is clearly visible in the views from Worthy Park House, accentuated by the presence of the characteristic valley, central to views, which give rises to a distinctive contouring of the landform. The presence of the valley is also accentuated by the patterns of the arable farming landscape with straight lines seemingly folding and curving around the contours of the landform.</p> <p>Despite the paucity of available information on the details of what is proposed for the possible northern deposition site, it is clear that the use of this site for the deposition of excess spoil would result in changes to this existing landscape, including potentially through the artificial infilling of a natural valley. This would seriously detract from the setting which has been present since the house was built in the early nineteenth century. The rolling downlands are an integral part of the landscape character of this local area and the proposed infilling of the valley and raising of the land would be an artificial intrusion in that natural landscape.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The proposed northern site for deposition of soils would be directly visible from the main building as well as from the grounds to the south of the building and the interrelationship of the building with its natural setting would therefore be harmed.</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (May 2021) (PEIR) produced by Highways England recognises at Table 6-5 that Worthy Park House, as a Grade II* listed building has 'high' sensitivity in relation to the proposals, and this is agreed.</p> <p>However, the Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline report undertaken by Highways England suggests at paragraph 5.2.17 and repeated in the PEIR at paragraph 6.8.13 that the existing setting has already been compromised by the construction of the M3 and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. It is contended that the effects of these later developments are overstated. The dominance of the house within the Itchen Valley and the relationship between the house and its setting is very largely unaltered since the time it was built and commented upon by the first owner, Sir Charles Ogle.</p> <p>Although it has been necessary to make certain assumptions about the extent of changes arising were the northern deposition site to be progressed, the conclusion is reached that there would be material impact to and therefore potentially significant harm to the setting of Worthy Park House. Such harm therefore would require to be offset by public benefits, which it is argued should be considered in the context of public benefits arising from the proposed northern deposition site. However, given that the proposal would appear to result in an artificial raising of the land and / or filling in of a natural valley, and its return to agricultural use, it is difficult to envisage any potential opportunities for landscape and / or environmental enhancements.</p> <p>This is of even more concern, given that it is noted that other parties submitting representations to this consultation exercise have raised the possibility of other areas of land for the deposition of excess soil, where there would be significant opportunities for landscape and environmental improvements.</p> <p>This report seeks to assess the potential impact of the works associated with the proposed northern site for the deposition of excess soils arising from the proposed works to J9 of the M3 on the setting and significance of Worthy Park House, a Grade II* listed building. Despite the serious shortcomings in the information available upon which the assessment necessarily has to be made, this report concludes that, on the understanding of the works envisaged, there would be significant harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* designated heritage asset of Worthy Park House.</p>		

K.2.S Traffic and transport

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	<p>I understand that you like to reduce congestion with all of it's negative effects. However, extending this junction will increase the traffic which will cause further congestion elsewhere. Increased traffic will increase noise and air pollution and increase green house gas emissions. Furthermore, it will lead to massive disruptions of traffic during the building phase that will effect Winchester and Badger Farm Road. Badger Farm Road is already very busy and cycling is very dangerous.. For this expense it would be much better to do following alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase capacity on railways and electrify towards Oxford and consider reopening the Watercress line between Arlesford and Winchester 2. Help people to use buses instead of their cars by building a bus network similar to CPRE's proposal, every village should have half hourly bus service to Winchester and or train stations 3. Build cycle ways along all high traffic roads, the M3 and especially this junction is much used for short distance travel too 	N	<p>An assessment of traffic impacts is reported in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). The report indicates a reduction in congestion and journey times through M3 Junction 9 with the Scheme in place. Furthermore, traffic flows on a number of local roads within Winchester City are predicted to decrease with the Scheme in place.</p> <p>The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13). The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p>
Local community	<p>It is unclear what the benefits of this system will be to traffic flow. However, it is clear this change will result in habitat loss and pressure to local chalk down land and the chalk streams/ rivers locally. What mitigation will be in place to restore these green spaces at the end of the project? As a local resident I am also concerned about the impact of increased road noise which does not appear to be considered. Again, what mitigation is in place?</p>	N	
Local community	<p>First and foremost consider how to reduce traffic, not to enable traffic flow. Forty years of studies have shown that road 'improvements' generate more and more traffic, and the climate and ecological emergency demands that we all drive less. I drive 5000 miles a year and am working on reducing that, how about you????</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p>
Local community	<p>Congestion does occur at the junction, but purely at peak times. You should optimise the existing infrastructure by encouraging certain traffic at off-peak times. Most congestion occurs on the southbound carriageway of the A34 heading to the M3. There is also a lack of enforcement of driving standards which cause accidents - people going through red lights and ignoring the junction boxes.</p> <p>Once traffic has accessed the M3 southbound, further congestion also occurs (probably more frequently) at junctions 10-11 and 12-13 - your modelling will have provided evidence of this.</p> <p>Your proposals are unlikely to reduce congestion at peak times, but simply</p>	N	<p>Assessment of Scheme traffic impacts are reported in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13). This indicates a reduction in congestion and journey times through M3 Junction 9 with the Scheme in place. Traffic flows on a number of local roads within Winchester City are predicted to decrease with the Scheme in place.</p> <p>The Scheme is also predicted to reduce collisions and have safety benefits. This is also further detailed in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>to move it to another part of the network during busy times. Presumably there is no intention to further destroy the area south of Winchester for motorway widening - which means you are always going to be constrained by merging traffic from a two-lane motorway and a two-lane A road into the capacity of a two-lane stretch of motorway south of junction 9.</p> <p>Your proposals does not really address the root cause - you will still be merging the 4 lanes from the A34 and M3 into the 3 and then 2 of the southbound M3.</p> <p>From my local knowledge congestion occurs: 1. At peak times when people are traveling to work 2. Because of holiday traffic in the summer heading to Bournemouth and the New Forest</p> <p>For (1) surely we should be encouraging modal shift - local commuter car journeys should not be facilitated at public expense when we are attempting to reduce pollution and wok to Net Zero. We should focus on encouraging walking and cycling by providing safe infrastructure at a fraction of the cost and encouraging public transport use.. For (2) holiday traffic on busy weekend is essentially stop-start all the way down to the coast on busy weekend - again you are simply moving the problem further south.</p> <p>I cannot see how this will reduce noise - is it not an established fact that road 'improvements' such as this actually result in increases in journeys?</p> <p>Connections from the M3 to the A33 appear to miss the main incident hotspot - local residents have been campaigning for years for junction improvements at the Cart and Horses turn in Kings Worthy where there have been a number of fatalities - this doesn't appear to be in scope.</p> <p>The changes you propose will take another large amount of our local environment and cover it in concrete. It will become an even less usable area for pedestrians and cyclists. The fact that you are putting pedestrians and cyclists in what appears to be a length subway shows how little priority is given to active travel - I never use subways even in daylight in town centres as they are intimidating places.</p> <p>I'm not sure why I have participated in this consultation - no doubt the decisions have been made and local residents are unlikely to have their voices considered against the well-funded and extremely vocal freight and motoring lobbies which are skewing the debate.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	I feel better traffic management would achieve more and should be looked at before digging up the greenbelt and causing more pollution and disruption to the local ecology.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	The current roundabout from the A31 feeder road already gets congested due it being the only exit that isn't traffic light controlled; I would expect during the works this may increase, would it be possible to consider traffic management on that exit?	N	Further details on the proposed temporary traffic management measures for implementation during the construction of the Scheme are set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) and the traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) . The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.
Local community	It will be essential during the works to not restrict traffic flows at all if possible	N	
Local community	The inevitable "rat run" that Kings worthy will experience, particularly along Springvale Road and Loveden Lane. These routes are not suitable for heavy lorries!	N	The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.
Local community	Sustainable practices are important and suggest renewable energies should power the project. Local community concerned about increased traffic through Winchester as people would exit M3 northbound at junction 11 or junction 10 to avoid roadworks and wanting to understand what measures will be in place. Concerned about the location of construction compounds and deposition areas being on national park land and suggested that any scheme using them as 'dumping grounds during construction' should be rejected.	N	Construction Traffic Management impacts were assessed and are detailed in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) .
Local community	Continuity of access for all traffic, pedestrian and cycle routes through the junction	N	The Scheme is retaining existing traffic connections through the reconfigured junction. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane.
Local community	Reduce traffic flows post COVID 19 Need to environment sustainability and reduction in car use The disruption to the lives of local residents for whom the junction is the main link to work and leisure travel	N	Currently potential pandemic impacts on travel demand and behaviour have not been considered. Low and High traffic growth tests have been undertaken as part of the economic assessment in line with Department for Transport guidance and are reported in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) .

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Just how to manage traffic flow during the works process - this could have a significant impact on traffic during the build period.	N	The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. Further details on the proposed temporary traffic management measures for implementation during the construction of the Scheme are set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) and details of the traffic impacts of the construction traffic management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) .
Local community	Minimising disruption to traffic during construction as this is such a busy area and making it clear where traffic should go to get to their destination.	N	
Local community	The need for total closures should be carefully considered, as the diversion routes available are very indirect.	N	
Local community	Impact of construction on traffic. Need effective traffic management throughout, and good signage re length of delays	N	
Local community	Environment, Climate change Looking at reducing traffic, not increasing it	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy including environmental aspects.
Local community	Wildlife and the importance of reducing traffic rather than allowing it to increase	N	
Local community	I'd consider not doing any construction. There will be huge disruption lasting years - what consideration have you given to the impact on the city centre which is already highly congested and will probably see additional local traffic diverting from the junction?	N	The Applicant has undertaken an environmental impact assessment which assesses potential construction impacts of the Scheme and is presented in the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) . The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) . The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.
Local community	Minimizing disruption to local traffic	N	The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) . The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.
Local community	Focus on minimising disruption to traffic on the M3 and A34.	N	
Local community	How to reduce the overall volume of traffic, both long-distance travel and local travel. Work with other Government departments to come up with a plan for traffic in and out of Southampton Docks and cruise passenger traffic.	N	The Applicant notes the points made in relation to transport. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>Provision of alternative routes for traffic during potential road closures during construction, particularly the A34 southbound and the A33.</p> <p>Currently closures of the A34 southbound at junction 9 create unacceptable congestion in Winchester on the Andover Road into the city centre, through Harestock via Harestock Road and through Littleton from the Three Maids Hill exit.</p> <p>Closure of the A33 southbound will create traffic congestion on London Road, Worthy Road, Worthy Lane route into the city.</p> <p>Alternative routes need to be considered.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) as part of its DCO application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) provides details of how the construction works will be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measure, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) will be refined at various stages of the Scheme development. The final version will be developed in consultation with key stakeholders such as Hampshire County Council and Hampshire Police.</p> <p>The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13). The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p>
Local community	<p>Better disposal of spoil than indicated at present and avoiding use of narrow lanes by construction traffic in the South Downs National Park.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p>
Local community	<p>Impact on local residents during construction, noise, light, disruption to local roads, paths, properties and businesses.</p> <p>I am concerned about the amount of construction traffic that may use the lower end of Long Walk to access Northern Soil Dump. Long Walk is narrow and steep and unsuitable for heavy traffic. Using this route will also have an impact on Footpaths 20 and 21 and Restricted Byway 19. Preferred locations for spoil dump would be Central and Southern.</p> <p>Would there be scope for further infill in the field adjacent to the new path from Easton Lane to Long Walk, or an increase in the size of the bund?</p>	Y	<p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p> <p>Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and PRowS are assessed in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). Specifically, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the effects of the Scheme in relation to noise. The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited as works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
Local community	You have not adequately considered sustainable travel modes	N	The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane.
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	Unsure and unclear how traffic thru area will be managed for the three years of construction	N	Consideration of the traffic management can be found in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) .
Local community	As before you have not adequately considered sustainable travel modes	N	The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane.
F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.			
Local community	Just minimize the distance it has to be transported!	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
Local community	Keeping the surplus material local can only be best approach.	Y	
Local community	Please do not use the location identified for the Northern spoil dump. I am concerned about the amount of construction traffic that may use the lower end of Long Walk to access Northern Spoil Dump. Long Walk is narrow and steep and unsuitable for heavy traffic. Using this route will also have an impact on Footpaths 20 and 21, and Restricted Byway 19. Preferred locations for spoil dump would be Central or Southern. Would there be scope for further infill in the field adjacent to the new path from Easton Lane to Long Walk, or an increase in the size of the bund?	Y	
F.4: Please let us know the reasons for your response to question F3 and any other views about the locations we've identified			
Local community	There are not any other suitable areas within economic distance, that will not mean lorry loads of soil being carted away via already overstretched routes!	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	minimize distance it's transported, reduce impact of slow, noisy, smelly, carbon emitting transport	Y	feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
Local community	As a frequent visitor to Magdalen Hill Down I am especially concerned about the potential adverse impact of dumping up to four metres of excess soil on the southern area. I also have major concerns about the adverse environmental impacts of the lorry movements that would be involved in moving the excess soil.	Y	
Local community	This project is unnecessary and will not solve medium to long term congestion in the area	Y	
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	Compound 1 is the best size and location. Compound 2 looks like it would create traffic problems on the roundabout with vehicles entering/exiting and the impact on site lines. Similarly with number 3, access to or from the compound could present safety issues. Compound 4 looks ok but is a bit far away.	N	Details of the construction traffic management can be found in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) . The northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 in the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals and will therefore not be required.
Local community	No 4 seems too far from the roundabout and will increase traffic through the junction. 2 looks OK but must make sure access for cyclists and walkers is not impeded	Y	
Local community	Having them closer to the works areas would save lorry movements or consider a conveyor. These locations do not directly affect many people so are probably a good choice as the material needs to go somewhere.	N	
General commentary			
Local community	Mainly, we should be looking again at traffic volumes and how we reduce them. I agree that we need a scheme for the A34/M3 interface, but the rest of it feels over engineered, as a result the programme is too long and likely too expensive. The construction programme should start in 2022 and be completed in 2 years maximum in order to reduce disruption to the local economy and in order to realise the benefits more quickly.	N	The preliminary design builds upon concept designs previously undertaken with a view to reduce congestion at Junction 9 and improve journey times. The proposed layout shown has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. Whilst the focus is Junction 9, this serves several connecting routes (providing connectivity for the A33, A34, A272 and Easton Lane into Winchester), all of which require careful consideration and inclusion into the junction layout. The DCO application was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in November 2022. If the application is accepted for examination, the Applicant expects a decision to be made by the Secretary of State in Q2 2024. Following development consent, the

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>Applicant would be required to discharge a number of requirements associated with the Development Consent Order (Document Reference 3.1) and undertake detailed design (including all necessary technical approvals) prior to construction. The construction phase is estimated to commence in early 2024.</p> <p>The current estimated construction programme has been developed based upon the current presented scheme, which includes several structures. The construction programme (including expected temporary traffic management during the works), will be carefully planned and developed to minimise delay to the travelling public during the works.</p>
Local community	Thank you for taking into consideration the responses from the initial consultation, this scheme looks a lot better for local traffic particularly.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	Please keep traffic flowing on major holiday migration days - traffic currently diverts through Winchester town centre when there are delays at Junction 9	N	Details of the construction traffic management can be found in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) . The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) . The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.
Local community	Needs a post pandemic assessment on "new" traffic volume to understand viability. Needs to focus on enabling cycling and walking as an alternative to car use (rather than starting with the aim of increasing the speed of traffic)	N	Currently potential pandemic impacts on travel demand and behaviour have not been considered. This can be considered at later stages of the scheme development. Low and High traffic growth tests have been undertaken as part of the economic assessment in line with Department for Transport guidance and are reported in Section 5 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) .
Local community	If the Cart and Horses A33/B3047 junction is left unaltered by this Scheme, an opportunity to cure a running sore and accident blackspot will sadly have been missed again.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.
Local community	<p>My opinion is that this improvement to both J9 roundabout (Winnal) and the intersection of A34/M3 is well overdue.</p> <p>My concern is by making the traffic more free flowing, it just moves the problem elsewhere:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic backing up M3 to London due to volume coming down A34 and The M3 between Hockley and Eastleigh being at a standstill. 	N	The Applicant welcomes the support for the Scheme. Assessment of Scheme traffic impacts are reported in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) . This indicates a reduction in congestion and journey times through M3 Junction 9. Traffic flows on a number of local roads within Winchester City are predicted to decrease.
Local community	Road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government 'Dasgupta Review'	N	The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>says, 'Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).' It would make no sense for the M3 to be severed at Junction 9, cutting off communities and transport links. In the same way, we can no longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to pressures.</p> <p>Highways England must now deal with the legacy of damage from previous schemes and ensure that there is real and tangible net gain for nature. Nothing short of major investment in nature's recovery is now acceptable.</p> <p>In addition, significant and meaningful investment in sustainable public transport throughout the area is absolutely VITAL in ensuring the protection of our essential rural environment and its natural resources. We cannot sustain this endless pursuit of car ownership. Sustainable public transport, better electric bus services, serving more communities, should be an essential public SERVICE, not a commercial venture. Important tourist destinations like Marwell Zoo for example are barely accessible by public transport, meaning its 500k visitors per year have no other option but to travel by car. Regular public transport links through Winchester, Colden Common , Fair Oak & Eastleigh would make a huge difference to this.</p>		<p>the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement for National Networks is the primary planning document against which the Scheme is assessed by the Secretary of State in deciding whether to grant a Development Consent Order. An assessment of the Scheme against the requirements of the National Policy Statement for National Networks is set out in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2). The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) also includes an assessment of the Scheme against other relevant national and local planning policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a biodiversity assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p>
Local community	<p>Needs to be more environmentally sensitive. Talk to the Hampshire iow national trust people who help manage some of the local areas which will be impacted.</p> <p>But with the pandemic, how many people commute less? Work from home more is there really a need? When I was commuting I loved traffic jams by j10/j11 - an opportunity at the right time of year to admire the orchids (only were perhaps 1 a month or so), but a positive!</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has engaged with the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust throughout the pre-application process.</p> <p>Currently potential pandemic impacts on travel demand and behaviour have not been considered. This can be considered at later stages of the scheme development. Low and High traffic growth tests have been undertaken as part of the economic assessment in line with Department for Transport guidance and are reported in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10).</p>
Local community	<p>By improving vehicle journey times and reliability, there could be an increase in vehicle trips generated, with potential for some modal shift between rail and car on the Oxford and Southampton Cross Country route. This could be mitigated</p>	N	<p>The Applicant as noted this comment.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	with demand management measures. HE should continue to work closely with the Hampshire and Southampton 'MyJourney' travel teams to promote sustainable travel along the corridor.		
Local community	<p>A scheme of this nature requires a huge amount of effort and planning. I understand that the aim is to reduce congestion at the Winnall roundabout and A34 but... whenever we attempt to solve one problem it shifts the problem somewhere else and is inevitably at the expense of someone, nature, the environment. The M3 at Winchester solved the congestion at the Hockley traffic lights, this led to noise, pollution, impact on our natural environment and inevitably congestion somewhere else - at the Winnall roundabout and A34. Your scheme will solve the Congestion on the A34 but - at the expense of increased noise, traffic, pollution, lowering of quality of life for those who live near the scheme, and no doubt lead to congestion elsewhere (M3/M27 junction etc)</p> <p>It would be good to interrupt this cycle and not accept increasing volume of traffic, lorries and cars as the solution. It really is time we acted on climate , environment and health concerns. It's time to be creative and come up with alternative solutions to more lanes, more cars, more lorries! What about freight trains, lorry lanes, local suppliers etc? Rant over!</p>	N	The Scheme increases attractiveness of the M3 Junction 9 attracting traffic that would otherwise be diverting onto other routes in the local network. The traffic on a number of local roads within Winchester City is predicted to decrease. Further details on the traffic impacts can be found in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) .
Local community	Please please please build this asap - the traffic is already here and the A34 is a key route from the midlands and north to Southampton and Portsmouth docks - it is essential to have this. The junction is already overloaded and inefficient thus affecting Winchester very badly especially Easton Lane, but also the Spitfire link and the unofficial bypass route from the A34/Three Maids Hill interchange via Andover Road to Harestock, Weeke, Stockbridge Road, Chilbolton Avenue, and Romsey Road. These routes are badly affected in terms of congestion, safety and air quality. The traffic is already here, queuing up for miles and overflowing into the local road network at peak times on work days and at weekends.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	<p>Please reassess the need for the scheme against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduced traffic post Covid - increased pollution from increased traffic - increased local noise from faster traffic - use of public funds which may be better suited to increasing green opportunities 	N	<p>Currently potential pandemic impacts on travel demand and behaviour have not been considered. This can be considered at later stages of the Scheme development. Low and High traffic growth tests have been undertaken as part of the economic assessment in line with Department for Transport guidance and are reported in Section 5 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10).</p> <p>Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme. The economic impacts have been monetised and a Benefit Cost Ratio has been produced which is detailed in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) and the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>Yes. Looking at the way the A33 route is designed, this will substantially ease access to the northbound M3 from north Winchester and Kings Worthy. This makes redevelopment of the junction of the A33 and the B3047 at Kings Worthy - the Cart & Horse junction an absolute necessity. Traffic is going to want to turn right to access the M3 north at far greater numbers than currently and that junction cannot cope with that kind of traffic.</p> <p>I am also curious as to plans for the M3 between Winchester & Basingstoke - with Smart Motorway work planned for J9 south to Southampton, this stretch is likely to become something of a bottleneck in itself. Also, how will J9 work be planned in conjunction with the extra Smart Motorway work?</p>	N	<p>The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.</p> <p>Following a ministerial statement on 12 January 2022, the roll out of all lane running (ALR) schemes not yet constructed was paused. Therefore, the Scheme has been assessed independently of potential Smart Motorway schemes. Further details of the traffic assessment can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13).</p>
Local community	<p>Whilst I understand you will not wish to consider ideas and proposals on diversions until the scheme has been approved I remain concerned that the issue needs raising in principle so that you are aware of the considerable damaging effects that could occur to Winchester. On the earlier scheme it was proposed Badger Farm Road (A3090) be used to divert traffic to/from J11 and A34 at Three Maids Hill. In such event the residents in Olivers Battery area (off Badger Farm Road) and other areas would inevitably find it virtually impossible to access/exit from it due to traffic levels; it is already difficult with the exit being on to a 40mph road. It is very important we do not find diversions that cost the least but have the worst impact upon us as residents. Are you able to give us any assurances as to your overall policy and intentions in this regard?</p>	N	<p>An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been submitted as part of the DCO application and secured by Requirement 11 @in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1). The Outline Traffic Management Plan will be finalised pursuant to Requirement 11 for agreement prior to commencement of construction. The Traffic Management Plan will set out the proposed temporary traffic management measures during the construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p>
Local community	<p>The Winchester Movement strategy work suggests that improvements to the capacity of and flow through this junction will have a positive impact on the city's traffic issues, air pollution, carbon footprint etc. I remain unconvinced, because in many cases, the issues are caused by accidents on the M3 or A34 outside the proposed plan area. I do not see any data in the consultation report to show expected movements, % of non polluting vehicles by 2035, etc in the papers. This leads to build up of traffic which is avoided by going through Winchester instead. Unless these plans reduce accidents on the feeder trunk roads (the M3 and A34,) the traffic build ups will still occur, all too often as traffic levels are returning to pre pandemic levels.</p> <p>These are my specific points for your consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The layout is better for local people using the A33 who were worried about crossing heavy traffic, but it now means that all local users will have to use the new junction every time (which wasn't the case in the previous design). This may lead to congestion so it has not served our needs as well as we would hope. The north exit from the A33 on to the M3 north 	N	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments and sets out its response to the matters relating to traffic and transport below. Other matters raised in this response are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p> <p>Assessment of Scheme traffic impacts are reported in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). This indicates a reduction in congestion and journey times through M3 Junction 9 and predicts that queuing on the Spitfire Link will reduce. Traffic flows on a number of local roads within Winchester City are also predicted to decrease. The traffic impacts also indicates that the Scheme will improve safety and there is predicted to be a reduction in accidents with the Scheme in place.</p> <p>The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>brings faster traffic movements closer to the communities that I represent- hence potentially noisier, which is unacceptable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The positioning of the soil deposits has been done to suit HE/landowners. It is a missed opportunity to mitigate the noise of the road in operation all along the route from south to north. (see also point 12) Princes Mead has concerns about the setting of the listed building too. There is no assessment of flood risk when these soil heaps are in place. • The omission of the cycle route to Kings Worthy when it was so clearly described in the first proposal is a failure in this design. It is a need that is clearly described in the WCC/HCC Infrastructure Funding Statement (previously the R123 list) which I have already sent to the design/project team. I believe it is a duty to consider the needs of Non Motorised Users to be taken into account in any NSIP scheme, so this omission is disappointing. • The lack of traffic lights may be ok initially, but inevitably, there will be a need to control traffic flows in years ahead. Please include electricity schemes to enable traffic lights to be fitted later. • Failure to show signage and gantries in the scheme means that we cannot tell what views these will present to local people, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area. Already, the traffic lights of the junction can be seen from miles away in my division, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area, and cross motorway gantries can be viewed from Martyr Worthy in the national park. • If this country is to embrace walking and cycling for local commuting use, then the 3m wide cycle routes are inadequate to pass and should be wider. This includes actually on the roundabout where at one point, the walk/cycle way is alongside the main road. The Winnall area will continue to provide employment opportunities as well as retail etc. Other larger lorries go into the city from this junction. The paths created should not be shared for walkers and cyclists on planned bridleway that connect and to the NCN 23 where cyclists can be riding faster than is safe for walkers sharing the same surface (all should be at least to LTN1/20). • Impact on Cart and Horses junction traffic going onto the A33 from the B3047 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The design has no traffic breaks in traffic moving north on the A33 from Junction 9. Currently, there are traffic breaks (traffic lights create this) which create gaps in traffic to allow people to exit from the Cart and Horses junction, allowing it to function. This is particularly important at peak times when traffic entering and leaving Winchester is heavy on both routes. The new arrangement may create congestion, reduce safety and even more confusion at this junction. (It is also an opportunity to improve the gateway into the National Park at this point.) ○ The road layout of the A33 is changing, with one lane in each direction, and a bike lane coming into/through the junction. 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Currently there are sections of two lanes for filtering etc. These changes will impact on the junction itself which will need redesign to ensure it is safe, congestion doesn't occur and ideally actually improves for traffic going south (Morning Basingstoke traffic into Winchester), and Worthys /Winchester traffic going north and south at all times of day, but particularly at peak times, and traffic from the B3047 east going north.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project statement states that one aim is to reduce Spitfire Link congestion, which severely impacts drivers there. There is no evidence in the project plan that the team have provided that shows how the new design will reduce congestion. At present, large traffic accelerates from a stop slower than smaller vehicles which results in no gaps for Spitfire Link traffic. There is no evidence provided that this will improve, because although much of the heavy traffic will be on the through road, not all of it will take that route; daytime traffic in particular, includes a considerable amount of large and small vehicles into Winnall. • The levels on the project plans are difficult to follow, and I asked HCC to seek more traffic data, and full levels plan to see the implications for views, noise, pollutants fall out. • The drive through video is poor, and difficult to follow : I requested an improved version but was told this was impossible. • There is a considerable amount of biodiversity work to be considered: which includes interconnectivity between areas being 'managed' for biodiversity. I am leaving this to the experts at WCC, HCC and to SDNPA, but I do have concerns about the long term management of the water areas, set within the road system. • The DEFRA 2016 noise map showed that improvement to noise mitigation were desirable at points through Winchester and for the A34 at the Headbourne Worthy site. A noise reference along Willis Waye is included in your scheme. Anything worse, even by a slight margin would be unacceptable in planning terms 'for the enjoyment of the property' and other properties affected in this way. Since Willis Waye was built, a considerable number of properties have been built in this area, alongside the A34 margins and I am seeking noise defence for these residents. Original tree planting is unsatisfactory: acoustic fencing is necessary here to mitigate noise. • I must also express my regret that an 'open air' event wasn't organised for this consultation. With many other events taking place, this was a missed opportunity to engage the public face to face. 		
Local community	<p>I know you know but to make my point I want to say that Winchester is a major junction of traffic from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Portsmouth – In normal times holiday traffic (Ferries) and local traffic 2. Southampton – major container port, cruises hips and local traffic 	N	The traffic impacts of the Scheme have been assessed in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) . This indicates a reduction in

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>3. Winchester – local traffic going to London, Basingstoke, Reading, ...</p> <p>4. Coastal holiday and local traffic from Pool, Bournemouth and towns on the coast to the west of Southampton</p> <p>5. Traffic feeding in from the A31 from the whole area to the east of Winchester e.g. Alton, Guildford and smaller country villages – increasing all the time</p> <p>6. Main North-South route for all traffic going north from this list – we have just been to Scotland and the A34 was carrying heavy traffic both North and South."</p> <p>Of course, it makes sense to join the A34 directly to the M3 and on then to the M27. However, the A34 has been overloaded for many years and it is getting worse. The improvements to Junction 9 are long overdue but so is turning the A34 into a motorway up to the M40 (At least). The improvements to junction 9 will make the A34 even worse. So, what is urgently needed is the junction improvement and an M34!</p> <p>For residents in Chilcomb which is just along the A31 from Spitfire Way, Junction 9 is a nightmare. So far as I can see the new junction does nothing to help us and all the people coming from the east to the M3, A34 and Winchester. You need to reconsider the management of the rapidly increasing traffic from the east arriving at Junction 9. With very large roundabouts the traffic travelling around the junction does so at speed and traffic coming up Spitfire Way cannot get onto the roundabout especially if travelling to Winchester and there is a large van or lorry to your right blocking the view. I can't see how things will improve under your plan for traffic from Spitfire Way. You seem to be relying on a reduction in traffic created by the direct access onto the A34 and M3. I suspect we will continue to have significant problems.</p> <p>I may yet think of more issues. I will look at the junction plan again!</p>		<p>congestion and journey times through M3 Junction 9. Traffic flows on a number of local roads within Winchester City are also predicted to decrease.</p>
Local community	<p>Chapel lane is a single track road with passing places which passes through Easton where some houses which were built long ago about the road .</p> <p>Normally it carries 10 to 15 vehicles an hour but if the A34/M3 is blocked the traffic increases to 600 to 750 an hour. This is unpleasant to those of us who live on this lane.</p> <p>In our comments to the first consultation we raised the need for an effective plan to prevent the traffic which will build up when work causes queues on the M3/A34 during the course of construction using Chapel lane but did not receive a response which recognised the need for action. We are unable to see in the recent consultation material your proposals to address this issue. Would you kindly set out your specific proposals.</p>	N	<p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been produced to document the construction traffic management. The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13). The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	I object to the scheme unless and until effective traffic management for Chapel lane is incorporated into your scheme's proposals.		
Local community	<p>Footpaths and cycle ways</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The original Itchen Way from the Fulling Mill into Winnall and the Nun's Walk (Allan King Way) into Winchester from St Mary's Church to the King Alfred should be preserved or improved. Both these original paths are important for local walkers and offer more attractive routes than the proposed new paths as they follow the course of river tributaries and also pass through protected wildlife areas. 2. The new footpath following the existing northbound A33 of does not appear to offer much amenity. Such a path on a narrow strip of land between two fast moving carriageways does not seem very attractive for walkers. The plan suggests that for at least 300 metres of the path the distance between the northbound and southbound carriageways is less than 30 metres. If this path is installed it would be better if it was made into a cycleway to offer local cyclists a traffic free route into Winchester and the shopping area at Winnall. For walkers it would appear a better option would be to link to the Itchen Way where it crosses the Itchen. 3. A generally better alternative for local amenity would be to run the northbound and southbound A34 adjacent to each other along the original Northbound route and put a footpath/cycleway along the old Southbound route away from the fast moving carriageways. 4. The new path proposed on the east side of the M3 does not appear to be of much benefit for local walkers. It appears it would be elevated on the side of the hill, but recessed into the hillside. As such, it would mainly offer views over the motorways or no views. It is not clear what local demands this path meets. It would be better to save the cost of this and spend more to achieve a better arrangement for walkers and cyclists on the western side where higher utilisation can be expected. <p>Noise Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise pollution coming from the A34 on the east of Kings Worthy (e.g Three Maids Hill) has increased significantly in over recent years. With increased traffic flows, and higher speeds, steps should be taken to mitigate the increased noise pollution on this section of the A34. • The sections of road forming the new junctions with the M3 are on higher ground and much closer to the village of Kings Worthy. Noise mitigation steps should be taken here to manage the increased noise pollution that will result. <p>Disruption</p>	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>1. Local residents are very concerned about the level of inconvenience and disruption this project will bring to the area. The journey from Kings Worthy to the south side of Winchester (e.g. Bar End) is already difficult and can be expected to be much worse while these works are being carried out. There are only two southbound routes out of Kings Worthy, via J9 or via the Worthy Road and through the City. Since the recent Covid restrictions were introduced the traffic flow around the City's one way system has been further restricted by the closure of Hyde Street and lane narrowing on North Walls. This means all southbound traffic going through the City is routed past the "Albion" junction close to the railway station. There are now major hold-ups as a result. As an example the journey from Kings Worthy to the new Sports and Leisure Centre at Bar End (less than 3 miles in a straight line) can approach half an hour at busy times. Therefore, it will be essential to re-open Hyde Street and restore a proper traffic flow around the Winchester one-way system before J9 works commence in order to avoid effectively cutting off Kings Worthy residents at busy times.</p>		
Local community	<p>1) Please can you outline how you plan to help protect villages such as Easton from being completely overwhelmed by sudden masses of traffic either trying to avoid this area or being diverted. This is a great concern form many residents. The village is small, the lanes are narrow and it's not designed to cope with over 700 vehicles as it was last time there was an issue in that area.</p> <p>2) What plans for lighting both on the roundabout and also the old spitfire link roundabout area please. It's far too dark and accidents have occurred.</p>	N	
	<p>Without the benefit of your research but as a user of the junction since it was first constructed I should have thought the largest, and by far the most important, volume of traffic using it is travelling between the Southampton (and Portsmouth) docks and the Midlands.</p> <p>If this is correct would it not be best for such traffic not to have to use a roundabout - especially such a cumbersome and time consuming arrangement as exists at present. This would require other, more local traffic - such as myself - to fit in around it. Fair enough.</p>	N	The Scheme is expected to reduce congestion at the M3 Junction 9. The traffic impacts are detailed in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) .
Local community	I live in Micheldever, a village 6 miles north of J9 and, more to the point, 6 miles north of the shops at Winnall. We have a very limited bus service from the village into Winchester, comprising a single return trip with a short stay in the city on two days a week. As a result, if I simply want to visit the city or the shops at Winnall I sometimes cycle into town, or to the Winnall trading estate.	Y	The Applicant has noted this comment. The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>I would do so more often if there were a safe cycle route from Kings Worthy to Winnall. A reduced gradient along this section would also be very appealing!</p> <p>It seems from the scheme documents that an improved cycleway/footpath is proposed but the local organiser of the Cycle Touring Club (of which I am not a member) wrote in the local paper last week that this was not the case and that Highways England were saying that demand for such a path had to be proven.</p> <p>Please also consider the increasing number of cyclists and the growing popularity of electric bikes and scooters. I think that as fossil fuel becomes more expensive, the government starts to get serious about implementing the environmental pledges that they have made, and people realise that negotiating the Hampshire hills no longer requires serious effort on a conventional bike there will be a growing demand for cycleways here and in many other locations.</p> <p>I otherwise think the scheme seems sensible and well thought through.</p>		<p>and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane.</p>
Local community	<p>Overall we are in favour of improving the junction to reduce congestion and enhance the national road network connectivity in our area. We hope this will also make it safer for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians in the local area especially where the B3047, A33, A34 and M3 interchanges are concerned. However, we do have concerns about the impact the works will have on traffic flow, congestion, landscape and biodiversity in and around the Winnal junction and especially along the Itchen valley to the north and east of the motorway.</p>	N	<p>The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13). The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p> <p>Predicted safety impacts are also documented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). The Scheme is predicted to reduce the number of casualties and therefore, improve safety.</p>
Local community	<p>The scheme proposed is more complex and expensive than it needs to be. It also fails to realise the potential benefits the project could deliver if a wider view of the road network is taken. We can have both a better local traffic solution and a cheaper Junction 9.</p> <p>The A33 is no longer a major trunk road, made obsolete by the M3 it now carries little traffic to and from small rural communities. There is no need to weave the A33 through the new junction via an underpass and bridge.</p> <p>The project can provide a route for all local traffic by using the existing north bound carriageway of the A34 until it has crossed north of the River Itchen where a new short link can connect to the B3047 at the roundabout with Bedfield Lane (or a new roundabout further to the West). Make this a two-way local road – it is local traffic only and this simple alteration removes all local traffic from the through flow junction.</p> <p>It has the following advantages:-</p> <p>(vi) The high speed stretch of the A33 south of its junction with the B3047 can be removed allowing the restoration of valuable meadow land along the banks of the River Itchen.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>(vii) The A33 restored to it's pre-War route through King's Worthy will pass under the A34 using the B3407 (which was the A33 in former times) via the existing underpass.</p> <p>(viii) The dangerous "Cart and Horses Junction", where there have been a number of fatalities, will cease to exist.</p> <p>(ix) Traffic through the heart of King's Worthy will be reduced as cars from Kings Worthy and Abbots Barton/North Winchester will use the new link to access Junction 9 without having to pass through King's Worthy and use the dangerous junction. This reduction will more than offset the traffic from the A33 passing though the village.</p> <p>(x) The new construction can be simplified and the cost reduced.</p> <p>Many homes in Winchester and the north of King's Worthy which currently use Lovedon or Church Lanes and the A33 to access Junction 9 will instead use the B3047 or Springvale Road and Bedfield Lane and the new link. Regarding Junction 9, the south bound carriageway of the A34 is now redundant as it approaches the junction so can be removed. This gives space for expansion of the depot, drainage, other services or landscape improvements. The depot does not need to have a roundabout access if this road is not carrying traffic headed north for the M3.</p> <p>The existing access road to the M3 can be widened to provide a two lane exit from the roundabout. One lane leading down to the A34 and one over the A34 to the M3. The slip road to the M3 passing over the A34 should be considerably reduced in length and there is no need for an underpass under the A34 northbound carriageway. As a result there is probably no need to alter the course of the existing riverside footpath.</p> <p>By building the new link first and closing the A33 south of its junction with the B3047 there is an immediate simplification and opening up of the construction site making the whole process less painful and costly.</p> <p>This proposal is illustrated on the enclosed map. I have marked in yellow two alternatives for a short new link from the current A34 north bound carriageway to the B3047. And in blue marked the existing length of A33 (North and South bound) which can be removed and where water meadows can be restored. As far as I can see this suggestion offers a superior solution at lower cost with additional benefits.</p> <p>Construction works avoided or reduced include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-use of existing A34 carriageway reduces new road build for local traffic. • No underpass of A33 under North bound A34. • No overpass of the A33 over the south bound A34. • More freedom to re-align the A34 carriageways. • No roundabout for the A33 with the M3 slip road North of the Junction. 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new North bound slip road for the M3 will be greatly reduced in length as once over the A34 it can immediately reduce in height and merge with the M3. More manageable construction site. No need for new footpath. <p>The extra benefits include: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Safety improvement by removing a known accident black spot with a history of fatalities. Preserving the existing footpath route along the river. Restoration of an area of water meadows and reconnecting King's Worthy to its river. Less traffic through the historic heart of King's Worthy. Shorter local journeys to/from Winnall to Winchester residents living in North of the City, drawing local through traffic away from the city centre. 		
Local community	<p>I want to very strongly OPPOSE the proposed M3/J9 plan. Headbourne worthy village is already compromised on the sound aspect, but retains some of its old charm. However, the proposed plans would make it like a rat run. Not only that, but from the looks of things the wildlife and the landscape would be harmed in the process. I appreciate the need but think a better way needs to be found.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment. The traffic impacts of the Scheme are documented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p>
Local community	<p>Your website states in very vague and general terms the "Benefits" of the proposed changes as "The changes we're proposing would reduce congestion at the junction and help make journey times more reliable. With less congestion there would also be fewer accidents and better air quality.</p> <p>Yet there is no comment about the 'Risks' and "Disbenefits" of the proposal up front to provide a balanced Cost Benefit Analysis approach. What is being lost in environmental and other terms?</p> <p>How can you say there will be less congestion anyway? Road traffic in the UK continues to increase. And the more roads that are built the more traffic is upon them.</p> <p>There have also been claims that this ""improvement"" will increase safety. Looking at news reports, I can find details of 1 serious accident at Winnall in 2014. Given this general, fatuous claim, I will make a counter claim: this project will result in more accidents as vehicles will be travelling faster than now.</p> <p>The bottom line is that to save a few minutes of travel time for impatient people an ecosystem has to be destroyed for ever. Hardly a sustainable, long-term, sensible business practice for the human race (but our ignorance, stupidity and arrogance abounds as evidenced again by this project).</p>	N	<p>The breakdown of the Scheme monetised impacts are presented in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10). A value for money analysis has been undertaken, which includes all monetised and non-monetised impacts, and is presented in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1).</p> <p>Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	I object strongly to this whole scheme. It has been shown repeatedly that the effect of road "improvements" is always to generate additional traffic. Therefore on environmental grounds alone we should not be going ahead with this scheme. It is inevitable in addition that any speeding of traffic at this junction will transfer the bottleneck further along the A34.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.
Local community	I object to the M3 junction 9 new scheme on environmental grounds.	N	
Local community	<p>Many of our pupils and parents walk to and from school along the B3047 that runs through Itchen Abbas. We would expect all possible efforts are made to avoid general traffic and construction traffic from increasing through the village due to the construction phase of the scheme, especially during the key times between 08:00 and 08:30 as well as 14:45 and 15:45 when pupils and staff are travelling to and from school.</p> <p>Safe passage between Junction 9 of the M3 and the B3047 ought to be maintained at all times, as many of our staff travel to school from the area to the south of Winchester, habitually using Junction 9 to leave the motorway.</p> <p>Any opportunities for outreach or a local primary school construction site visit for our pupils, with the appropriate safety protocols, would be most welcome.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p> <p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p> <p>The traffic impacts of the Scheme and its construction are documented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). Access between the M3 Junction 9 and the B3047, via the A33, is retained in the Scheme proposals.</p>
Local community	<p>Traffic flows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed routing of the M3 and A34 appears to offer the opportunity of improved the traffic flows from M3 to A34 and from A34 to M3, with less risk of congestion. 2. The proposed routing of the A33 between the Cart & Horses junction and Winnall is improved compared to the previous proposal. The arrangement appears to offer a clearer route from Kings Worthy to Winnall and avoids joining the A34 and the queues that build up towards Jct 9 currently. This promises to make this route potentially easier to access the amenities just off junction 9. It also may offer a better option for people to access the new Sports & Leisure park, than driving through Winchester. If these assumptions prove correct this may reduce traffic flow along the Worthys Road and lower pressure at peak times on the City Rd junction in Winchester – we hope. 3. Referring to the A33 link to Jct 9, with one of the current lanes becoming a path, there will be changes to the A33 and how it flows through to the Cart & Horses junction. In addition, the new arrangement for accessing the M3 from Jct 9 will likely attract some proportion of drivers from areas such as Harestock, Kings Barton and Weeke, who will see the route through to the Cart & 	N	<p><i>Response to traffic flows:</i></p> <p>The Applicant has noted these comments. An assessment of traffic impacts of the Scheme is reported in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). The assessment indicates a reduction in congestion and journey times through M3 Junction 9. Traffic flows on a number of local roads within Winchester City are predicted to decrease with the Scheme in place.</p> <p>The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Horses Junction as the quickest route. This will add pressure on this junction which is a well-known trouble spot where priorities are ambiguous to many. The A33 junction with the London Rd/B3047 aka Cart & Horses junction, should be addressed within the overall scheme.</p> <p>Cycling and walking</p> <p>5. I welcome that National Cycle route 23 will continue to be in place. This route is an important route for cyclists in Winchester to head east and for people who cycle to work from the east into Winchester. Steps should be taken to ensure that this route remains open and free from mud etc during construction.</p> <p>6. It is disappointing to see that the “path” between the Cart & Horses junction and Winnall has been downgraded to a walking only path from what was a shared cycle/walking path in the previous proposal . The route proposed between the north & south bound carriageways of the A34 would be quite intimidating. Proximity to some traffic is inevitable, but better options are available, with zero or very marginal change in costs:</p> <p>a. The path should be designated as a shared walking and cycle path. I’d have no objections to it being a bridleway, but I’d be surprised to see the horse riding community using it as such. The route is likely to be used by people using it to get between the Worthys & Winnall, and perhaps beyond, rather than as a nice leisurely walk. In addition to providing access to Winnall for people in the Worthys, this could link to other paths - current & future – to give a cycle route to the new Sports & Leisure complex. This route would be flatter than cycling along the Worthy Road.</p> <p>b. Routing – This shared path should be routed to minimise the proximity to the fastest traffic. The current routing of the path does the opposite. I can envisage two possible better routings:</p> <p>i. A path that runs alongside the north-bound A34 on the south side of the road, to join in with Nuns Walk. Nuns walk could be upgraded to a shared cycle path / footpath from the point where they join, into the Worthys. The Nuns walk route could be extended alongside the A34 all the way until this path meets the London Road in Headbourne Worthy. This would be a welcome improvement in amenity to residents in Headbourne Worthy</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>ii. The shared path could be designed into to follow the same route between Winnall and the Cart & Horses Junction as the A33. This would use the same under-passes as the road.</p> <p>There are pro's and con's to each of these two options, but both options are better than the route proposed".</p> <p>Noise mitigation</p> <p>A reduction in the frequency of major congestion between the A34 and the M3 at junction 9 will be welcomed by many from well beyond the Worthys and indeed for many in the Worthys. It is reasonable to anticipate that, on average, there will be an increase in road noise generated. One of the "benefits" of the Southbound A34 being jammed is that traffic speed is much reduced which reduces the noise levels which are intrusive for many who live in Headbourne Worthy and Kings Worthy either side of the A34. I'd particularly highlight residents of Willis Waye and The Dell, but there are plenty of others for whom noise levels are intense. The scheme plan should make clear what measure are being put in place to limit the noise levels to ensure that they do not increase and preferably that they decrease by at least 3dB – preferably more. I believe there are noise survey sensors in place in several back gardens in some houses in Willis Waye. The environmental services team at Winchester City council could provide details and data.</p> <p>Environmental concerns</p> <p>The webinars on this were scheduled for while I was on holiday, so I have been unable to get enough insight into these areas to make well informed comments. But it is clear that this project would be a major undertaking in a fragile environmental area. In addition, the volume of material used will have an associated impact in terms of CO2 and other emissions. It is critical that any impact is mitigated and that an "environmental" business case analogous to a financial business case is conducted.</p> <p>Consultation with public</p> <p>While I understand the approach chosen was done so to be able to navigate the restrictions placed on all of us by the Covid Pandemic, the On-Line consultation process is quite different to that which people are used to before, as exemplified by the consultation in Tubbs Hall, Kings Worthy for the previous iteration of the proposed junction. The Online process has some advantages for some people, but it could be onerous for many. Indeed, I was unable to attend any of the briefings on the mitigations of the environmental impact for example. Many people are unfamiliar with "online" meetings and many more</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>still are not familiar enough to be able to get as much insight from the Online resources as they would from an “in person” consultation. Given that we have a significant easing of the Covid rules from 19th July 21, I strongly recommend that to ensure better stakeholder engagement, that a series of in person consultations be added into the process. While clearly, this will take time, it will pay back in terms of stakeholder engagement.</p>		
<p>South Downs Network</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>The South Downs Network objects to the proposed M3 Junction 9 Development in its present form.</p> <p>Executive Summary: Move over to Sustainable Transport</p> <p>We respectfully suggest that this £180+ million road scheme should be referred back to be replaced by a sustainable transport version that will help us meet our climate change commitments, providing better bus services, bus and rail infrastructure, integrated green cycle and walking routes, safe crossing for active travel, green (car free) bridges, safer paths for access to schools and access to rail stations.</p> <p>Secretary of State for Transport guidance</p> <p>We would take this opportunity to remind Highways England of the words used by the Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps when launching the Government’s 'Decarbonising Transport: Setting the Challenge,' said in the foreword that: “public transport and active travel will be the natural first choice for our daily activities” and that “We will use our cars less and be able to rely on a convenient, cost-effective and coherent public transport network”.</p> <p>More roads - more traffic</p> <p>More roads equals more traffic - when a new road is built, new traffic will divert onto it. Many people may make new trips they would not otherwise make just because of new roads. This well-known and long-established effect is known as 'induced traffic'</p> <p>Increase of emissions and global warming gases</p> <p>The Highways England proposal will increase CO2 emissions by attracting more cars onto the roads! Highways England's own report admits a significant increase in carbon emissions as a result of the project - some 534,628 tonnes of CO2 for user emissions. This doesn't include the emissions from the construction which doesn't seem to be reported on.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges South Downs Network’s objection to the Scheme. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>Response in relation to traffic and transport:</p> <p>The Applicant notes the points made in relation to transport. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>How are we going to meet the Government’s commitment to net zero emissions in less than 30 years with road schemes like this? Highways England say the project will be completed in 2026 so the timeline is even shorter at less than 25 years to achieve net zero! Wouldn't it be better to cancel the project and spend the £180 million on sustainable transport solutions?</p> <p>In 2020 transport accounted for 29.8% of all CO2 emissions. The majority is from road transport! How can Highways England advance a road scheme that will actively increase CO2 emissions?</p> <p>It is likely that there will still be 40 million petrol and diesel cars and vans on the roads in 2030 pulse diesel HGVs!</p> <p>The UK's new climate target to cut our emissions by 78% by 2035 was passed into law in June 2021 - the Highways England plan is out of step with this. The proposal does not include a landscape strategy. Road developments are not excluded from the UK’s legally adopted climate commitment. The UK Government has a commitment to tackle climate change.</p> <p>Nature</p> <p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation Design Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that this design plan consists of just one page! We are concerned that there is no landscape strategy or detailed plan. The Mitigation Design Plan contains simply focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, we urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and biodiversity net gain. As part of this, we would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done. The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. We want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</p> <p>Whilst the actual road design plan seems to be very firm there seems to be a lack of commitment by Highways England to the environment, an EIA</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>and a landscape and biodiversity/habitats plan. Words such as ‘ongoing’ and “is being developed” keep cropping up. One gets the impression that the natural world is not important to Highways England.</p> <p>We are concerned that Highways England seemed to be avoiding a commitment to the production of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). In Para 1.5.4 of the PEIR Highways England says “It should be noted that at this stage the information is preliminary. An iterative process of scheme development and EIA is ongoing”. Surely a draft EIA should be available for public consultation now, and not be delayed until the DCO application? Indeed there seems to be a fudging of the commitment even at that stage to the production of an EIA. Highways England says “The final EIA work will be reported in the ES.”</p> <p>Indeed further fudging of commitment to environmental assessment is contained in the response to Natural England’s submission of 9 November 2020. They highlighted that the impact of emissions to designated ecological sites is required. Highways England response was “Ongoing EIA work will include the assessment of the impacts of emissions from traffic on designated habitats.”</p> <p>Avoiding say yes to Natural England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England said “The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies.” Highways England said “ongoing EIA work is to be reported.” • Natural England said they would welcome the opportunity to comment on the landscape, biodiversity and access enhancement plan. Highways England responded “A biodiversity and landscaping mitigation package is being developed.” But when? • Natural England advised that “the potential impact of the proposal upon features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for habitat creation/enhancement should be included within this assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance on such matters.” Highways England responded ““The Biodiversity chapter of the ES will identify all potential impacts on identified biodiversity features”” Further fudging.” <p>SDNPA Nature Investment Areas</p> <p>The road site is where the South Downs National Park has identified one of its 12 nature investment areas. These nature recovery areas are part of a hub of an interconnected ‘nature network.’ The Highways England intrusion flies in the face of nature recovery and will destroy and fragment</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>important protected habitats. This scheme affects the local nature reserve which is home to rare and notable wildlife, and a SSSI site.</p> <p>Previous environmental damage</p> <p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust's nature reserve at St Catherine's Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally. "</p> <p>SSSI and Special Area of Conservation</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network.</p> <p>Government Environmental Policy</p> <p>Highways England need to take on board Government policy on the environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government's Final Report of the Independent Review on the Economics of Biodiversity led by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta. Amongst other things he says "Human demands on nature must be curbed • We say - road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government 'Dasgupta Review' says, 'Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).' We should no longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to urbanisation pressures. • Also please bear in mind the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this scheme. 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Green Bridge</p> <p>We support the Hampshire and IoW Wildlife Trust’s proposal for a green bridge to the National Park which would reunite wildlife habitats that became disconnected by the 1990s M3 construction.</p> <p>We want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature’s recovery despite modern transport development.</p> <p>Spoil</p> <p>The Highways England report says “We have not yet completed our junction design, so we do not know exactly how much material may need to be placed in these areas, or whether we will need all three areas”. Surely after at least two and a half years of preparation such civil engineering detail should be known? The amount of spoil will affect the landscape design. This should be known now; before Highways England applies for a Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>2019 consultation</p> <p>We have serious concerns about the previous stages of public consultations.</p> <p>Highways England says “There was a high level of support for the Proposed Scheme”. “We received 526 responses to our consultation”. Other than a few meaningless and valueless paragraphs the Public Consultation Summary Report does not provide any substantive information on exactly what those 526 respondents said. What organisations responded and what did they say? How many of the 526 comments were from individual members of the public. How many were car, commercial and HGV vehicle owners/drivers? Did horse riding, walking and cycling groups respond? Indeed were they invited to respond?</p> <p>References are made to ‘stakeholders.’ It is understood they were invited to workshops to give their input. Exactly who were they? and how were they selected? We hope it wasn't a question of selecting the appropriate stakeholders so that it assisted in giving the right answer to suit Highways England.</p> <p>Walking and Cycling Proposals Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that there is little substance to walking and cycling provision. The plan just consists of one page. There seems to be very little reference to provision for horse riders.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Walkers, cyclists and horse riders to be put in a 'subway'! Underground? Highways England say "On both sides of the motorway, the existing walking and cycling route links both parts of Easton Lane, which would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders will be improved with a widened 3m route, which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway..."</p> <p>This is unacceptable. This proposal is fraught with all sorts of problems. Who is going to police the subway to ensure the safety of users? Who will maintain it and how will it be lit? Will there be security cameras? Will there be traffic separation to ensure safety of different users such as horse riders and cyclists?</p> <p>Instead of hiding these active travel users away below ground highways England should provide a green bridge out in the fresh air above the pollution from the motorway style road.</p> <p>In any event Highways England should ensure that cycle provision is compliant with Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20 Published last year by the Government.</p> <p>Highways England must take account of latest Government policy</p> <p>The business case for this project should be rewritten taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Gov policy paper - A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment (pub Jan 2018) • DfT's policy paper - Decarbonising transport: setting the challenge (pub March 2020) • UK Gov policy paper: Gear change: a bold vision for cycling and walking • UK Gov policy paper: Bus Back Better: national bus strategy for England 		

K.2.T Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	The improvements were urgently required before the move to home working triggered by COVID 19. The amount of traffic has now reduced substantially and I am not sure that the enormous investment is still justified. It is essential that the economic case for the scheme is revised taking into account post pandemic traffic flows. I do like the idea to improve cycle access around the junction.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	Please could you restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths.	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
Local community	In earlier plans, the footway from J9 to Kings Worthy left Easton Lane on the footpath/cycleway within the confines of the new traffic island, then followed to line of the A33 and would provide essential cycle facilities were the footpath upgraded either now or in the future. The current plan creates a footpath which departs from Easton Lane (Tesco) on the opposite side of the road from the cycleway, then follows the A34 towards Kings Worthy, where there is no practical link to the cycleable road system in Kings Worthy. This is 'closing the door' to future development of a much needed, local cycleway network.	Y	
Local community	I feel that, although the new proposal seems to offer a far more logical scheme for motor vehicles, there seems to be a huge void when it comes to the cycling and walking routes so badly needed to link the North east of Winchester with the city centre and the new leisure centre on the south side. Please don't overlook the opportunity to provide a purpose built, dedicated, safe route to allow all walks of life safe access to the fantastic new facilities designed to improve people's general health.	Y	
Local community	<p>I am very disappointed by the latest proposal that no longer significantly improves walking and cycling routes across the junction and seems to have abandoned the proposed additional walking and cycling route from and to the junction from Kingsworthy.</p> <p>The public are being cajoled to improve their health and well being by increasing exercise generally and particularly for short journeys adopting walking and cycling instead of car travel. This development is a once in 50 years opportunity to make a significant improvement to non-vehicular routes between Winchester and Kingsworthy, and Easton.</p>	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	I'm no traffic expert but the design for the connection to the A33 still looks unsafe.		
Local community	<p>The Scheme is not needed. Sure you will smooth the traffic flow at Junction 9 by taking out the roundabout/lights etc, but this just moves the bottlenecks up and down the network due to weight of traffic. e.g. at the Junction 27 split off heading south near Eastleigh which is already a pinch point or up the A34 at Oxford or M3 Camberley. The solution is to reduce traffic and spend the money on improving the quality of local roads so more people feel it is safe to walk/cycle.</p> <p>Secondly, the proposals seem to keep reducing the provision for walking/cycling where as this should be a great opportunity to increase provision for sustainable transport. e.g. restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths.</p>	Y	<p>The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling (which includes the surrounding area and major arterial routes leading to the junction) which provides a forward forecast to 2047. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p>
Local community	<p>Overall I strongly agree with the revised design. It achieves the strategic objective of providing freeflowing connections for the A34 while eliminating the weaving on the A34 between Junction 9 and the A33 junction that the previous design would have introduced. Nevertheless there are aspects of the design that could be improved, as described below.</p> <p>A34 southbound route to the M3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently the M3-A34 southbound merge is shown as a single lane gain plus tigertail. This provides lower merging capacity than the previously consulted double lane gain. This does not seem acceptable given the very high merging volumes from the A34 (around 30k AADT). The current proposal has the fourth lane instead joining from the J9 roundabout, which seems unnecessary as only 9k AADT uses this link. In addition the combined M3 southbound+A34 southbound volume will be around 60k AADT on opening according to PEIR figures*, which exceeds design capacity for a three lane carriageway. Presumably this is why the northbound M3 has four lanes at this point. In short, providing only three lanes southbound through J9 creates an unnecessary bottleneck. <p>Improve connections to/from the A33?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First, the proposed NMU route towards Kings Worthy, utilising the current A33 northbound carriageway, is an excellent idea. However, its benefits are limited in the current proposal as the route does not allow cycle access. A route for pedestrians and cyclists would better deliver on HE's objectives of promoting active travel. Ideally it would also start further south, using much of the current A34 northbound carriageway. 	Y	<p>The support for the Scheme has been noted.</p> <p><u>A34 southbound route to the M3:</u></p> <p>DMRB CD 122 (Geometric Design of Grade Separated Junctions), defines several options for merge layouts. These options are dependent upon forecasted traffic flows. Using a combination of the annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) in vehicles per hour (VPH) for a mainline flow of traffic and the AADT in VPH for a merge flow of traffic, a required layout option type for a merge layout can be determined within DMRB CD 122. From an assessment of the forecasted traffic flows (contained within the Scheme transport model), the layout currently shown, follows the requirements of DMRB CD 122 and that a double lane gain is not required. The scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p><u>Improve connections to/from the A33:</u></p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p><u>National Highways Proposed Roundabout:</u></p> <p>Consideration was given to the proposed roundabout to the National Highways depot during the preliminary design and a 'left in, left out' junction configuration was considered. The main clear routes for vehicles entering and leaving the depot are the A34 and the M3. The provision of a 'left in, left out' junction arrangement has the following disbenefits:</p> <p>Disbenefit 1 - The introduction of a left in / left out junction could encourage higher speeds within the proposed A33 link road, leading to enforcement issues.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second, I disagree strongly with the new roundabout for access to the Highways England compound. The A33 at this point is projected to have 13k AADT, which is a lot of traffic being forced to brake and then accelerate for what is, essentially, a property access. This will have non-negligible CO2 and safety impacts, not to mention the cost of building the roundabout. These surely cannot be justified by any convenience to the comparatively tiny amount of traffic accessing the Highways England depot; at any rate, I have found no evidence in the published material that the costs and benefits of this element of the scheme have been considered. Giving such high priority to Highways England depot traffic, without presenting any economic or social case for this, could be perceived to reflect a conflict of interest. There are options that would much better serve general traffic and the taxpayer, such as using a simple priority T-junction in place of the proposed roundabout, or simply retaining the current access arrangements. 		<p>Disbenefit 2 – With the left in / left out arrangement, vehicles exiting at Junction 9 wishing to enter the depot would need to travel to the proposed A33 roundabout and back on themselves. This is an additional 1200 metres (0.7 mile) journey for vehicles. If a left in / left out junction was introduced, a form of central reserve would be required to prevent vehicles from attempting to make a right turn into the depot (avoiding the need to travel to the proposed M3 northbound onslip roundabout and back), which would increase (widen) the scheme footprint within this area.</p> <p>Disbenefit 3 - In addition, vehicles exiting from the depot intending to travel north via the M3, would need to circumnavigate the proposed J9 gyratory and travel back on themselves. This is an additional 1025 metres (0.6 mile) journey for vehicles and would be pertinent for maintenance vehicles (undertaking winter salt runs, etc).</p> <p>The Applicant considered a 'left in/left out' junction configuration during the preliminary design, which has the following disbenefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction of a left in/left out junction could encourage higher speeds within the proposed A33 link road which could lead to enforcement issues. With the left in/left out arrangement, vehicles exiting at Junction 9 wanting to enter National Highways' depot would need to travel to the proposed A33 roundabout and back on themselves. This would be an additional 1200m (0.7 mile) journey for vehicles. Furthermore, if a left in/left out junction was introduced, a central reserve would be required to prevent vehicles from attempting to make a right turn into National Highways' depot which would result in an increase of the Scheme footprint. With the left in/left out arrangement, vehicles exiting from National Highways' depot who intended to travel north via the M3 would need to circumnavigate the proposed Junction 9 roundabout and travel back on themselves. This would be an additional 1025m (0.6 mile) journey for vehicles. Following design reviews, the Applicant considered that the proposed roundabout to the depot was most appropriate.
Local community	<p>Overall, the proposals look like a sensible way to relieve congestion around the junction 9 roundabout / interchange. I am a bit confused by the plan for access on to the A34 from the roundabout itself - i.e. if I wish to travel northbound on the A34 from Tesco or the other shops near to the roundabout, how would I do so, now that the A33 and A34 access appear to have been separated? (I agree with this separation, by the way, as the current blended A33/A34 access route is confusing and dangerous.)</p> <p>I am sure there will be other places to comment on this, but I cannot stress enough how important it is to use this opportunity to improve routes for cycling/scooting/skateboarding/mobility scooters/walking etc. It is really important that any new paths are wide enough to be multi-use - i.e. for both pedestrians and wheeled transport without a combustion engine! This will mean e.g. excellent signposting, shared routes but distinct surfaces for wheeled transport vs walkers/runners, appropriate bridges and</p>	N	<p>The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision of a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	underpasses. Please don't rely on the N23 meeting all the demand for cycling in the area!		
Local community	Separating A33 away from A34 is very positive. Old northbound route should be a cycleway not a footway. Southbound merge from A34 to M3 should be two lane gains, not a lane gain and a merge. The local traffic from the roundabout should merge instead.	Y	The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.
Local community	I would like to see the proposed new footpath from Winnall to Worthy (A33) upgraded to cycle route. This would dramatically shorten the route and make feasible a cycle shopping trip from Worthy to Tesco, for example	Y	
Local community	The removal of the cycle routes from the schemes original proposal is very disappointing. Cycling currently in Winchester itself is borderline dangerous and any opportunity should be taken when improving the infrastructure to implement cycle safe routes. The shared footpath from Kingsworthy to the junction at Winnall is not a safe proposal for either bicycles or pedestrians	Y	The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route.
Local community	I disagree with building more roads when we should be reducing traffic on the roads not encouraging more vehicles. I'm also appalled at the fact that the cycle lanes have been reduced to walking paths only.	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p>
Local community	I agree that the improvements were urgently required before the move to home working triggered by COVID 19. The amount of traffic has now reduced substantially and I am not sure that the enormous investment is still justified. I think it is essential that the economic case for the scheme is revised taking into account post pandemic traffic flows. I do like the idea to improve cycle access around the junction	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	Although I acknowledge that congestion at the junction is problematic, I disagree with the general premise that increasing road capacity is a reasonable strategy in the midst of climate crisis, or one that in this particular instance is likely to produce the desired results when taking a long view. Widening of roads will ultimately serve to induce increased volumes of traffic in the medium to long term. The sums of money being spent on these works could have a profound	Y	The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>and lasting impact if invested in public transport instead.</p> <p>That said, given that this project is apparently seen as a fait accompli, I'd like to focus on the earlier promises of enhanced access for cyclists and horses that have been severely compromised. This seems to add insult to injury for those of us who use active travel in the area and wish to see provision for this extended. I'm disheartened that the cynicism I heard from others with respect to these promises at earlier stages of development appears to have been well founded. I can only imagine that it was an oversight in what is understandably seen as a minor peripheral detail, and trust that this oversight at least can be rectified.</p>		<p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
Local community	<p>I understand that you like to reduce congestion with all of it's negative effects. However, extending this junction will increase the traffic which will cause further congestion elsewhere. Increased traffic will increase noise and air pollution and increase green house gas emissions. Furthermore, it will lead to massive disruptions of traffic during the building phase that will effect Winchester and Badger Farm Road. Badger Farm Road is already very busy and cycling is very dangerous. For this expense it would be much better to do following alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase capacity on railways and electrify towards Oxford and consider reopening the Watercress line between Arlesford and Winchester Help people to use buses instead of their cars by building a bus network similar to CPRE's proposal, every village should have half hourly bus service to Winchester and or train stations Build cycle ways along all high traffic roads, the M3 and especially this junction is much used for short distance travel too 	Y	
Local community	<p>Please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths. The upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 should meet the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20)</p>	Y	
Local community	<p>Highways England has totally disregarded the opportunity to improve the routes for cyclists and horse riders. At one point there was to be a bridle way which has now disappeared from the proposals. The improvements for motorists and driving and walking is clear but why has Highways England not included cycle routes alongside the footpath to Kingsworthy and to Longwalk? This is a one off opportunity to include good cycle paths which in the overall cost must be minuscule. Government introduced funding for improved cycle routes during lockdown and Hampshire County Council is making alterations to roads to encourage cycling in the city but Highways England is clearly not. Commuters are encouraged to cycle for reduced traffic congestion, reduced air pollution, fitness and wellbeing but Highways England is not supporting this initiative.</p>	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	As a regular cyclist in the area and occasional walker, the revised plans are worse than the previous ones. Provision for cyclists and horse riders is worse than before, with no good explanation. There was supposed to be a cycle route from Tesco to Kings Worthy, and a bridleway to provide for horse riders. The proposed cycle routes have been scaled back - this is not good for regular cyclists in the area. In addition, the proposed bridleway and a proposed cycleway are now footpaths. Please reinstate access for cyclists and horse riders as the A33/A34/M3 represent a major barrier to these people. The cycle routes should also comply with LTN 1/20.	Y	
Local community	The change of route to get to the A33 is better, but why was the cycle route taken out? Will cyclists have to share the roundabout with the traffic heading for the M3?	Y	The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.
Local community	Important to keep cycle path connections across the motorway. Must have cycle paths and not just footpaths which would be dangerous if not just short sighted.	Y	
Local community	I am disappointed at the substandard design of the cycle path for ncn23, the downgrading of the cycle path to Kings Worthy to a footpath and the lack of a bridleway through the fields to Long Walk. I don't understand why, given the minimal cost compared to the project, that these cannot be planned to help and encourage cycling walking and riding in the area. I travel by bicycle to Kings Worthy and Easton from Winchester regularly and would like my family and friends to easily be able to do the same safely please.	Y	
Local community	The rationale for this improvement may have been sound a few years ago and at the last consultation I generally agreed. But with the rapid change to more home working and flexible working plus the increasing urgency to reduce carbon emissions, it is clear to most people that more road building and improvements will not be needed in the future. I therefore consider this scheme should be scrapped and the re-thought. I think some improvements could be made to the existing junction design to ease flow at much lower cost. There should be full bicycle path to Kingsworthy along the A33.	Y	
Local community	The plans do not look as the same as the previous consultation. I am only interested in the cycle routes which seem to have changed.	Y	
Local community	It's not clear how to access A33 from Worthy Road in Kingsworthy (the dangerous Cart & Horses junction)... currently SO unsafe, and needs improving - or at the very least not to be made any worse by the new plans.	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Can't see the long promised cycle route from Jn9 to Kingsworthy - is it now only a footpath? A cycle route is critical to make it safer for cyclists in this area, and reduce the level of cycling in to Winchester along the Worthy Road.</p>		
Local community	<p>There appears to be no provision for cyclists coming from A33/Kingsworthy To Easton Lane. There is pedestrian access, but not cyclist access.</p> <p>The cycling access for route 23 is good, but there is not a convenient way to cycle either way between Kingsworthy and the Easton lane area.</p> <p>While it is physically possible for bikes to use the footway, this will not be legal if cyclists are not considered on the route, then we miss an opportunity.</p> <p>I suspect the footway could be made dual usage with cycles at little extra expense.</p>	Y	
Local community	<p>Congestion does occur at the junction, but purely at peak times. You should optimise the existing infrastructure by encouraging certain traffic at off-peak times. Most congestion occurs on the southbound carriageway of the A34 heading to the M3. There is also a lack of enforcement of driving standards which cause accidents - people going through red lights and ignoring the junction boxes.</p> <p>Once traffic has accessed the M3 southbound, further congestion also occurs (probably more frequently) at junctions 10-11 and 12-13 - your modelling will have provided evidence of this.</p> <p>Your proposals are unlikely to reduce congestion at peak times, but simply to move it to another part of the network during busy times. Presumably there is no intention to further destroy the area south of Winchester for motorway widening - which means you are always going to be constrained by merging traffic from a two-lane motorway and a two-lane A road into the capacity of a two-lane stretch of motorway south of junction 9.</p> <p>Your proposals does not really address the root cause - you will still be merging the 4 lanes from the A34 and M3 into the 3 and then 2 of the southbound M3.</p> <p>From my local knowledge congestion occurs: 1. At peak times when people are traveling to work 2. Because of holiday traffic in the summer heading to Bournemouth and the New Forest</p> <p>For (1) surely we should be encouraging modal shift - local commuter car</p>	N	<p>The Scheme has been designed with careful consideration to the surrounding environment, including South Downs National Park. The provision of foot/cycle bridges (as opposed to underpasses) would be visually intrusive to the surrounding environment. In addition, foot/cycle bridges require shallow gradients on the approach/departure ramps to the actual bridge span. These approach/departure ramps require a considerable amount of space and due to the constrained Scheme footprint and reconfiguration of the A34, foot/cycle bridges would not be feasible.</p> <p>All proposed underpasses are to be 4m in width and shall be lit. In addition, visibility to and from the underpasses will not be constrained</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>journeys should not be facilitated at public expense when we are attempting to reduce pollution and work to Net Zero. We should focus on encouraging walking and cycling by providing safe infrastructure at a fraction of the cost and encouraging public transport use..</p> <p>For (2) holiday traffic on busy weekend is essentially stop-start all the way down to the coast on busy weekend - again you are simply moving the problem further south.</p> <p>I cannot see how this will reduce noise - is it not an established fact that road 'improvements' such as this actually result in increases in journeys?</p> <p>Connections from the M3 to the A33 appear to miss the main incident hotspot - local residents have been campaigning for years for junction improvements at the Cart and Horses turn in Kings Worthy where there have been a number of fatalities - this doesn't appear to be in scope.</p> <p>The changes you propose will take another large amount of our local environment and cover it in concrete. It will become an even less usable area for pedestrians and cyclists. The fact that you are putting pedestrians and cyclists in what appears to be a length subway shows how little priority is given to active travel - I never use subways even in daylight in town centres as they are intimidating places.</p> <p>I'm not sure why I have participated in this consultation - no doubt the decisions have been made and local residents are unlikely to have their voices considered against the well-funded and extremely vocal freight and motoring lobbies which are skewing the debate.</p>		
Local community	<p>I'm disappointed that you've gone against your promises on providing decent and safe transport links for active and alternative transport- especially as the government aims to double cycling activity and reduce deaths and injuries on UK roads by 2025. Please can you restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths. This way we could encourage young children and students to cycle into Winchester for school, shopping and socialising. For adults it would be ideal for reducing the amount of traffic that is caused by short journeys for commuting and leisure. In Holland these routes between smaller settlements and cities are very common and they serve the population well. Children gain a sense of independence, improved physical fitness, mental health and wellbeing. It's also a great opportunity for walkers and horse riders to gain a quiet route away from the traffic too.</p> <p>As well as this, I would like to remind you that your upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 should meet the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20).</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>I used to travel through the junction as a commuter. I travel much less by car now, and mostly only at weekends.</p> <p>I cycle through the junction regularly.</p> <p>Winchester City Council like others has quite rightly signed a climate emergency. I would not want to see a big highways investment made at junction 9 unless there is a massive improvement for pedestrians, cyclists and horseriders so as to give people locally genuine travel options.</p>	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
Local community	<p>Your original scheme included a proposal for a cycle link from Kings Worthy through to Winnall via the junction. You have removed this link in the current proposals, replacing it with a pedestrian (footpath) link. The pedestrian route you propose would be along mostly current carriageway (A34 and A33 northbound lanes) and as such will presumably be a result of stopping up orders. Reducing the provision to pedestrian only is short-sighted and misses a number of quick (and cheap) wins.</p> <p>Such stopping up orders could remove vehicles (including horse drawn carriages) but leave non-motorised users to share the way. Where additional creation orders are needed (if any) then the cost of making orders for cycle accessible routes will be of no significant difference to making orders for pedestrian only routes.</p> <p>In other schemes that have created routes over residual carriageway surfaces it is not normally necessary to provide much in the way of new surfacing, instead relying on simply not removing the existing surface from the width of the new route. This would mean that the carbon footprint of the new route would also be very low, and would minimise the need to recycle surface materials. There would be negligible difference in cost between providing a cycle friendly surface compared to a pedestrian friendly surface, if any at all. A cycle friendly surface and cycle friendly infrastructure normally helps to ensure a facility that would be open to all, including those in wheelchairs and mobility scooters.</p> <p>The route could be created/stopped-up as a bridleway, but acknowledging that the predominant users would be pedestrians and cyclists keeping a bound bituminous surface. Should bridleway status imply an unbound surface then cycle way / cycle track orders should be the appropriate mechanism to limit equestrian impact. Equestrian use on roads in the area (ie feasible links) is minimal to non-existent in comparison to cycling and walking, and as such should not form a realistic need for inclusion within the scheme. However, should equestrian provision be considered necessary and viable then a greater width should be considered for the route to minimise potential conflict between</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. Sections of the existing A34 and A33 carriageways will be stopped up (to vehicular traffic) to facilitate this route. The intention is to utilise the existing stopped up sections of the A34/A33 carriageway construction / surface (where possible), which will reduce the need for new areas of construction. Furthermore, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>users.</p> <p>Providing a new, safe, environmentally sustainable access corridor through the proposed road layout would add to the climate-positive aspects of the scheme. In our household it would enable more rapid and manageable access to shops at Winnall without reliance on a car to overcome the various junction issues. With the link that it could provide to the NCN route through Winnall it could enable local people and visitors to the area to negotiate crossing the motorway by traffic free routes.</p> <p>Lastly, providing a multi-user traffic free route of some length must be a good press story to hang the cost and environmental impact of the project upon. Please look at the bigger forward picture and create the cycle friendly routes we need to be able to travel sustainably in the future.</p>		
Local community	Please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy.	Y	The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.
Local community	<p>Design for cycling is worse than that presented at the end of the 2019 consultation. Key improvements needed to the current plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate cycleway to Kings Worthy, a very valuable route linking KW residents to Winnall for shopping and leisure. • Reinstate bridleway to Long Walk, Easton. • Adopt current DfT standard LTN 1/20 for the NCN23 cycleway. • Add a barrier separating NCN23 cyclists from motor traffic • Maintain cycle access for NCN23 throughout the works / publish closures in advance. 	Y	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route • A bridleway is now proposed, linking Long Walk to Easton Lane. • The proposed footway/cycleway is to be designed to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges design standards. • Where the proposed footway/cycleway crosses the gyratory (via the proposed southern overbridge, a Vehicle Restraint System is proposed to separate the pedestrians/cyclists from the vehicular traffic. • Cycle access for NCN23 will be maintained throughout the construction phase where possible. Any temporary closures/diversions will be published in advance. <p>Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	The proposed new footpaths should be upgraded to cycle paths 1. to facilitate active travel and promote safer cycling. 2. to facilitate their use by users of mobility aids (wheelchairs, buggies etc) 3. to facilitate their use by parents with small children using pushchairs, prams, scooters etc.	Y	The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the current provisions and introduce new routes and connections. All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			The use of tactile paving (both blister and corduroy types) is also proposed to cater for the visually impaired, and wayfinding signage will also be provided along the footway/cycleway/bridleway routes as part of the Scheme proposal.
Local community	Not considering the best interests of other road users such as cycling and walking in this plan. The plan is only about increasing the capacity for motorized traffic and not fit for purpose when we are in a climate crisis which is going to worsen. The plan does not fit in with the idea of meeting C zero targets in line with the Paris Agreement.	Y	<p>In relation to encouraging a modal shift to different forms of transport, a key objective of the Scheme is to improve provisions for walkers and cyclists. The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded as part of the proposals. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An improvement to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23 • An additional footway, cycleway and horse riding route on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages • A new combined footpath and cyclepath for the western side of the Scheme to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. <p>In total, an additional 4.8km of public rights of way are to be provided as part of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>Information about the scheme states that your aim is '<i>support economic growth – improving road capacity</i>'. Increasing road capacity means making room for more traffic meaning the increased capacity will fill up and lead to extra journeys ('induced traffic') and in turn lead to demands for still more capacity.</p> <p>This process of unending road building in an attempt to escape traffic jams must stop - first, because it does not work, second, because it creates more carbon emissions. Wales has recently frozen most road schemes because of climate change. The UK government is being urged to do the same. There are two legal actions in progress against its roads programme and the refusal of the Minister for Transport to revise the outdated NPSNN which takes no account of climate change.</p> <p>Some of the supposed improvements you put forward, such as a new link for a cycle path, could be actioned without the need to improve capacity at this junction.</p>	Y	The Applicant has noted this comment. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	Continuity of access for all traffic, pedestrian and cycle routes through the junction.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Additional capacity on Spitfire Link (A272). Also old A33 carriageway to be opened to cycles as well as foot traffic.	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.
Local community	Yes, making the walking only routes suitable for cyclists as well	Y	<p>In relation to encouraging a modal shift to different forms of transport, a key objective of the Scheme is to improve provisions for walkers and cyclists. The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded as part of the proposals. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An improvement to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23 • An additional footway, cycleway and horse riding route on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages • A new combined footpath and cyclepath for the western side of the Scheme to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. <p>In total, an additional 4.8km of public rights of way are to be provided as part of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	I like the proposals for alterations to the existing cycle route from Winnall to Easton lane, the sight lines on the underpasses in the proposal are much better than the existing ones. The long sweeping 270 loop at the Tesco end will make the climb easier for bikes, but please add steps to shorten the loop for walkers. Please also consider gradients on the existing route on the east side of the M3. Heading west from Easton, there is a sharp climb after the underpass, then a downward slope with sharp turn to parallel the road. It looks like you've smoothed this on the plan. Please also smooth it in the vertical.	Y	The Applicant has noted this comment. The provision of steps have been incorporated within the loop to enable a more direct and quicker route for pedestrians.
Local community	Upgrade footpath link from Kings Worthy to Easton Lane from Footpath to Cycleway.	Y	The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.
Local community	<p>Paths designated as footpaths or cycle ways need to be wide enough to ensure a family with children and the cyclists can pass safely and far enough from the road to be pleasant. Unless cycling is a safe and attractive option people will not stop using cars even for quite short journeys and the planet is in disaster.</p> <p>The location of the deposition areas is key. The contractors must not be allowed to do whatever is cheapest as topsoil is valuable, chalk downland habitats are priceless and the river is almost unique in the world.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Noise control Cycle access to Easton	Y	The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users
Local community	Ensure that access for non motorised traffic is maintained and to a good standard e.g. road bikes and invalid carriages can't navigate potholes or rough tracks very well. Ensure that where works traffic crosses these routes that non works traffic has priority.	N	Details on the proposed temporary traffic management measures for implementation during the construction of the Scheme are set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) and details of the traffic impacts of the construction traffic management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) .
Local community	Access for cyclists and horse riders is inadequate in the latest proposals due to the replacement of proposed cycleways and bridleways with footways, and cycling provision is not in accordance with LTN 1/20	Y	The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.
Local community	The proposed provision for cyclists is incredibly poor. There should be a fully surfaced cycle lane from Winnall to Kings Worthy allowing residents to leave their cars at home and the original proposed bridleway reinstated. Sadly we know that most major road projects do nothing to reduce journeys and congestion. Given the climate crisis, it is incredibly disappointing that these plans do nothing to enable residents to reduce their car journeys, especially those less than 5 miles which are easily completed on a bike/e-bike.	Y	The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.
Local community	Safe cycle routes.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	Plan and implement safe cycle and walking routes into your plans to allow people safe, convenient, segregated, routes from Winchester to Easton and Kings Worthy.	Y	The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. The footway / cycling route along the entirety of the A34 section will be protected by a Vehicle Restraint System (VRS). In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. At the proposed Junction 9 gyratory, the proposed footway/cycleway crosses the southern overbridge. At this point a vehicle restraint system is proposed to separate the pedestrian/cyclist flow from the vehicular traffic
Local community	With such a huge investment this plan should include improvements for active travel. This is not adequately included here.	Y	The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.
Local community	I'm really disappointed that the most recent version of the plans has downgraded provision for cycling and for the planned bridleway. I'm always sceptical about road improvement projects because in the long run they have always ended up generating even more congestion. In this case I was ready to be persuaded	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>because the plans included measures that would have made cycling easier, by opening access to the Itchen Valley and to Kings' Worthy that is currently really tricky.</p> <p>The original shared cycle-footpath to Kings' Worthy has been downgraded to a footpath; this will save a tiny, tiny amount from a massive budget and yet produce something of a white elephant: it's hardly going to be a beautiful place for a stroll, but would be a fantastic commuter route for bikes. Therefore, please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths.</p> <p>I do believe that road improvements can be mitigated by trying to make moving around as easy as possible for those of us who cannot drive, or who do not have access to a car. That means paying as much attention to cycle routes as to motorway lanes. To this end, please also ensure that the upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 meets the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20) on this.</p>		<p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
Local community	Maintaining the cycle route to Easton....it is a very well used route to the countryside.	N	The Applicant has noted this.
Local community	Cyclists	Y	The Applicant has engaged with relevant local planning authorities, parish councils and walking, cycling and horse-riding groups to consider their suggestions for improving the provisions for non-motorised users.
Local community	I think you should consider better cycle routes. The plan is very focused on vehicle traffic without considering how improvements can be made to active travel. This project will determine the structure of routes out of the city to the countryside and nearby villages for a lifetime and should pay greater attention to non-vehicular transport in and out of the city. The proposed cycle link through Junction 9 (reconnecting the truncated Easton Lane), does not fully comply with the latest national guidance and so is unlikely to be fit for purpose. The proposed bridleway within the South Downs National Park has been downgraded to a footpath, excluding both equestrians and cyclists. Why is this? If you are looking at spend by vehicle against non-vehicular traffic I would imagine the proportion assigned to active travel is miniscule. I would therefore recommend ensuring all routes around the scheme are suitable for walking, cyclists and equestrians.	Y	<p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the current provisions and introduce new routes and connections. All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>The use of tactile paving (both blister and corduroy types) is also proposed to cater for the visually impaired, and wayfinding signage will also be provided along the footway/cycleway/bridleway routes as part of the Scheme proposal.</p>
Local community	Please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths	Y	NCN Route 23 would be upgraded. On both sides of the gyratory (east and west), the existing walking and cycling route which links both parts of Easton Lane, would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders would be improved with a widened 3m route (with 4m wide underpasses), which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway to enable rider dismounting for leading horses through to continue the route to the existing bridleway extent (which currently ceases within the existing roundabout). Future provision for horse-riders is allowed for (beyond the existing
Local community	Dedicated cycling and walking (separate if possible) routes to allow safe access from the Worthys / Itchen valley to Winnall and Bar end. The city has moved it's leisure centre south of junction 9 and the city centre is already busy. A dedicated safe route to allow youngsters to attend swimming and sports sessions would be a huge advantage to the whole community. The same families could benefit from access to the retail park in Winnall for work and shopping.	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Please consider cyclists and their needs to travel around safely.	Y	cessation point within the roundabout) by providing a wider 3m width bridge over the M3, and space for future mounting block provision either side of the western subway which would be sufficient to lead horses through.
Local community	The NCN cycle route through the junction forms an important link for commuters as well as being significant for tourism, and of course is a public bridleway with associated rights and duties. It is important that a route is maintained through the junction for cyclists and walkers. It is inevitable that there will be short closures of course, just as there will be for motor vehicles, but this should be the exception. Also, the cycle route is not a dumping ground for work materials, signage and so on. This happens too often.	Y	A new 3m wide combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. The route runs parallel to the west of the A33 with the route to be constructed within the existing verge. A signalised (unlit) Toucan crossing is proposed adjacent to the proposed National Highways depot roundabout, to provide a link to this route through the north-western side of the gyratory roundabout. The route then transitions to utilise the existing A34 northbound and A33 carriageways which are to be abandoned as part of the Scheme. The existing informal link to the existing PRow would also be upgraded from its connection to the A33.
Local community	I am concerned about the cycling routes that have been changed from the original plans, for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths. Please ensure that any upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 should meet the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20). It would be short-sighted not to include cycling preferentially in plans as we move towards carbon-neutrality in not so many years. We need to design our roads to consider how we will want to use them, not just how we want to use them with current makeup of traffic.	Y	For the first River Itchen crossing (i.e. most northern), the route follows the existing A33 and is accommodated on the existing bridge deck abandoned carriageway. For the second river crossing (i.e. most southern), the Scheme includes a new cycle/footbridge to be constructed across the River Itchen, with the route extending south along the east of the new A34 alignment, crossing under the A34 in a new 4m wide subway which would then traverse around new attenuation basins, then progressing to the existing depot junction and towards NCN Route 23 via a new subway under the northern arm of the gyratory roundabout. The new cycle/footbridge would be approximately 3.5m wide.
Local community	Cyclists - no route from Jn 9 to Kings Worthy	Y	Four proposed subways would be required to accommodate existing and improved provision of routes in the area. The two new subways at the gyratory roundabout would cater for existing users of NCN Route 23, one additional subway would link with the western walking and cycling route, while a subway under the A34 northbound catering for the pedestrian/cyclist users of the new route.
Local community	I'm disappointed that you've gone against your promises on providing decent and safe transport links for active and alternative transport- especially as the government aims to double cycling activity and reduce deaths and injuries on UK roads by 2025. Please can you restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths. This way we could encourage young children and students to cycle into Winchester for school, shopping and socialising. For adults it would be ideal for reducing the amount of traffic that is caused by short journeys for commuting and leisure. In Holland these routes between smaller settlements and cities are very common and they serve the population well. Children gain a sense of independence, improved physical fitness, mental health and wellbeing. It's also a great opportunity for walkers and horse riders to gain a quiet route away from the traffic too. As well as this, I would like to remind you that your upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 should meet the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20).	Y	The new subways would comprise of in-situ or precast reinforced concrete box structures. In-situ or precast reinforced concrete splayed wing walls are proposed on corners of the new subways. Lengths vary but the longest subway is approximately 28m length with a clear width of 4m with clear site lines to the exit to maximise user comfort and safety. Furthermore, all subways are to be appropriately lit during day time and night time hours.
Local community	Cycle access - these works offer a unique opportunity to link Kingsworthy and areas to the north and east of the city to Winnall (and beyond into Winchester city centre and the Bar End leisure centre) via an off-road cycle route. Plans to improve the NC route 23 must take into consideration safety concerns raised by local campaigners and meet the latest government design standards (LTN 1/20). This will support local and national government goals to promote active travel and reduce road traffic and air pollution.	Y	An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. The bridleway has been designed to a gradient of no more than 1:20. The route would be an unbound surface (i.e. crushed basalt or

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Routes for NMU's. Cycle and pedestrian routes should not mix, routes should be wide enough to allow two bikes to pass by each other on the path itself. The lack of cycle route north to Kings Worthy is a glaring omission. Winnall presents an excellent employment opportunity for residents in the area, since there is no public transport route this way, the only option to a vehicle is a bike or walking.	Y	similar) to allow for a free draining surface which is suitable for the range of users. A swale would be included adjacent to the path (on the upward side of the landform), to informally collect surface water (following heavy rainfall) to ensure the bridleway remains accessible. The route would provide for a varied visual experience for users accessing the South Downs National Park and connect to the wider rights of way network within improved access via the M3 Junction 9 gyratory.
Local community	It is highly disappointing that you have not even followed the promises given 2 years ago to include the building of cycle links between Winchester and Easton as well as Winnall and Kings Worthy. Why did you avoid working together with main local stakeholders like Cycle Winchester? The only work needed on this junction is to build barriers for noise and air pollution as well as building a proper cycle link to Easton.	Y	
Local community	There should be a focus on provision for cycling and equestrian infrastructure. New / widened carriageways should be discouraged, and focus also be made on noise and pollution barriers.	Y	
Local community	Yes - a green bridge for wildlife. Improve rather than downgrade cycle paths.	Y	
Local community	Reinstate safe and standards-compliant cycling routes.	Y	
Local community	Yes, upgrade the proposed new footpaths to cycle paths	Y	
Local community	Include much more importance to bicycle use and access.	Y	
Local community	You should abandon plans for new and wider carriageways and focus solely on constructing noise and pollution barriers, and on improving walking, cycling, and equestrian infrastructure to ensure the junction is no longer a barrier of any sort. In particular plans for cycling and pedestrian connections between King's Worthy and Winnall should revert to the previous plan, and more work needs to be done on the NCN 23 proposals. Effective noise and pollution barriers are needed especially to reduce conditions on footpaths and in housing to acceptable levels along the Itchen Valley to the north and south of the site at all points where the M3 and A34 are on embankments.	Y	
Local community	Yes, much better facilities for cyclists and horseriders. The current proposals are grossly inadequate.	Y	
Local community	Yes, cycle provision along the currently proposed pedestrian link from Kings Worthy to Winchester.	Y	
Local community	Stop this project and spend the money to help local people with noise barriers, better walking and cycling infrastructure. Please revert back to the plans for cycling and pedestrian connections between King's Worthy and Winnall in the previous plan and better integration of the NCN 23	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Climate change and the Covid pandemic, investment in public transport and prioritising cycling and walking over private vehicle traffic	N	Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate. During operation, the main source of greenhouse gas emissions is from end-user traffic. However, with the incorporation of enhancement planting, active travel routes encouraging sustainable modes of transport and technological changes including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the Scheme is not anticipated to have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon reduction targets and therefore, there would be no significant effect.
Local community	Stop construction. Start sorting out congestion properly by reducing car use. The only thing you could construct could be a safe cycle way & pathway	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	That the construction is on the edge of the National Park, and also the Winnall nature area. While the improvements to the junction are needed, it will impact the walking and cycling routes around the area quite heavily. For the Kings Worthy/Micheldever/Itchen villages/Alresford area, there will be an additional problem while construction is taking place...getting into Winchester. Recently HCC and WCC closed Hyde St, which was a main useful route into the City Centre for traffic coming down the Worthy Rd, and traffic has to go through the busy City Rd junction. This has already contributed to gridlocks in the City, and if access via Winnall is limited during construction of the new junction, this will have a big impact.	N	Potential impacts on PRoWs during the construction period have been assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) . Temporary diversions will be required during construction and this will be subject to design and approvals prior to construction commencing. Diversion Plans will be set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan . An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been prepared for the DCO application.
Local community	Cycling walking and the climate crisis	N	Specifically, Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate. During operation, the main source of greenhouse gas emissions is from end-user traffic. However, with the incorporation of enhancement planting, active travel routes encouraging sustainable modes of transport and technological changes including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the Scheme is not anticipated to have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon reduction targets and therefore, there would be no significant effect.
Local community	More information is needed on temporary and permanent impacts arising from the proposals, including in terms of noise impacts and noise mitigation. Additional noise reduction measures could beneficially be adopted as part of the scheme to reduce existing noise impacts on Kings Worthy from the combination of the M3, A33 and A34. It is not clear from the consultation material whether there are direct impacts (in terms of temporary diversion of closures of PROW) during the construction period. There is a very well used network of footpaths within the local area, including passing underneath the A33 and A34 from the Itchen Valley and Kings Worthy to Winchester and it is not clear if these	N	Potential impacts on PRoWs during the construction period have been assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) . Temporary diversions will be required during construction and this will be subject to design and approvals prior to construction commencing. Diversion Plans will be set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan . An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been prepared for the DCO application.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>will all remain open (even if temporarily locally diverted) during construction - they should be.</p> <p>It is not clear if there are any direct impacts in terms of loss of habitats associated with Winnall Moors during construction.</p>		
Local community	<p>Impact on local residents during construction, noise, light, disruption to local roads, paths, properties and businesses.</p> <p>Particularly, concerned about the amount of construction traffic that may use the lower end of Long Walk to access Northern Soil Dump. Long Walk is narrow and steep and unsuitable for heavy traffic. Using this route will also have an impact on Footpaths 20 and 21 and Restricted Byway 19. Preferred locations for spoil dump would be Central and Southern.</p> <p>Would there be scope for further infill in the field adjacent to the new path from Easton Lane to Long Walk, or an increase in the size of the bund?</p>	Y	<p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p> <p>Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and PRowWs are assessed in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). Specifically, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the effects of the Scheme in relation to noise. The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited as works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>
<p>D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure.</p>			
Local community	I think the need to sort out traffic congestion at this junction cancels out most other considerations. If you can improve walking and cycling access to Kings Worthy and Easton at the same time then brilliant.	Y	The Applicant has engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant has decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.
Local community	Please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths.	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust's nature reserve at St Catherine's Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally.</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network, as well as potentially impacting the ability of Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust to manage the nature reserve.</p>		<p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,7,17m in length
Local community	<p>The whole proposal is detrimental to the environment. You have not considered the overall and cultural environmental impacts - though, to be fair, the local impact is considered, but it is insignificant in the grand scheme.</p> <p>Some proposals have regressed since the 2019 proposal. For example, some cycle ways and bridle ways have been downgraded to foot ways. This is mean. In any case who would want to walk along a motorway ... a cycle way at least is quick!</p>	Y	
Local community	By removing cycle friendly access from Kings Worthy to Winnall you miss the opportunity to reduce vehicular traffic in the scheme. Make the proposed pedestrian route a cycle link and you can claim and deliver further carbon saving.	Y	
Local community	The cycle paths have been dropped. It must be a cycle route all the way to Kings Worthy to encourage active travel. It will never be possible to add a cycle route later. The path to long walk should be at least a bridle path to create a good recreational route on the edge of the city.	Y	
Local community	The plan does nothing to enable local residents to reduce local journeys because of the removal of the original proposed cycle path from King's worthy to Winnall.	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	A greater emphasis on facilitating active travel would reduce the number of car users for those shorter journeys.	N	The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes. In total, an additional 4.8km of public rights of way are to be provided as part of the Scheme.
Local community	Better consideration should be given to encouraging active travel, rather than just focussing on cars. Better consideration to where spoil is deposited	N	
Local community	<p>More information is needed on temporary and permanent impacts arising from the proposals, including in terms of noise impacts and noise mitigation. Additional noise reduction measures could beneficially be adopted as part of the scheme to reduce existing noise impacts on Kings Worthy from the combination of the M3, A33 and A34.</p> <p>It is not clear from the consultation material whether there are direct impacts (in terms of temporary diversion of closures of PROW) during the construction period. There is a very well used network of footpaths within the local area, including passing underneath the A33 and A34 from the Itchen Valley and Kings Worthy to Winchester and it is not clear if these will all remain open (even if temporarily locally diverted) during construction - they should be.</p> <p>It is not clear if there are any direct impacts in terms of loss of habitats associated with Winnall Moors during construction.</p> <p>It is not possible to currently conclude on the extent to which the proposals comply with the relevant National Policy Statement.</p>	N	<p>Potential impacts on PRoWs during the construction period have been assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). Temporary diversions will be required during construction and this will be subject to design and approvals prior to construction commencing.</p> <p>Diversion Plans will be set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan. An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been prepared for the DCO application.</p>
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	The biggest problem with these junctions and roads is the barriers it produces for cyclists, pedestrians and wildlife. I wholly don't support the expansion of the junction but any improvements should include dedicated cycle and walking and wildlife corridors. This could only be done with tunnels and bridges	Y	<p>The Applicant has engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant has decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,7,17m in length
Local community	I like the improved walking / cycle path; hopefully it extends all the way to the junction roundabout instead of stopping just before the highways maintenance buildings.	N	This comment has been noted.
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	My main interest is cycle routes around this junction: I don't have a car and I know that junctions are always ugly pollution generators.	N	This comment has been noted. Details of the proposed cycling routes are set out on the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Document Reference 2.4) .
Local community	<p>Needs to be more aware of conservation & protecting the environment. This is SSI, nature reserve, AONB you are talking about building on.</p> <p>There are rare plants in abundance, kingfishers, insect life all which help with the biodiversity. The rivers/streams are chalk alluvial rivers (which are 'a priority area for habitat under uk biodiversity action plan') there are 200 globally of which 85% are uk & a number in Hampshire. The area also has wetlands/water meadows & grassland - all host to flowers & invertebrates, birds & animals.</p> <p>Squeezing the SSI/nature reserves into smaller spaces & building more roads doesn't help. Demolishing ancient downs/grassland/wetlands/woodlands take many years (lifetimes to recover), planting a few sympathetic trees/ plants are not the solution when you have impacted things like chalk streams/rivers.</p> <p>Needs more footpaths joining areas together for local residents (the area should not just be a road junction & growing).</p> <p>Give local people access to the space without driving miles round Winchester. I remember as a resident, being easier to drive round Winchester via the motorway than walk into the city!!!!</p>	N	The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes. In total, an additional 4.8km of public rights of way are to be provided as part of the Scheme.
Local community	The landscape proposals will impact massively on the Itchen and its floodplain and will disturb wildlife to a massive degree. The proposed footpath to Long Walk is a positive proposal but outweighed massively by the rest of the scheme.	N	This comment has been noted.
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			
Local community	<p>Generally very positive. Two small comments:</p> <p>1. the underpass beneath the J9 roundabout looks very good although does</p>	Y	The Applicant has engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>the long loop on the western side make it too indirect? Will the path be well lit and overlooked to promote perception of safety?</p> <p>2. the abandoned A33 carriageway would be perfect as a cycleway not just a footway.</p>		<p>improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant has decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,7,17m in length <p>The Scheme only includes lighting of the underpasses, which would be designed to minimise light spill. The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved. This has been reduced in size as the design has developed and the provision of steps has been incorporated within the loop enabling a more direct and quicker route for pedestrians.</p>
Local community	The new proposals have scaled back the provision for cyclists and horse riders, thus encouraging more people to make local journeys by motor vehicle. There must be a proper, LTN 1/20 compliant, cycle route from Kings Worthy to Tesco, and again to Easton. The bridleway should be reinstated as well.	Y	
Local community	The proposed footpath from Easton Lane with Long Walk would in effect connect existing Bridleway 502 with Restricted Byway 19. The path should be created as a multi-use path and classified as a Bridleway (can be used by walkers, cyclists and horse-riders) or a Restricted Byway (can be used by walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and non-motorised vehicles/carriages) to only offer a footpath makes no sense at all when there is an opportunity to provide a safe off-road route for all users, connecting existing routes. The new Kingworthy footpath should be a cycle path.	Y	
Local community	I am sure that in one set of plans there was a cycle route to Kings Worthy. This appears to have been dropped in the new design which is not a great thing. To cycle that route now is unpleasant, there is a real opportunity to make some best in class active travel infrastructure to show what can be done. The path to long walk should not just be a footpath, there is an opportunity to create a circular route from the roundabout to long walk and back for cyclists but by making it just a footpath the opportunity is missed.	Y	
Local community	Provision for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders is inadequate	Y	
Local community	Earlier plans included bridleway & cycle path routes to Kings Worthy and Long Walk. The Kings Worthy is clearly a strategically important cycle route and downgrading it to a footpath seems an inexplicable idea and a waste of an obvious opportunity to provide routes between Kings Worthy and Winnall, and from there to leisure facilities at Bar End where the alternatives are very hostile. The Kings Worthy to Winnall route would be a valuable travel route for cycles but noisy as a leisure walk and too long to be much used as a route to walk as a means of travel. The downgrading of the footpath to bridleway is a wasted opportunity for a valuable leisure facility (for off-road cyclists as well as horses) with a minimal saving.	Y	
Local community	Once again pedestrians and cyclists have been made a secondary consideration to motor traffic.	Y	
Local community	There are mainly walking routes, what happened to the cycle routes that were in the initial plans?	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>I don't understand why the access to cyclists and horse-riders has been so drastically curtailed - can only assume this is a simple oversight. The 'new footpath Easton lane to long walk' connects with a bridleway (wrongly labelled as a footpath in your documents) on to Easton village and it makes no sense for this not to be available as a bridleway.</p> <p>The other new footway route along the scenic A34 seems to offer marginal benefit to pedestrians (who can already use Nun's Walk) while it could be a very useful link to Kings Worthy for cyclists who are otherwise limited to Worthy Road, which has high volumes of traffic and an inadequate shared pavement provision for cyclists.</p> <p>All of these routes will be mired with noise pollution and fumes, making it hard to imagine that they will be attractive for walkers.</p>	Y	
Local community	<p>The walking/footpath route on the old A33/A34 carriageway is a missed opportunity to create a facility for all non motorised users - this should be designed primarily for walkers and cyclists to create a valuable connection from Kings Worthy and beyond down the east side of Winchester to Winnal. The other existing routes along Worthy Road into Winchester are very poor and there is little scope for HCC to improve them so you must! A link into the Winnal trading estate for walkers and cyclists would be valuable in addition to the link to the NCN23 at the roundabout.</p>	Y	
Local community	<p>Downgrading the cyclepath to Kings Worthy to a footpath, with no cycle access (and no explanation for this decision) makes no sense. It is especially disappointing that this has occurred without warning and with no explanation, despite previous positive dialogue as part of the 2019 consultation round.</p> <p>Please reinstate this as a cycle path; it makes little sense as a footpath but has potential to be a very useful and well-used route commuter and utility route linking up settlements with key services in Winnall (and the city beyond), and offering an alternative to congested and dangerous inner-city routes with little or no cycle provision.</p> <p>The bridleway through the fields to Long Walk has also been downgraded to a footpath, with no access for cyclists or horse riders. Why?</p> <p>Questions raised about the design and safety of the NCR23 route plans have not been met.</p> <p>The above suggests that plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle are not being given the care and attention needed. Given the huge sums of money involved in the project overall, why not work with the walking, cycling and horse riding communities to commit what are very small sums of</p>	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	money to make positive change by implementing the previously consulted upon plans?		
Local community	The removal of the cycle routes from the schemes original proposal is very disappointing. The shared footpath from Kingsworthy to the junction at Winnall is not a safe proposal for either bicycles or pedestrians	Y	
Local community	I assume you mean cycles, looks ok.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	It is good to see connections being provided for non-motorised users. However, I do have two areas of concern. One, at the Junction 9 roundabout there is a 270-degree loop on the western side of the M3, clearly intended for passage of cyclists. However, this is a convoluted route for pedestrians, and pedestrians will follow path of least resistance. If a formal shortcut bypassing the loop is not provided, pedestrians will likely create their own cut through the soft estate. Two, I believe the footway between Easton Lane and King's Worthy should be a shared-use footway/cycleway facility.	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved. This has been reduced in size as the design has developed and the provision of steps has been incorporated within the loop enabling a more direct and quicker route for pedestrians. In addition, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route
Local community	Overall it's an excellent plan, my only request would be that the footpath route that's intended from Winnall to King's Worthy would be a joint path with cyclist access too. This would link up the cycle route between Easton and Winnall with the King's Worthy area and the bridleways/disused railways that are popular with cyclists there.	Y	The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route
Local community	You have chosen to not keep promises to build cycle links between Winall and Easton as well as Kings Worthy as was promised 2 years ago. This is highly disappointing particularly given how small the costs would have been compare to the overall scheme. It highlights that HE only cares about cars but not people who cycle or walk or use horses to ride.	Y	
Local community	You have only created a footpath link between Kings Worthy and Easton Lane when this should be a shared footpath/cycleway.	Y	
Local community	Suggest that the footpath along the A34 is upgraded to a shared cycle route the underpasses will make it almost impossible to cycle on the new A34 and A33 routes. Use footbridges instead of underpasses to route path over roads (underpasses are very intimidating to lone women and older people). Separate cycles from cars on the new bridges	Y	
Local community	The plan changes to the footpath to Kings Worthy have created a route which will not be readily upgraded to a much-needed local cycleway network. This is short sighted and amounts to poor planning.	Y	
Local community	The footpath which is shown running from Easton Lane to Kings Worthy must have a segregated cycle lane. For the vast majority of its length there is ample room, especially if you reduce the footprint of the A33 as suggested.	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Would like the new footpath link from A33 along the A34 to Easton Lane to also be a cycle route to join onto cycle route 23. That would provide great cycle access from Kings Worthy into the shops etc in Winnall.	Y	
Local community	Better walking/cycling paths, with a provision that they are maintained effectively, would be most welcomed.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	I cannot stress enough how important it is to use this opportunity to improve routes for cycling/scooting/skateboarding/mobility scooters/walking etc. It is really important that any new paths are wide enough to be multi-use - i.e. for both pedestrians and wheeled transport without a combustion engine! This will mean e.g. excellent signposting, shared routes but distinct surfaces for wheeled transport vs walkers/runners, appropriate bridges and underpasses. Please don't rely on the N23 meeting all the demand for cycling in the area! And don't forget that not everyone uses a bicycle or wants to walk – there is an increasingly wide range of options for people looking for zero carbon personal transport, including e-bikes, e-scooters, skateboards, skates, trikes, etc; and there is also a need to create safe off-road routes for wheelchair and mobility vehicle users. Please think very carefully about how to provide smooth, wide, shared paths for all these users – this is the future of transport in Britain and globally.	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved. This has been reduced in size as the design has developed and the provision of steps has been incorporated within the loop enabling a more direct and quicker route for pedestrians.</p> <p>In addition, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route.</p>
Local community	Leave that to people interested but the cost of any works to keep them happy should not be skimmed on.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Generally very favourable, but as a regular user of the cross M3 routes here: 1) Add cycling capability on new route to Kings Worthy 2) Add steps to remove the loop on the cycle path route for walkers on the western side of M3 3) Smooth / reduce the hill from the underpass on the eastern side of M3 4) Ensure same cycle and walker routes continue to be available during construction	Y	<p>The range of views expressed in this comment have been acknowledged.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. The provision of steps has also been incorporated within the loop enabling a more direct and quicker route for pedestrians. Temporary diversions will be required during construction and this will be subject to design and approvals prior to construction commencing.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	Good effort to include non-car routes - though I am curious as to just how many do pass through in such a way.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The footpaths need to be made into bridleways to allow for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.	Y	The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. Further details are provided in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) .
Local community	Cycling and pedestrians sharing space	N	This comment has been noted.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>I note that the cyclepath to Kings Worthy has been downgraded to a footpath, with no cycle access. Also, the bridleway through the fields to Long Walk has also been downgraded to a footpath, with no access for cyclists or horse riders. Another thing that's missing from the plans is any information at all about closures or diversions of the existing cycle route during the construction work should this go ahead, which would last three years. People who cycle are often commuters and are often missed out on vital communications about any changes to cycle paths.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has engaged with relevant local planning authorities, parish councils and walking, cycling and horse-riding groups to consider their suggestions for improving the provisions for non-motorised users.</p> <p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the current provisions and introduce new routes and connections. All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>I am content that you are making provision for non-vehicular travellers but I make the following points :</p> <p>(1). You show a spiral loop for the footway within the J9 roundabout. This will be tedious for non-wheelchair users compared with the present more direct but steeper route. Will you add in a more direct route avoiding the spiral for able-bodied walkers and cyclists?</p> <p>(2). You show a new footpath starting at the Tesco roundabout, skirting the M3 J9 roundabout, continuing alongside the A34 northbound slip, passing underneath it, and then continuing into King's Worthy along the route of the present northbound A33 carriageway.</p> <p>Will there be a foot connection with the Itchen Way which currently passes beneath the A34+A33 northbound carriageway.?</p> <p>It is not clear to me that there will be a high demand for this route by pedestrians. Leisure walkers are likely to be deterred by its proximity to busy roads. It will be a long walk from King's Worthy to Tesco and other commercial developments in the Winnall area, and I cannot see there being a demand for people to walk this route for shopping purposes etc.. On the other hand, cycle access between King's Worthy and Winchester is appalling at present, so making this a cycle/e-scooter route could serve a really useful purpose for those heading for the Winnall area.</p>	Y	<p>The use of tactile paving (both blister and corduroy types) is also proposed to cater for the visually impaired, and wayfinding signage will also be provided along the footway/cycleway/bridleway routes as part of the Scheme proposal.</p> <p>NCN Route 23 would be upgraded. On both sides of the gyratory (east and west), the existing walking and cycling route which links both parts of Easton Lane, would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders would be improved with a widened 3m route (with 4m wide underpasses), which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway to enable rider dismounting for leading horses through to continue the route to the existing bridleway extent (which currently ceases within the existing roundabout). Future provision for horse-riders is allowed for (beyond the existing cessation point within the roundabout) by providing a wider 3m width bridge over the M3, and space for future mounting block provision either side of the western subway which would be sufficient to lead horses through.</p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. The route runs parallel to the west of the A33 with the route to be constructed within the existing verge. A signalised (unlit) Toucan crossing is proposed adjacent to the proposed National Highways depot roundabout, to provide a link to this route through the north-western side of the gyratory roundabout. The route then transitions to utilise the existing A34 northbound and A33 carriageways which are to be abandoned as part of the Scheme. The existing informal link to the existing PRow would also be upgraded from its connection to the A33.</p>
Local community	<p>The new footpath on the western side of the junction needs to be a cycle route as well, to provide a link between King's Worthy and Winnall. Could it also be moved away from the A34 carriageway (e.g. through the trees between the two A34 carriageways) to create a pleasanter route?</p>	Y	<p>For the first River Itchen crossing (i.e. most northern), the route follows the existing A33 and is accommodated on the existing bridge deck abandoned carriageway. For the second river crossing (i.e. most southern), the Scheme includes a new cycle/footbridge to be constructed across the River Itchen, with the route extending south along the east of the new A34 alignment, crossing under the A34 in a new 4m wide subway which would then traverse around new attenuation basins, then progressing to the existing depot junction and towards NCN Route 23 via a new</p>
Local community	<p>See earlier comments-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. cycle footways should not be mixed 2. Need cycle way to the Worthys for all users North/east/west of the Cart and Horses junction (B3047) 3. All cycle ways to be wide enough to allow to opposing cycles to pass 	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	4, Potential of board walk over Winnall for excellent cycling away from the road and in good air quality, appreciation of water meadows.		subway under the northern arm of the gyratory roundabout. The new cycle/footbridge would be approximately 3.5m wide.
Local community	We would expect the design of the walking and cycling links to conform to the latest LTN 1/20 design standards. People walking should not be put into conflict with people cycling so high quality separated infrastructure is preferable. Any shared use routes should be wide enough to comfortably accommodate people walking and cycling. NCN23 Walking and Cycling signage should be clear and easy to read, with destinations showing the links to Southampton. This could form part of promotion and publicity campaign to promote this as a high quality leisure route that attracts cycle tourism to the area. HE could explore opportunities to work with Sustrans, HCC and Winchester City Council, to improve other links along NCN23.	Y	<p>Four proposed subways would be required to accommodate existing and improved provision of routes in the area. The two new subways at the gyratory roundabout would cater for existing users of NCN Route 23, one additional subway would link with the western walking and cycling route, while a subway under the A34 northbound catering for the pedestrian/cyclist users of the new route.</p> <p>The new subways would comprise of in-situ or precast reinforced concrete box structures. In-situ or precast reinforced concrete splayed wing walls are proposed on corners of the new subways. Lengths vary but the longest subway is approximately 28m in length with a clear width of 4m with clear site lines to the exit to maximise user comfort and safety. Furthermore, all subways are to be appropriately lit during day time and night time hours.</p>
Local community	The proposed footpaths should be upgraded to cycle paths. A lot of people use the area for cycling and more people want to cycle, but the link from the Itchen Valley requires the negotiation of the notoriously tricky Cart and Horses junction on the A33 and/or Winnall roundabout. Upgrading the footpaths to cycle paths would give a safer link to promote cycling, as well as for those with reduced mobility and parents with small children.	Y	<p>An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. The bridleway has been designed to a gradient of no more than 1:20. The route would be an unbound surface (i.e. crushed basalt or similar) to allow for a free draining surface which is suitable for the range of users. A swale would be included adjacent to the path (on the upward side of the landform), to informally collect surface water (following heavy rainfall) to ensure the bridleway remains accessible. The route would provide for a varied visual experience for users accessing the South Downs National Park and connect to the wider rights of way network within improved access via the M3 Junction 9 gyratory.</p>
Local community	<p>E : New paths</p> <p>(1) The proposed new footpath between Easton Lane and Long Walk, across the shoulder of Easton Down (east side of M3) is a welcome addition to the footpath network in the vicinity of J9 - an area I have walked frequently over many years.</p> <p>Although no public footpath currently exists on this line, I have walked most of the suggested footpath route. From this experience it is clear the new path would be subject to significant traffic noise coming from the adjacent M3, A34, and associated slip roads. Such noise intrusion on this path would be unavoidable - whatever mitigation measures were put in place - but, despite the likely noise levels, the path is still one I would use and value during recreational walks in the area.</p> <p>I welcome this proposed eastern path.</p> <p>From the plans, it seems this path would be largely screened by earthworks and vegetation from the M3 and A34. While this is an understandable design feature, such screening would also block views west across the Itchen valley for people using the path. On some of the more elevated sections of this path I would welcome walkers having the benefit of distant views west across the Itchen valley, even if this meant reduced screening from the roads below.</p> <p>My experience is that walks with an open aspect are much more enjoyable than paths which are completely screened. Please arrange for some open</p>	Y	<p>Potential impacts on PRowWs during the construction period have been assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). Temporary diversions will be required during construction and this will be subject to design and approvals prior to construction commencing. Diversion Plans will be set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan. An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been prepared for the DCO application.</p> <p>Further details are provided in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>views to the west along the elevated sections of this path.</p> <p>Also, my preference for this eastern footpath would be for it to be reserved for pedestrians only. There is already an existing suitable paved alternative route available for cyclists via Easton Lane and Long Walk. Horses using footpaths inevitably damage the path surface, to the detriment of pedestrians. Also, I have rarely if ever seen horses being ridden in the vicinity of J9 - and there is no pre-existing network of bridleways in the J9 area that would be enhanced by this path being designated as a bridleway. Please keep this proposed eastern path as a footpath only.</p> <p>(2) The proposed new footway route on the west side of the M3 / A34, between Tesco's roundabout (Easton Lane) and Kings Worthy, would provide a useful and worthwhile link making effective use of the abandoned stretch of northbound A33 carriageway. However, it is difficult to see why this route is not proposed as a shared footpath and cycleway.</p> <p>The western route is one which cyclists from the north and west sides of Winchester would find very useful for reaching the eastern side of the town (especially the retail and employment areas of Winnall) without having to use the congested central town area. I would like to see this western route constructed as a shared cycle/pedestrian route.</p> <p>(3) Also, as a footnote to both these proposed new routes for people travelling through the area other than by vehicle - could they be given official names? Naming paths helps identify them and raise public awareness - the local parish councils could undoubtedly suggest suitable and appropriate names if approached.</p>		
Local community	<p>The Consultation Summary document states that there were supportive comments on all of the WCH routes proposed in the scheme. The main WCH route linking Kings Worthy with Winnall and the NCN 23 seems however to have been removed. Even though WCC/HCC's Infrastructure wish list clearly includes a cycle path from the Worthy's to join NCN 23 at Winnall.</p> <p>As a local cyclist I would use a cycle route from Kings Worthy to and through junction 9. To for example shop at Winnall and for onwards travel to Winchester and the NCN 23 in both directions. A cycle path would link Kings Worthy with the leisure centre and HWRC using the existing route to Highcliffe.</p> <p>The current options for the journey are the B3047 which for a significant</p>	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>section has a 60mph speed limit and feels particularly unsafe during rush hour, followed by the NCN 23. The other alternative is to use the Worthy Lane cycle route which as a dual purpose route often causes conflict, followed by Winchester's busy one way system and the NCN 23 through Winnall.</p> <p>The current proposals fly in the face of sustainable transport and carbon footprint reduction. I can see no reason not to have the proposed footpath link as a bridleway link to enable all forms of non-motorised travel.</p> <p>As a final comment, I would like to propose that the underpasses for the non-motorised traffic are actually bridges as underpasses can be scary places to travel through as they are dark and encourage crime.</p>		
Local community	<p>I'm really disappointed that the most recent version of the plans has downgraded provision for cycling and for the planned bridleway. I'm always sceptical about road improvement projects because in the long run they have always ended up generating even more congestion. In this case I was ready to be persuaded because the plans included measures that would have made cycling easier, by opening access to the Itchen Valley and to Kings' Worthy that is currently really tricky.</p> <p>The original shared cycle-footpath to Kings' Worthy has been downgraded to a footpath; this will save a tiny, tiny amount from a massive budget and yet produce something of a white elephant: it's hardly going to be a beautiful place for a stroll, but would be a fantastic commuter route for bikes. Therefore, please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths.</p> <p>I do believe that road improvements can be mitigated by trying to make moving around as easy as possible for those of us who cannot drive, or who do not have access to a car. That means paying as much attention to cycle routes as to motorway lanes. To this end, please also ensure that the upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 meets the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20) on this.</p> <p>The changes to Jcn 9 will largely benefit people from outside the area, who are rushing through it to get to somewhere else. There are no advantages to anyone having to live close to a huge junction. However, if there are measures that think carefully about everyone, not just a token gesture to pedestrians, the impact can be mitigated. Please restore the cycle route and bridleway!</p>	Y	
Local community	<p>I'm disappointed that you've gone against your promises on providing decent and safe transport links for active and alternative transport- especially as the government aims to double cycling activity and reduce deaths and injuries on UK roads by 2025. Please can you restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just</p>	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>footpaths. This way we could encourage young children and students to cycle into Winchester for school, shopping and socialising. For adults it would be ideal for reducing the amount of traffic that is caused by short journeys for commuting and leisure. In Holland these routes between smaller settlements and cities are very common and they serve the population well. Children gain a sense of independence, improved physical fitness, mental health and wellbeing. It's also a great opportunity for walkers and horse riders to gain a quiet route away from the traffic too.</p> <p>As well as this, I would like to remind you that your upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 should meet the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20).</p>		
Local community	While I support the idea of improving pedestrian and cycle routes they are not something I would be likely to use.	Y	
Local community	The cycle route through the junction is far from ideal.	Y	
Local community	I believe there should be more cycle lanes	Y	
Local community	Foot and cycle routes should be improved. New western is a good idea.	Y	
Local community	<p>I'm not sure whether "not travelling through the area by vehicle" includes cyclists & horse riders. If so:</p> <p>Please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths.</p>	Y	
Local community	It's not clear why the proposed footpath routes cannot be used by cyclists as well.	Y	
Local community	Although the plans for a new footpath from Kings Worthy to Winnall are good - we need it to be a CYCLE ROUTE - in this era where we need to reduce the amount of motorised traffic it's essential that this links to Winnall is cycle friendly.	Y	
Local community	The cycle ways across the junction and to Kingsworthy have been downgraded to footways.	Y	
Local community	As a walker I see little advantage in what is proposed over the existing pedestrian/cycle route through the junction to Easton Lane on the eastern side of the motorway. I am particularly concerned about disruption to that route during the construction phase of the project.	Y	
Local community	I'm sorry to see the abandonment of the plans for a new cycle route and a new bridleway, reducing the options for cycling back to the bare minimum. Please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	The area is not looking too inviting for cyclists travelling from A33 and A34 to Winchester.	Y	
Local community	I like the plans for new footpaths	Y	
Local community	Again you have not adequately considered sustainable travel modes. There should be a much better segregated cycling (not just walking) connections between Winnall and King's Worthy, in line with Local Transport Note 1/20. The bridleway through the fields to Long Walk needs to be reinstated. The traffic -free cycle path NCN23 should be designed with input from the local Cycling UK (Winchester CTC) a group who understand the local cycling needs better than anyone. Highways England should adopt a positive approach to the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and horseriders rather than the current approach designed to try and get away with the absolute bare minimum.	Y	
Local community	Steps taken are nominal and nowhere near sufficient. Footpaths along the Itchen Valley will have to contend with a new layer of noise pollution and fumes without substantial sound and pollution barriers. Failure to retain the proposal for a cycle route between King's Worthy and Winnall, and poor design of the revised NCN23 are deeply disappointing given the budget for this project. The walking route from King's Worthy will be horrifically dominated by speeding traffic and should be diverted away from the roads wherever possible e.g. by using the road to the west of Homebase. Footpath interconnections between the new path and the existing footpath network are poor and dysfunctional. Concessions to the horse-riding community should not have been abandoned.	Y	
Local community	In the earlier consultation it was agreed (and is shown in the plans) for a pedestrian/cycleway route to Kingsworthy. This is now shown as a 'footway'. Please re-instate this as a pedestrian/cycleway. Why you have used the terms 'footpath' and 'footway route' without definition, which is confusing and unhelpful.	N	Details of the Applicant's terminology to describe walking, cycling and horse-riding routes is set out in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1) .
Local community	Doesn't even touch the surface of what needs to be done. Totally inadequate	Y	The Applicant has engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant has decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has revised the design to incorporate additional cycling provisions. The footpath on the western side of the
Local community	More cycling provision is needed	Y	
Local community	The cycle route across the junction is a welcome improvement, but the opportunity to upgrade the Winnall/Kings Worthy footway to a cycleway should be taken. I am not sure of the need for an additional footpath route along the east boundary to Long Walk, as there is already an adjacent footpath route from Long Walk under the M3 and back through Kings Worthy and Nuns' Walk	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	or alongside the industrial estate to Winnall. Opportunity could also be taken to remedy the earthworks failure beside the west side.		<p>junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,7,17m in length
Local community	There needs to be a safe cycle route from the junction to Kingsworthy. Also I thought there was meant to be a new bridleway on the Easton side of the junction. I often use long walk/Easton lane to cycle to work at the fire station which is that end of town.	Y	
Local community	Total disregard in the current proposals for improving links for cyclists to Kingsworthy and Longwalk. It is a missed opportunity , Highways England have made a U turn on their earlier promise.	Y	
Local community	<p>Why have you abandoned the previous proposals for a cycle way between Kingsworthy to and Winnall? It was probably the only good things on the whole proposal.</p> <p>The proposed footpath route is so close to the traffic that it will be unpleasant, noisy, pollute the air, and thus it's not a useful amenity at all.</p> <p>The M3 should be destroyed. If not, it should be or put into a tunnel to prevent its noise and pollution affecting people who travel in more planet-friendly ways.</p>	Y	
Local community	It is ridiculous that the plan for a cycle path to Kings Worthy has not been included. The current alternative path is dangerous and this was the perfect solution. Many people commute to Kings Worthy and would be able to safely use this for shopping, leisure and travel to employment. The original plan needs to be reinstated to include this and the bridle way to Long walk, with the upgrade meeting latest government guidance.	Y	
Local community	Initial proposal included a comprehensive network of cycle ways which are being scaled down to footpaths which in reality would be best hated by bicycles and e scooters. Need to include safe efficient travel options to further reduce density of local traffic making short journeys.	Y	
Local community	There is pedestrian access, but not cyclist access.	Y	
Local community	<p>The originally proposed cycle path from Kingsworthy to Winnall must be reinstated in the plans. The additional cost would be a fraction of the overall scheme cost. This path would enable people in Kingsworthy to cycle to the new leisure centre. Having this path as a footpath only is a total waste. Few, if any people would walk along that route.</p> <p>The only way to address pollution levels is to make cars less attractive and sustainable transport such as cycling more attractive. This requires a network of segregated cycle lanes as seen in the Netherlands. The Dutch achieved</p>	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	their wonderful network by investing in cycle lanes, not spending billions on cars and penny pinching on cycling.		
Local community	Cycle path needed from Jn 9 to Kings worthy	Y	
Local community	Please can you reinstate the cycle route from Winchester to Kings Worthy and make sure all cycle routes to government standard LTN 20	Y	
Local community	Not good enough	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	If these changes were not made the changes for walkers and cyclists would not be needed.	N	This comment has been noted
Local community	There seems to be an adequate provision for cycling and walking.	N	The Applicant has acknowledged this comment.
Local community	Improvements to NCN 23 will enhance access to Winchester for cyclists, please work with Winchester CC to connect improve the local cycle infrastructure.	N	The Applicant has acknowledged this comment. The Applicant has engaged with a range of local walking, cycling and horse-riding groups throughout the Scheme development to discuss and refine provisions for non-motorised users.
Local community	Please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths	Y	The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.
Local community	Please provide safe, convenient (I.e.no cyclists dismount signs) cycling and walking routes from Winchester to Kings Worthy and Easton so that I and my family do not have to use our car if we do not want to. Please also provide a bridleway through the fields to Long Walk. The proper design and implementation of these routes would surely be a fraction of the cost of the project so please, please design and implement these to the latest and highest government standards.	Y	<p>The Applicant has engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant has decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme will be retained and upgraded. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCN Route 23, with a widened 4m underpass and 3m route either side of the M3 junction 9 gyratory. • A new minimum 3m wide (increasing to 4m) combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. • An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.
General commentary			

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	The design of the scheme appears to have continuously improved with each iteration, to the point that the latest proposal is a really good one that is not compromised. As mentioned, I feel some very minor tweaks to the non-motorised user provisions are needed, but this scheme will be a major improvement both for local and long distance users.	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,7,17m in length
Local community	Needs a post pandemic assessment on "new" traffic volume to understand viability. Needs to focus on enabling cycling and walking as an alternative to car use (rather than starting with the aim of increasing the speed of traffic)	Y	The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes. In total, an additional 4.8km of public rights of way are to be provided as part of the Scheme.
Local community	I think this is an excellent, creative, 3-dimensional scheme which will make it safer for everyone who drives though M3 Junction 9. I like the proposed footpaths and cycleways too and think you have made great efforts to minimise environmental disruption.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	<p>I think the latest design with its direct safe link from J9 to the A33 Kings Worthy is a great improvement and I am pleased that you are now proposing this design</p> <p>Some points of detail:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is of critical importance that the road route between Kings Barton development and J9 through the Cart and Horses junction be improved in order to meet the requirement, stated at the Barton Farm Public Inquiry, that this would be the route rather than a route through the City Centre. I ask that you work closely with HCC to provide improvements to the A33 Cart and Horses junction to achieve this. The footway proposed between Kings Worthy and J9 should be a joint shared footway and cycleway to provide a direct route between Kings 	Y	<p><i>In relation to point 1:</i></p> <p>The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.</p> <p><i>In relation to point 2:</i></p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p><i>In relation to point 3:</i></p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Worthy and Winnall and onward destinations. A cycle route requiring cyclists to use the J9 gyratory is not safe and is not acceptable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The shared footway and cycleway through J9 should have a pedestrian barrier on the at-grade section immediately adjacent to the gyratory roadway to prevent pedestrians and cyclists accidentally moving onto the roadway. 4. There should be an approved Diversion Plan published by Highways England for when sections of the A34 and/or M3 are closed for maintenance or due to accidents. This Plan should ensure that traffic is not diverted through Winchester City Centre or along Andover Road and through the Kings Barton residential area. 		<p>The footway/cycleway through Junction 9 will have a form of separation by means of a Vehicle Restraint System.</p> <p><i>In relation to point 4:</i></p> <p>Diversion Plans will be set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan. An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been prepared for the DCO application.</p>
Local community	<p>I previously objected very strongly to the 2019 proposals and was particularly concerned about the proposed off-side diverge off the A34 for the northbound A33 local traffic which, of course, is contrary to DMRB advice. I am very pleased you have changed that layout and now the proposal is for a separate route for northbound and southbound A33 / local traffic. I note you have also changed the previous proposal for a dumb-bell layout of the actual junction 9 that is a great improvement, although it is sad that you cannot retain the two original bridges- I understand the span is insufficient to accommodate the 10 lanes of M3 and slip roads.</p> <p>I have some comments on particular design details but overall, I comment the present proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the proposed footway between junction 9 and Kings Worthy utilising part of the abandoned A33 northbound carriageway should be widened from 2m to 3.5m to become a joint footway /cycleway otherwise cyclists will have to use the new local road, part of which will be used by vehicles heading northbound for the M3. 2. the southbound entry to the new junction 9 roundabout seems unduly complicated. Do the combined traffic flows from the southbound exiting M3 traffic and the southbound exiting A34 traffic really justify a segregated left turn arrangement? 3. the proposed Easton footway /cycleway where it passes into the inside of the junction 9 roundabout (on the west side) where you show a 270° loop should have some pedestrian steps where it comes out of the underpass, otherwise all pedestrians will have to walk the extra 150m around the loop. Clearly cyclists and the mobility impaired will walk all around the gently sloping loop but many walkers will just climb up the bank. 	Y	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments.</p> <p><i>In relation to point 1:</i></p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane.</p> <p><i>In relation to point 2:</i></p> <p>The proposed segregated left turn lane has been omitted as part of ongoing scheme development and further analysis of traffic flows.</p> <p><i>In relation to point 3:</i></p> <p>The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved. This has been reduced in size as the design has developed and the provision of steps has been incorporated within the loop enabling a more direct and quicker route for pedestrians.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14), Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	<p>I was really disappointed to read that Highways England have backtracked on their plans to build a really decent cycle way and bridle way between Kingsworthy and Winchester. I know that you are not the MP for that area but</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>this seems to be a really kick in the teeth for the governments plans to get people on active and alternative transport by 2025. As well as that the traffic that affects that junction then affects the traffic in and around Eastleigh- and any opportunity to free up cars from that area to support towns and cities further up and down the M3 corridor should be embraced. This is the full story below: https://cyclewinchester.org.uk/updates/m3-junction-9-highways-england-u-turns-on-cycleways https://cyclewinchester.org.uk/updates/m3-junction-9-highways-england-u-turns-on-cycleways/</p> <p>I'm disappointed that Highways England have gone against their promises on providing decent and safe transport links for active and alternative transport- especially as the government aims to double cycling activity and reduce deaths and injuries on UK roads by 2025. Please can you put pressure on them to restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths. This way we could encourage young children and students to cycle into Winchester for school, shopping and socialising. For adults it would be ideal for reducing the amount of traffic that is caused by short journeys for commuting and leisure. In Holland these routes between smaller settlements and cities are very common and they serve the population well. Children gain a sense of independence, improved physical fitness, mental health and wellbeing. It's also a great opportunity for walkers and horse riders to gain a quiet route away from the traffic too.</p> <p>As well as this, I would appreciate it if you could look into whether their new design for the upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 would meet the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20).</p>		<p>consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length
Local community	As long as the access along Sustrans Route 23 to/from Easton Lane is preserved, and preferably retaining no need to stop at traffic lights, it looks like a very good plan.	Y	A Footway/Cycleway now proposed as part of ongoing scheme development. Access to/from Easton Lane to NCN Route 23 will be preserved as part of the Scheme proposal.
Local community	<p>Regarding the two proposed new footpaths in the scheme (1) from Kings Worthy to Winnall and (2) from Easton Lane to Long Walk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These should both be upgraded to accept cycles, for the safety of riders keeping them separate from busy vehicular traffic routes • Cycling as a means of transport was growing significantly before the pandemic but with the reassessment of working patterns this growth will hasten ,underlying the need for greater provision. • The route from Kings Worthy to Winnall would provide an important link to the ""Hub"" of stand-alone retail outlets - including a major Superstore - as well as a southerly route to the new Sports Centre via an existing cycling path ; and a national cycling route (23) to the South Downs National Park to the east..So strategically this is an important proposal. 	Y	<p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The route from Easton Lane to Long Walk would be a useful circular path for both local cyclists and walkers looking to redirect away from the city/M3 amongst the villages ,and so would be an enhancement to the existing road network. Additional costs for the upgrade to accept Cyclists would be small within the context of the whole scheme, whilst the potential benefits would continue to deliver for future decades. 		Further details are set out in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) .
Local community	<p>The footpaths and cycleways need to be wide enough to accommodate both cyclists and walkers and well separated from the traffic. If net zero CO₂ is to be achieved then walking and cycling need to be made as attractive as possible.</p> <p>The plans for the spoil are not clear - topsoil is valuable and should not be simply piled up on the chalk downland. It is vital that the precious habitat of the River Itchen is not damaged by the construction work, or by run-off from the roads once built - bearing in mind the likely increase in periods of very heavy rainfall as the climate becomes more volatile.</p> <p>The construction work will need to be very carefully managed because the volume of traffic already going through this junction is high and disruption will cause major problems.</p> <p>Would the £175M be better spend on improving rail networks so that freight can travel by rail instead of by road - combined with charging freight for the CO₂ impact of its transport?</p> <p>While construction work is being undertaken the different bodies should cooperate to sort out for the dangerous Cart and Horses junction of the B3047 and the A33. The public, do not see why each body has to operate independently and take turns digging up the road, instead of doing it all on a sensible schedule.</p>	Y	The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.
British Horse Society	<p>The following comments on behalf of the British Horse Society (BHS) relate to provisions for walking, cycling and horse-riding (WCH) which are set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and the Walking and Cycling Proposals Plan and were discussed at a meeting between walking, cycling and horse-riding representatives, South Downs National Park Authority and the Volker Fitzpatrick Engagement Team on 2 July.</p> <p>As the biggest UK charity representing the interests of equestrians, the Society's main concerns are as follows:</p> <p>1. Winchester Bridleway no. 520 within the existing and proposed roundabout</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the provision of National Cycle Network Route 23. On both sides of the gyratory (east and west), the existing walking and cycling route which links both parts of Easton Lane, would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. The existing provision for horse-riders is being retained, and as part of the Scheme would be improved with a widened 3m route (with 4m wide underpasses), which includes mounting blocks provided either side of</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>It is correctly identified in the PEIR (paragraph 2.1.3) that “...<i>Junction 9 of the M3 is specifically highlighted as being a location where there is a substantial barrier to connectivity in relation to the SDNP and walking, cycling and horse-riding (WCH).</i>”</p> <p>The BHS welcomes, therefore, the intention (para 2.4.27) to improve existing provision for horse-riders within the roundabout and subways and to allow for future provision by providing a wider bridge over the M3. The proposed width of 3 metres for this element of the scheme, however, is too narrow. The BHS recommends a minimum useable width of 3 metres for a bridleway. Three metres is adequate for an unenclosed path in open countryside, however a bridleway enclosed by fencing or other boundary (such as a vehicle barrier or subway wall) requires an additional 0.5 metres at least each side because the body of the horse plus riders’ legs take up a far greater width than at ground level.</p> <p>For the safety and convenience of all users in this provision for future access, the width of the enclosed elements of the WCH route within the roundabout and over the bridge should be a minimum of 4 metres.</p> <p>2. Path linking Winchester Bridleway no. 502/Easton Lane with Itchen Valley Restricted Byway no. 19 and Long Walk</p> <p>This bridleway was included in the 2019 WCH scheme on the recommendation of the South Downs National Park Authority to connect two existing equestrian routes and provide a pleasant off-road recreational route within the National Park boundary for walkers, horse riders and cyclists. It was the only element within the earlier scheme that offered any meaningful mitigation to horse riders for loss of connectivity within the off-road riding network.</p> <p>We are dismayed therefore to see that the current proposal has downgraded this route to footpath status, without any explanation or rationale for the change.</p> <p>When we asked about this at the meeting on 2 July, we were told that this could only be a footpath as it would not be possible to meet the requirements for surfacing and achieve the necessary gradients, which we were told had to be not greater than 1 in 20. I am nonplussed by this specification, which bears no relation to our own guidance and indicates a profound lack of understanding of the design requirements for a bridleway.</p> <p>a) Surfacing – many bridleways have a natural surface, which within Hampshire is often simply trodden earth. Additional surfacing is generally only necessary on heavy, clay soils or where a path is inadequately drained and/or heavily used. Where it is required, there are a range of lowcost solutions, details of which are set out both in BHS advice leaflet on Surfaces (www.bhs.org.uk/accessadvice) and in</p>		<p>the eastern subway to enable rider dismounting for leading horses through to continue the route to the existing bridleway extent (which currently ceases within the existing roundabout). Should a future and separate proposal come forward to lengthen the bridleway provision across the M3, the Scheme facilitates this by including a wider bridge over the M3 for a 3m width route, and space for future mounting block provision either side of the western subway so that horse-riders could dismount after leading horses through the subway. It should be noted that any future provision for horseriders would also require the bridge parapet height to be raised.</p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway, footpath and cycle track for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Tesco’s situated on Easton Lane. The route runs parallel to the west of the A33 with the route to be constructed within the existing verge. A signalised (unlit) Toucan crossing is proposed adjacent to the proposed National Highways depot roundabout, to provide a link to this route through the north-western side of the gyratory roundabout. The route then transitions to utilise the existing A34 northbound and A33 carriageways which are to be abandoned as part of the Scheme. The existing informal link to the existing Public Right of Way (PRoW) would also be upgraded from its connection to the A33. For the first River Itchen crossing (i.e. most northern), the route follows the existing A33 and is accommodated on the existing bridge deck abandoned carriageway.</p> <p>For the second river crossing (i.e. most southern), the Scheme includes a new cycle/footbridge to be constructed across the River Itchen, with the route extending south along the east of the new A34 alignment, crossing under the A34 in a new 4m wide subway which would then traverse around new attenuation basins, then progressing to the existing depot junction and towards NCN 23 via a new subway under the northern arm of the gyratory roundabout. The new cycle/footbridge would be approximately 3.5m wide.</p> <p>Four proposed subways would be required to accommodate existing and improved provision of routes in the area. The two new subways at the gyratory roundabout would cater for existing users of NCN Route 23, one additional subway would link with the western walking and cycling route, while a subway under the A34 northbound catering for the pedestrian/cyclist users of the new route.</p> <p>An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. The bridleway has been designed in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges document CD143 ‘Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding’, which states that the minimum 2-way width (where horses are expected to pass each other) is 3.0 metres. The bridleway has been designed to a gradient of no more than 1:20.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>the Hampshire Countryside Service Design Standards (https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/countryside/designstandards). In the general scope of this major infrastructure scheme, costs for this would be below the level of resolution.</p> <p>b) Gradients – BHS advice (www.bhs.org.uk/accessadvice) states that <i>“Steep gradients are not a limiting factor for horse use and should be considered as for pedestrians where variation in experience and agility mean some people will choose to use certain steep routes or not. In natural terrain, the feasibility of any gradient is up to the judgement of the individual.</i></p> <p><i>For general purposes of a built path, such as a ramp for a bridge, a gradient of 1 in 12 is the ideal maximum for horse use, which may also be useable by people in mobility scooters or similar, although lower ramps for the latter are preferred. This does not apply to natural terrain where gradients of 1 in 3 or steeper are possible for some horses and riders.”</i></p> <p>We see no reason therefore why Highways England considers it to be feasible to provide a satisfactory footpath to the east of the M3 between Easton Lane and Long Walk, yet impossible to provide a bridleway between these existing equestrian routes. Even if the path were to require surfacing to support equestrians and cyclists as well as pedestrian use, the cost of this would be negligible in relation to the overall cost of this project.</p> <p>These are important considerations for local equestrians, and we ask that Highways England continue to engage with the BHS on these aspects of the Junction 9 improvement scheme.</p>		<p>Further details are set out in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Cycle Winchester	<p>NC23</p> <p>We welcome the continued inclusion of this route in the plan. It’s a vital link between Winchester and the communities of the Itchen Valley. It also provides recreational access to the country lanes and bridleways and to the South Downs National Park more widely. It is already well-used by local cyclists, with peak time usage of up to 50 per hour¹ despite the current cyclist-hostile arrangements on the overbridge. However many local people are unaware of it and many others are put off by the narrow overbridge section, tight bends and poor sightlines. If the new path is properly designed, built and signed then we expect to see a substantial increase in usage.</p> <p>We are therefore concerned that the project team has declined to make a commitment to build this path to the latest LTN 1/20 standards. These standards are mandated by DfT for any project it funds (not just local authority projects). If this were a minor alteration to an existing route then there might be a case for bending the standards; as it is, it’s effectively a new build and there</p>	Y	<p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the current provisions and introduce new routes and connections. All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT’s inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>The use of tactile paving (both blister and corduroy types) is also proposed to cater for the visually impaired, and wayfinding signage will also be provided along the footway/cycleway/bridleway routes as part of the Scheme proposal.</p> <p>NCN Route 23 would be upgraded. On both sides of the gyratory (east and west), the existing walking and cycling route which links both parts of Easton Lane, would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders would be improved with a widened 3m route (with 4m wide underpasses), which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway to enable rider dismounting for leading horses through to continue the route to the existing bridleway extent (which currently ceases within the existing roundabout). Future provision for horse-riders is allowed for (beyond the existing</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>is no reason to produce anything substandard. In the context of the overall costs of the project, the difference in cost between a to-standard cycleway and a substandard one must surely be trivial.</p> <p>At the launch presentation for this consultation round, one member of the project team suggested that LTN 1/20 conflicted with the DMRB standards in certain situations. We have not heard this claim from any other highways engineer either locally or nationally. Our offer from that presentation still stands: if the team would like to tell us what these conflicts are, we have contacts (via the Cycling UK campaign network) who may be able to approach the authors of the standards and seek a resolution.</p> <p>From the current drawings we can't see any details of what is proposed: this is disappointing considering that the project team has had more than two years since the WCH workshop to come up with a detailed plan. We would like reassurance that the path will meet LTN 1/20 standards for width, height, sealed surfacing, sightlines, turning circles and gradients based on the expected frequent usage. After looking at the latest plans we are especially concerned about several aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The overbridge above the M3, on the southern section of the roundabout. The plans show the cycleway on this bridge alongside the carriageway lanes, but there is no sign of a physical barrier between the vehicle lanes and the cycleway. This was raised in the 2019 WCH workshop and it was agreed that a physical barrier here was very important: (a) for physical protection should a driver swerve off the vehicle lane or decide to use the cycleway as a place to pull over (not unusual elsewhere!) and (b) for psychological protection, ensuring that non-motorised users feel adequately shielded from the heavy traffic on the roundabout. We should also note that our view is coloured by experience from 2009, when HE's predecessor (the Highways Agency) decided it needed another lane on the roundabout and simply removed the buffer zone between the cycleway and the carriageway to make room for it. If there is no physical barrier in the new design, the implication will be that HE is once again treating the gap between carriageway and cycleway as a "spare" vehicle lane, to be pressed into use when required. There is also a history of highways contractors using the path on the existing overbridge as a dumping-ground for their equipment and supplies. A physical barrier would make it harder for them to obstruct the path in this way. 2. The entrance to the southern underpass, coming towards the junction from Tesco and passing beneath the roundabout. This appears to have 		<p>cessation point within the roundabout) by providing a wider 3m width bridge over the M3, and space for future mounting block provision either side of the western subway which would be sufficient to lead horses through.</p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. The route runs parallel to the west of the A33 with the route to be constructed within the existing verge. A signalised (unlit) Toucan crossing is proposed adjacent to the proposed National Highways depot roundabout, to provide a link to this route through the north-western side of the gyratory roundabout. The route then transitions to utilise the existing A34 northbound and A33 carriageways which are to be abandoned as part of the Scheme. The existing informal link to the existing PRoW would also be upgraded from its connection to the A33.</p> <p>For the first River Itchen crossing (i.e. most northern), the route follows the existing A33 and is accommodated on the existing bridge deck abandoned carriageway. For the second river crossing (i.e. most southern), the Scheme includes a new cycle/footbridge to be constructed across the River Itchen, with the route extending south along the east of the new A34 alignment, crossing under the A34 in a new 4m wide subway which would then traverse around new attenuation basins, then progressing to the existing depot junction and towards NCN Route 23 via a new subway under the northern arm of the gyratory roundabout. The new cycle/footbridge would be approximately 3.5m wide.</p> <p>Four proposed subways would be required to accommodate existing and improved provision of routes in the area. The two new subways at the gyratory roundabout would cater for existing users of NCN Route 23, one additional subway would link with the western walking and cycling route, while a subway under the A34 northbound catering for the pedestrian/cyclist users of the new route.</p> <p>The new subways would comprise of in-situ or precast reinforced concrete box structures. In-situ or precast reinforced concrete splayed wing walls are proposed on corners of the new subways. Lengths vary but the longest subway is approximately 28m length with a clear width of 4m with clear site lines to the exit to maximise user comfort and safety. Furthermore, all subways are to be appropriately lit during day time and night time hours.</p> <p>An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. The bridleway has been designed to a gradient of no more than 1:20. The route would be an unbound surface (i.e. crushed basalt or similar) to allow for a free draining surface which is suitable for the range of users. A swale would be included adjacent to the path (on the upward side of the landform), to informally collect surface water (following heavy rainfall) to ensure the bridleway remains accessible. The route would provide for a varied visual experience for users</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>a sharp bend in it, something that was avoided in the 2019 proposals. It's vital that there are clear sightlines when approaching the tunnel.</p> <p>3. The circular loop at the south end, evidently put in place to raise the level of the cycleway to the overbridge. While the loop is a sensible way to ensure a gentle gradient for cycling and for wheelchair, mobility scooter or pushchair use, it was agreed in 2019 that this was a very long way round for pedestrians and that there should be a short-cut route (probably steps) allowing pedestrians to bypass that section. If a short cut isn't provided then pedestrians will create their own along the obvious desire lines, scrambling up and down the embankment. There is no sign of a pedestrian short cut in the new plan.</p> <p>4. Path width. We understand that the plan is to provide a 3m-wide path. This is the "absolute minimum" allowed by current standards and is not adequate for a well-used shared path, especially in the underpasses and overbridge where useable width is reduced because of walls and barrier. The "desirable minimum" in the standards is 5m. Again as this is a new build, the marginal cost difference between a 3m and 5m path will be small.</p> <p>5. Termination of bridleway halfway across. In the plan, provision for equestrians starts on the east side of the junction and extends under the eastern underpass before stopping dead just before the overbridge, where a turning area for horses is proposed. This makes no sense at all. We understand from the designers that this is because "the current bridleway stops there." As Highways England are aware, the current bridleway is the result of a dispute between the Highways Agency (later HE) and Hampshire County Council over the status of the path. HCC's rights-of-way committee formally designated the entire path across the junction as a bridleway. HE challenged this and the matter went to public inquiry. The inspector's decision was that there was sufficient evidence to designate part of the route as bridleway, but the status of the remaining part was not clear. The result was an awkward compromise that satisfied no-one. Now is not the time to slavishly replicate that pointless compromise: this is a chance for HE to improve the facilities available to non-motorised users by ensuring that the entire length of the crossing is not only designated as a bridleway but is usable as such.</p> <p>The Kings Worthy Path (the non-motorised route from Junction 9 (or nearby) to Kings Worthy, specifically the Cart & Horses junction on the A33)</p>		<p>accessing the South Downs National Park and connect to the wider rights of way network within improved access via the M3 Junction 9 gyratory.</p> <p>The Applicant has reduced the size of the loop on the western side of the gyratory and incorporated the provision of steps within the loop to enable a more direct and quicker route for walkers. The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved. The footway/cycleway through Junction 9 and along the entirety of the A34 section will have a form of separation by means of a Vehicle Restraint System.</p> <p>Further details are set out in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p>Furthermore, potential impacts on PRoWs during the construction period have been assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). Temporary diversions will be required during construction and this will be subject to design and approvals prior to construction commencing. Diversion plans will be set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan. An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been prepared for the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>In the previous plans this was a cycle route. In this plan it has been downgraded to a footpath. This makes no sense at all. It should be restored to being a utility cycling route</p> <p>This was originally proposed as a utility cycle route by cycling advocates way back in the first consultation round. At the WCH workshop in 2019 the project team agreed that a cycle route to Kings Worthy should be an integral part of the project, with the caveat that – at that time – the project boundary stopped at the Itchen river. The project team undertook to bid for a feasibility study to extend the scope of the project all the way to the Cart & Horses junction on the A33. From the new plans it's evident that the extension was agreed, but the reason for it seems to have been completely forgotten.</p> <p>This path can provide a direct, reasonably level cycle route between the large residential areas of Kings Worthy and the large business and retail areas of Winnall. Beyond Winnall it can form part of a cycle route that will link through to the new sports & leisure centre on the south side of the city. This is especially important as the old leisure centre was much closer to Kings Worthy; if we are to avoid substantial increases in motor traffic through the city centre and on the A33, it's important to provide ways that Kings Worthy residents can travel into and through town without using their cars. (The current main route from Kings Worthy into the city, Worthy Road, is both hilly and hazardous for cyclists, with high levels of traffic and an inadequate cycleway that's too narrow for two cyclists or pedestrians to pass each other safely.)</p> <p>The DfT's Propensity to Cycle Tool (PCT) suggests that in the "e-bike" scenario, provision of safe, direct cycle routes from Kings Worthy to Winnall could result in a 660% increase in the number of people commuting by cycle between these two locations.² This path is key to providing these routes (and in fact the PCT maps highlight the existing footway from Kings Worthy to Junction 9 as the most direct, convenient route for a cyclist, even though it's currently illegal to cycle on it)</p> <p>This path is about 2 miles long. That's an easy 10-15 minute ride for a regular cyclist and even easier for an e-bike user – an important factor given the explosion in e-bike ownership and use. However it makes little sense as a footpath: 2 miles is a long walk on a path that (in the latest plans) is sandwiched between major trunk roads. It's not a quiet stroll in the countryside. The route only makes sense as an all-year-round utility route for cycling as well as walking.</p> <p>The new route for this path seems almost to have been chosen to add to the cost of building it. Our original proposal involved upgrading the existing footway along the eastern side of the southbound A33/A34 slip road and providing a new underpass at the redesigned roundabout, to minimise the cost and provide the most direct route. In the new plans, the Winnall-to-A33 link road provides another opportunity: an off-carriageway cycleway could be built</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>alongside that link road, sharing its bridges and underpasses. This would surely be more cost-effective than a separate path with its own bridges. It would also be safer as a commuter route, being overlooked by passing traffic and benefiting from any lighting.</p> <p>In the 2019 WCH discussions the idea was raised of a footpath to the west of the A34 to connect Winnall to the existing Nuns' Walk path by the Itchen. The project team promised to look into it. This had merit as a recreational path, but it seems to have got mixed up with the cycle route proposals. The current plan provides neither a functional cycle route nor an attractive pedestrian route, but a mixture of the two that provides the benefits of neither and even manages to route itself right down the middle of the A34, between the carriageways.</p> <p>The Long Walk connecting path from Easton Lane</p> <p>In the previous plans this was shown as a bridleway. The latest plans have downgraded it to a footpath without explanation. It should remain a bridleway.</p> <p>This route was introduced specifically as a bridleway by the Highways England project team in the 2019 sessions. We understand that it was put in at the request of the South Downs National Park Authority specifically for the benefit of horse riders, who are deriving very little of value from the rest of the scheme</p> <p>Given the amount of engineering work required to build the path, the marginal cost of widening it to bridleway width must be very small by comparison. The main point of the path was to provide a pleasant, low-traffic circular route for horse riders starting from Easton village. As a side effect it also delivers a pleasant recreational route for walkers and offroad cyclists, but the main objective was always to provide an equestrian facility. We know that SDNPA has not changed its view and was not aware of the change of plan prior to the latest public consultation. Unless HE has some as-yet-unrevealed reason for downgrading it, it should be restored to being a bridleway.</p> <p>Closure/diversion arrangements during construction.</p> <p>This is a major project lasting several years and we understand that closures and diversions of the existing cycle route will be required from time to time. However we were surprised that at this advanced stage – the third round of consultations – the project team was still unable to give us any information about the possible duration of such closures or the plans for diversions. We understand that the draft plans will only be prepared after the consultation period has finished.</p> <p>The NCN23 route across Junction 9 is one of only four practical options available to cyclists wanting to travel east from Winchester. Two of the others</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>are suitable for offroad biking only – and one of those includes a section that runs within inches of a busy bypass. The third involves use of the relatively busy B3047 and a crossing of the A33 at Kings Worthy – viable for experienced cyclists, but a major disincentive to less-confident riders and family groups. (The B3404 Alresford Road is not considered a practical option here as it is busy and narrow with fast traffic and is therefore rarely used by cyclists.)</p> <p>The route across Junction 9 is therefore of huge importance in providing an active travel link between Winchester and the Itchen Valley and the South Downs. It needs to be kept open as much as possible</p> <p>We would like to be able to see and comment on the closure/diversion plans well before they are finalised. We have the local knowledge to assess their impact and suggest alternatives where possible. We hope and expect that the project team will treat the subject of diversions for cycling with the same seriousness that it would treat diversions for motorists, with plans to minimise disruption and provide clear signage</p>		
<p>Ramblers Association – Winchester Group</p>	<p>The previous two consultations about these proposals, in 2018 and 2019, were very disappointing to Ramblers because they did not offer any sort of improvements for walkers (although existing rights of way were preserved). The proposals offered some positive aspects for cyclists (and equestrians) but even these were only partial solutions. Issues raised by walkers to the 2018 consultation appeared to be ignored. Therefore, we are very pleased to see the improved NMU proposals for walkers included in the current consultation, although we are astounded that for the most part the improvements appear to be for walkers only, rather than for all NMUs.</p> <p>There are 3 elements of the Ramblers position on the proposals –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ramblers welcome the improved route through the junction 9 roundabout for the NCN 23. However, this route needs to be created according to current standards, in particular from the walker’s perspective this requires adequate width to enable safe sharing of the route with other classes of user. The proposed width of 3m is not sufficient and does not conform to current guidelines. For a national organisation implementing a strategic infrastructure project there is no excuse for not complying with standards. The existing unsatisfactory and confused status and history of the route through the roundabout is as a direct result of previous failures to conform to required guidelines. The biggest requirement from all classes of NMU is for a more or less direct safe link from Winnall/Tesco to Kings Worthy. As set out in our response to previous consultations, a most valuable additional 	<p>Y</p>	<p>The Applicant has engaged with the Ramblers Association, in addition to other walking, cycling and horse-riding groups, as it develops its proposals for non-motorised users.</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, an additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. The bridleway has been designed to a gradient of no more than 1:20. The route would be an unbound surface (i.e. crushed basalt or similar) to allow for a free draining surface which is suitable for the range of users.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>opportunity for walkers would be the creation of a link between the Nuns Walk (entering Kings Worthy by way of the light industrial estate and hence through the churchyard to the centre of the community) and the footpath to Easton Lane that currently carries the Itchen Way beneath the A33/A34. Taken in conjunction with the new NMU route proposed from the Winnall roundabout to the Itchen bridge this link provides a convenient walkers' utility route between Winnall and Kings Worthy church and also opens up numerous walkers' recreational route opportunities that do not exist at present.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ramblers therefore welcome the route proposed in the current consultation which address these opportunities, although it is highly dependent on the two very short links, depicted in the maps, that connect it to the two footpaths mentioned above. It is worth emphasising that without these two very important links the value of the proposal would be greatly reduced. However, the direct route from Winnall to Kings Worthy MUST be provide as a bridleway, it makes no sense to provide this as footpath/footway only. Any route provided in this scheme is never going to provide a tranquil environment, but as mentioned above, it does open up significant new recreational routes for walkers (for example a circular route from the centre of Winchester via the Nuns Walk returning via the Itchen Way), and as such it is welcomed. <p>The addition of the new route on the eastern side of the scheme from Easton Lane to Long Walk is welcomed as a 'nice to have' element of this plan but as emphasised above, it needs to be created as a bridleway. This DOES NOT imply creating a surfaced 'urban' route. This would become very much a rural route and should be created to the standard, including width, that all classes of rural user would expect under those circumstances.</p>		
South Wonston Parish Council	SWPC supports the provision of a cycle way from Kings Worthy (Cart and Horses pub) to the Winnall retail area, as together with the Watercress Way this could provide a cycle route from South Wonston to the retail area, avoiding the city centre. SWPC also requests that the proposed bridleway within the South Downs National Park should not be downgraded to a footpath. This will exclude both equestrians and cyclists, who could be accommodated at minimal extra cost.	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, an additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. The bridleway has been designed to a gradient of no more than 1:20. The route would be an unbound surface (i.e. crushed basalt or similar) to allow for a free draining surface which is suitable for the range of users.
Upper Itchen Valley Society	We welcome the modifications to the original proposals which redesign the roads giving access to the valley to join the B3047. The creation of a new footpath between Church Lane, Easton, and Easton Lane at Junction 9 and the redesign of the national cycleway crossing there are also welcome. The cycleway is also a footpath and <u>pedestrians should have a</u>	N	The Applicant acknowledges the views expressed, including Upper Itchen Valley Society's support for the cycling provisions proposed. The provision of steps have been incorporated within the loop to enable a more direct and quicker route for pedestrians.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p><u>stepped route short-cutting the graded cycling loop through the roundabout area.</u></p> <p>We are concerned by the proposal to export waste soil from the development area into the valley. Insufficient information has been provided at this stage about the need for this or the form it would take, the duration of soil storage, the controls intended to avoid adversely affecting local hydrology, water quality, flora and fauna. One of the proposed sites is a large area of the side of Easton Down above the Itchen. There is no indication in the consultation document of the likelihood that this site or either of the other two, or whether all three of the large areas identified will be used. That said, the side of Easton Down is not, in our view, a suitable soil storage area due to the direct impact-pathway to the River Itchen. <u>We feel there is not sufficient information for us to adequately feedback on this matter fully. We would welcome further engagement before the DCO application is submitted, in sufficient time that our views may be given regard within the scheme proposals.</u></p> <p>At this stage we would emphasise the sensitivity of these sites within the National Park, and their visibility from footpaths and viewing points. We question the need to export soil waste at all instead of identifying sites in the part of the valley already compromised by dense highway development. For the short term we point out that during any disposal works the noise and disruption may be unacceptable to people living in Abbots Worthy and Easton as well as the pupils and staff at the two local schools potentially affected. <u>In particular we seek assurance that any transport of waste will take place on routes directly between the works and any disposal sites and will not use the narrow local road network.</u></p> <p>For the longer term there are indications in the consultation material that waste several metres in depth may be deposited and we object to any landscaping which detracts from the appearance of the rolling landscape or which risks depositing soil in the river Itchen and its tributaries.</p> <p>Ironically the disturbed chalkland around the M3 and Junction 9 are particularly diverse in plants and shrubs when compared to the farmed land around them and <u>we encourage you to manage the works in a way that will recreate and enhance this diversity after completion.</u> As a Society we applaud local efforts to maintain wild verges throughout the Itchen valley. Long established local programmes such as the excellent Wild Valley Verges promote the establishment of low nutrient wildflower verges through initial seeding and altered maintenance. Highways England have also taken similar approaches, for example the Weymouth Relief Road in Dorset, where established wildflower swathes reportedly require little to no maintenance cutting and provide an incredible visual display and great biodiversity net gain for pollinators and insectivores. A similar approach to the legacy landscaping around the M3 Junction 9 restoration post-construction would fit with local landscape character</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>and be very welcome. <u>Planting around the proposed new ponds should similarly reflect their downland setting.</u></p>		
<p>South Downs Network</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>The South Downs Network objects to the proposed M3 Junction 9 Development in its present form.</p> <p>Executive Summary: Move over to Sustainable Transport</p> <p>We respectfully suggest that this £180+ million road scheme should be referred back to be replaced by a sustainable transport version that will help us meet our climate change commitments, providing better bus services, bus and rail infrastructure, integrated green cycle and walking routes, safe crossing for active travel, green (car free) bridges, safer paths for access to schools and access to rail stations.</p> <p>Secretary of State for Transport guidance</p> <p>We would take this opportunity to remind Highways England of the words used by the Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps when launching the Government's 'Decarbonising Transport: Setting the Challenge,' said in the foreword that: "public transport and active travel will be the natural first choice for our daily activities" and that "We will use our cars less and be able to rely on a convenient, cost-effective and coherent public transport network".</p> <p>More roads - more traffic</p> <p>More roads equals more traffic - when a new road is built, new traffic will divert onto it. Many people may make new trips they would not otherwise make just because of new roads. This well-known and long-established effect is known as 'induced traffic'</p> <p>Increase of emissions and global warming gases</p> <p>The Highways England proposal will increase CO2 emissions by attracting more cars onto the roads! Highways England's own report admits a significant increase in carbon emissions as a result of the project - some 534,628 tonnes of CO2 for user emissions. This doesn't include the emissions from the construction which doesn't seem to be reported on.</p> <p>How are we going to meet the Government's commitment to net zero emissions in less than 30 years with road schemes like this? Highways England say the project will be completed in 2026 so the timeline is even shorter at less than 25</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges South Downs Network's objection to the Scheme.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to walking and cycling provisions:</i></p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with relevant local planning authorities, parish councils and walking, cycling and horse-riding groups to consider their suggestions for improving the provisions for non-motorised users.</p> <p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the current provisions and introduce new routes and connections. All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>The use of tactile paving (both blister and corduroy types) is also proposed to cater for the visually impaired, and wayfinding signage will also be provided along the footway/cycleway/bridleway routes as part of the Scheme proposal.</p> <p>NCN Route 23 would be upgraded. On both sides of the gyratory (east and west), the existing walking and cycling route which links both parts of Easton Lane, would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders would be improved with a widened 3m route (with 4m wide underpasses), which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway to enable rider dismounting for leading horses through to continue the route to the existing bridleway extent (which currently ceases within the existing roundabout). Future provision for horse-riders is allowed for (beyond the existing cessation point within the roundabout) by providing a wider 3m width bridge over the M3, and space for future mounting block provision either side of the western subway which would be sufficient to lead horses through.</p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. The route runs parallel to the west of the A33 with the route to be constructed within the existing verge. A signalised (unlit) Toucan crossing is proposed adjacent to the proposed National Highways depot roundabout, to provide a link to this route through the north-western side of the gyratory roundabout. The route then transitions to utilise the existing A34 northbound and A33 carriageways which are to be abandoned as part of the Scheme. The existing informal link to the existing PRoW would also be upgraded from its connection to the A33.</p> <p>For the first River Itchen crossing (i.e. most northern), the route follows the existing A33 and is accommodated on the existing bridge deck abandoned carriageway. For</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>years to achieve net zero! Wouldn't it be better to cancel the project and spend the £180 million on sustainable transport solutions?</p> <p>In 2020 transport accounted for 29.8% of all CO2 emissions. The majority is from road transport! How can Highways England advance a road scheme that will actively increase CO2 emissions?</p> <p>It is likely that there will still be 40 million petrol and diesel cars and vans on the roads in 2030 pulse diesel HGVs!</p> <p>The UK's new climate target to cut our emissions by 78% by 2035 was passed into law in June 2021 - the Highways England plan is out of step with this. The proposal does not include a landscape strategy. Road developments are not excluded from the UK's legally adopted climate commitment. The UK Government has a commitment to tackle climate change.</p> <p>Nature</p> <p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation Design Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that this design plan consists of just one page! We are concerned that there is no landscape strategy or detailed plan. The Mitigation Design Plan contains simply focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, we urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and biodiversity net gain. As part of this, we would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done. The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. We want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</p> <p>Whilst the actual road design plan seems to be very firm there seems to be a lack of commitment by Highways England to the environment, an EIA and a landscape and biodiversity/habitats plan. Words such as 'ongoing' and "is being developed" keep cropping up. One gets the impression that the natural world is not important to Highways England.</p>		<p>the second river crossing (i.e. most southern), the Scheme includes a new cycle/footbridge to be constructed across the River Itchen, with the route extending south along the east of the new A34 alignment, crossing under the A34 in a new 4m wide subway which would then traverse around new attenuation basins, then progressing to the existing depot junction and towards NCN Route 23 via a new subway under the northern arm of the gyratory roundabout. The new cycle/footbridge would be approximately 3.5m wide.</p> <p>Four proposed subways would be required to accommodate existing and improved provision of routes in the area. The two new subways at the gyratory roundabout would cater for existing users of NCN Route 23, one additional subway would link with the western walking and cycling route, while a subway under the A34 northbound catering for the pedestrian/cyclist users of the new route.</p> <p>The new subways would comprise of in-situ or precast reinforced concrete box structures. In-situ or precast reinforced concrete splayed wing walls are proposed on corners of the new subways. Lengths vary but the longest subway is approximately 28min length with a clear width of 4m with clear site lines to the exit to maximise user comfort and safety. Furthermore, all subways are to be appropriately lit during day time and night time hours.</p> <p>An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. The bridleway has been designed to a gradient of no more than 1:20. The route would be an unbound surface (i.e. crushed basalt or similar) to allow for a free draining surface which is suitable for the range of users. A swale would be included adjacent to the path (on the upward side of the landform), to informally collect surface water (following heavy rainfall) to ensure the bridleway remains accessible. The route would provide for a varied visual experience for users accessing the South Downs National Park and connect to the wider rights of way network within improved access via the M3 Junction 9 gyratory.</p> <p>Further details are provided in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>We are concerned that Highways England seemed to be avoiding a commitment to the production of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). In Para 1.5.4 of the PEIR Highways England says “It should be noted that at this stage the information is preliminary. An iterative process of scheme development and EIA is ongoing”. Surely a draft EIA should be available for public consultation now, and not be delayed until the DCO application? Indeed there seems to be a fudging of the commitment even at that stage to the production of an EIA. Highways England says “The final EIA work will be reported in the ES.”</p> <p>Indeed further fudging of commitment to environmental assessment is contained in the response to Natural England's submission of 9 November 2020. They highlighted that the impact of emissions to designated ecological sites is required. Highways England response was "Ongoing EIA work will include the assessment of the impacts of emissions from traffic on designated habitats."</p> <p>Avoiding say yes to Natural England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England said “The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies.” Highways England said “ongoing EIA work is to be reported.” • Natural England said they would welcome the opportunity to comment on the landscape, biodiversity and access enhancement plan. Highways England responded “A biodiversity and landscaping mitigation package is being developed.” But when? • Natural England advised that “the potential impact of the proposal upon features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for habitat creation/enhancement should be included within this assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance on such matters.” Highways England responded ""The Biodiversity chapter of the ES will identify all potential impacts on identified biodiversity features"" Further fudging." <p>SDNPA Nature Investment Areas</p> <p>The road site is where the South Downs National Park has identified one of its 12 nature investment areas. These nature recovery areas are part of a hub of an interconnected ‘nature network.’ The Highways England intrusion flies in the face of nature recovery and will destroy and fragment important protected habitats. This scheme affects the local nature reserve which is home to rare and notable wildlife, and a SSSI site.</p> <p>Previous environmental damage</p> <p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust’s nature reserve at</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>St Catherine’s Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally. "</p> <p>SSSI and Special Area of Conservation</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network.</p> <p>Government Environmental Policy</p> <p>Highways England need to take on board Government policy on the environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government's Final Report of the Independent Review on the Economics of Biodiversity led by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta. Amongst other things he says “Human demands on nature must be curbed • We say - road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government ‘Dasgupta Review’ says, ‘Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).’ We should no longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to urbanisation pressures. • Also please bear in mind the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this scheme. <p>Green Bridge</p> <p>We support the Hampshire and IoW Wildlife Trust’s proposal for a green bridge to the National Park which would reunite wildlife habitats that became disconnected by the 1990s M3 construction.</p> <p>We want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature’s recovery despite modern transport development.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Spoil</p> <p>The Highways England report says “We have not yet completed our junction design, so we do not know exactly how much material may need to be placed in these areas, or whether we will need all three areas”. Surely after at least two and a half years of preparation such civil engineering detail should be known? The amount of spoil will affect the landscape design. This should be known now; before Highways England applies for a Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>2019 consultation</p> <p>We have serious concerns about the previous stages of public consultations.</p> <p>Highways England says “There was a high level of support for the Proposed Scheme”. “We received 526 responses to our consultation”. Other than a few meaningless and valueless paragraphs the Public Consultation Summary Report does not provide any substantive information on exactly what those 526 respondents said. What organisations responded and what did they say? How many of the 526 comments were from individual members of the public. How many were car, commercial and HGV vehicle owners/drivers? Did horse riding, walking and cycling groups respond? Indeed were they invited to respond?</p> <p>References are made to ‘stakeholders.’ It is understood they were invited to workshops to give their input. Exactly who were they? and how were they selected? We hope it wasn't a question of selecting the appropriate stakeholders so that it assisted in giving the right answer to suit Highways England.</p> <p>Walking and Cycling Proposals Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that there is little substance to walking and cycling provision. The plan just consists of one page. There seems to be very little reference to provision for horse riders.</p> <p>Walkers, cyclists and horse riders to be put in a ‘subway’! Underground? Highways England say “On both sides of the motorway, the existing walking and cycling route links both parts of Easton Lane, which would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders will be improved with a widened 3m route, which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway...”</p> <p>This is unacceptable. This proposal is fraught with all sorts of problems. Who is going to police the subway to ensure the safety of users? Who will maintain it and how will it be lit? Will there be security cameras? Will there</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>be traffic separation to ensure safety of different users such as horse riders and cyclists?</p> <p>Instead of hiding these active travel users away below ground highways England should provide a green bridge out in the fresh air above the pollution from the motorway style road.</p> <p>In any event Highways England should ensure that cycle provision is compliant with Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20 Published last year by the Government).</p> <p>Highways England must take account of latest Government policy</p> <p>The business case for this project should be rewritten taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Gov policy paper - A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment (pub Jan 2018) • DfT's policy paper - Decarbonising transport: setting the challenge (pub March 2020) • UK Gov policy paper: Gear change: a bold vision for cycling and walking • UK Gov policy paper: Bus Back Better: national bus strategy for England 		
Local community	<p>Traffic flows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed routing of the M3 and A34 appears to offer the opportunity of improved the traffic flows from M3 to A34 and from A34 to M3, with less risk of congestion. 2. The proposed routing of the A33 between the Cart & Horses junction and Winnall is improved compared to the previous proposal. The arrangement appears to offer a clearer route from Kings Worthy to Winnall and avoids joining the A34 and the queues that build up towards Jct 9 currently. This promises to make this route potentially easier to access the amenities just off junction 9. It also may offer a better option for people to access the new Sports & Leisure park, than driving through Winchester. If these assumptions prove correct this may reduce traffic flow along the Worthys Road and lower pressure at peak times on the City Rd junction in Winchester – we hope. 3. Referring to the A33 link to Jct 9, with one of the current lanes becoming a path, there will be changes to the A33 and how it flows through to the Cart & Horses junction. In addition, the new arrangement for accessing the M3 from Jct 9 will likely attract some proportion of drivers from areas such as Harestock, Kings Barton and Weeke, who will see the route through to the Cart & Horses Junction as the quickest route. This will add pressure on this junction which is a well-known trouble spot where priorities are ambiguous to many. The A33 junction with the London 	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme. The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,7,17m in length

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Rd/B3047 aka Cart & Horses junction, should be addressed within the overall scheme.</p> <p>Cycling and walking</p> <p>7. I welcome that National Cycle route 23 will continue to be in place. This route is an important route for cyclists in Winchester to head east and for people who cycle to work from the east into Winchester. Steps should be taken to ensure that this route remains open and free from mud etc during construction.</p> <p>8. It is disappointing to see that the “path” between the Cart & Horses junction and Winnall has been downgraded to a walking only path from what was a shared cycle/walking path in the previous proposal . The route proposed between the north & south bound carriageways of the A34 would be quite intimidating. Proximity to some traffic is inevitable, but better options are available, with zero or very marginal change in costs:</p> <p>a. The path should be designated as a shared walking and cycle path. I’d have no objections to it being a bridleway, but I’d be surprised to see the horse riding community using it as such. The route is likely to be used by people using it to get between the Worthys & Winnall, and perhaps beyond, rather than as a nice leisurely walk. In addition to providing access to Winnall for people in the Worthys, this could link to other paths - current & future – to give a cycle route to the new Sports & Leisure complex. This route would be flatter than cycling along the Worthy Road.</p> <p>b. Routing – This shared path should be routed to minimise the proximity to the fastest traffic. The current routing of the past does the opposite. I can envisage two possible better routings:</p> <p>i. A path that runs alongside the north-bound A34 on the south side of the road, to join in with Nuns Walk. Nuns walk could be upgraded to a shared cycle path / footpath from the point where they join, into the Worthys. The Nuns walk route could be extended alongside the A34 all the way until this path meets the London Road in Headbourne Worthy. This would be a welcome improvement in amenity to residents in Headbourne Worthy</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p style="text-align: center;">ii. The shared path could be designed into to follow the same route between Winnall and the Cart & Horses Junction as the A33. This would use the same under-passes as the road.</p> <p>There are pro’s and con’s to each of these two options, but both options are better than the route proposed”.</p> <p>Noise mitigation</p> <p>A reduction in the frequency of major congestion between the A34 and the M3 at junction 9 will be welcomed by many from well beyond the Worthys and indeed for many in the Worthys. It is reasonable to anticipate that, on average, there will be an increase in road noise generated. One of the “benefits” of the Southbound A34 being jammed is that traffic speed is much reduced which reduces the noise levels which are intrusive for many who live in Headbourne Worthy and Kings Worthy either side of the A34. I’d particularly highlight residents of Willis Waye and The Dell, but there are plenty of others for whom noise levels are intense. The scheme plan should make clear what measure are being put in place to limit the noise levels to ensure that they do not increase and preferably that they decrease by at least 3dB – preferably more. I believe there are noise survey sensors in place in several back gardens in some houses in Willis Waye. The environmental services team at Winchester City council could provide details and data.</p> <p>Environmental concerns</p> <p>The webinars on this were scheduled for while I was on holiday, so I have been unable to get enough insight into these areas to make well informed comments. But it is clear that this project would be a major undertaking in a fragile environmental area. In addition, the volume of material used will have an associated impact in terms of CO2 and other emissions. It is critical that any impact is mitigated and that an “environmental” business case analogous to a financial business case is conducted.</p> <p>Consultation with public</p> <p>While I understand the approach chosen was done so to be able to navigate the restrictions placed on all of us by the Covid Pandemic, the On-Line consultation process is quite different to that which people are used to before, as exemplified by the consultation in Tubbs Hall, Kings Worthy for the previous iteration of the proposed junction. The Online process has some advantages for some people, but it could be onerous for many. Indeed, I was unable to attend any of the briefings on the mitigations of the environmental impact for example. Many people are unfamiliar with “online” meetings and many more still are not familiar</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>enough to be able to get as much insight from the Online resources as they would from an “in person” consultation. Given that we have a significant easing of the Covid rules from 19th July 21, I strongly recommend that to ensure better stakeholder engagement, that a series of in person consultations be added into the process. While clearly, this will take time, it will pay back in terms of stakeholder engagement.</p>		
Local community	<p>Reconsider the proposed cycling and pedestrian routes. We should be doing everything in our power to enable people to cycle short journeys reducing both congestion and pollution.</p>	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant amended its proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route • The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>The Applicant has developed its proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions in consultation with the host authorities, parish councils and walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups.</p>
Local community	<p>Consider the needs of people walking cycling and horse riding. These activities are wonderful for people's physical and mental health and in these covid times we need to give ourselves all the help possible.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route • The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length. <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on population and human health, resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. The assessment considers the impacts on walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Use this opportunity to improve current routes for cyclists as well as motorists	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant amended its proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route • The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length. <p>The Applicant has developed its proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions in consultation with the host authorities, parish councils and walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups.</p>
Local community	<p>Sceptical about huge road "improvements", as they rarely result in genuine improvement for anyone living locally. Hence my "neutral" views on the vast majority of the scheme. It is clear that it will happen, and that the views of local people will only hold sway if they are in line with the project plans. However, when I found out that you were going to downgrade the cycle plans, which would only have a marginal impact on your costs, I was really disappointed. The very least that road builders can do, when building roads and junctions that are not accessible without a car/van, and which actively exclude locals to the benefit of those passing through, is to maximise the means by which non-drivers and those trying to drive less, can travel through and around the new junction.</p>	Y	<p>M3 Junction 9 currently experiences a high level of congestion and delay with poor journey time reliability. The significant volumes of traffic act as a bottleneck on the local highway network, causing significant delays throughout the day. Northbound and southbound movements between the M3 and the A34 are particularly intensive with downstream queues forming on the northbound off-slip of the M3 partially caused by the high proportion of HGVs travelling between the M27, M3 and A34 and often backing onto the main carriageway of the M3, resulting in significant disruption and safety concerns during peak periods.</p> <p>As identified in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1), there is a need case for the Scheme in order to address the significant existing congestion and road safety issues at the A34/M3 interchange. The Scheme will deliver extensive benefits including a reduction in congestion and delays; improving journey times; economic benefits; safety improvements; improvements to visual amenity and landscape character over the long-term; wildlife and green infrastructure enhancements; enhanced pollution and run-off control; and enhanced provision for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant amended its proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.
Local community	Review the proposals for cycle paths and the bridleway	Y	<p>The Applicant has since reviewed its walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals. Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.
Local community	Needs to consider cyclists/walkers more plus local traffic.	Y	<p>As set out in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13), the Scheme will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce delays at key areas currently congested. The Scheme also reduces journey times from the M3 to the A34 and the A34 to the M3 in the AM and PM peak period. Furthermore, there are reductions in journey times from the A33 to Easton Lane and Easton Lane to the A33. Smooth the flow of traffic by improving journey time reliability and reducing delays (time lost per vehicle per mile) at M3 Junction 9 and the exit and entry roads for the A33 and A34. The operational traffic model shows that there are reductions in journey times with the Scheme in place on key approaches to the M3 Junction 9. There are reductions in delays on the M3 southbound off-slip/A34 in the PM peak and reductions in delays on the A33 approach to the Junction in the AM and PM peak period. Furthermore, the A34 route between M3 Junction 10 and the A34/A272 junction is predicted to have journey time savings in excess of two minutes in 2027, in excess of three minutes in 2042, and in excess of four minutes in 2047 in the PM peak period and around one minute for the AM Peak. The equivalent southbound journey time savings are approximately one minute in 2027, 2042 and 2047. The Scheme provides a direct connection between the M3 and A34, hence the journey time improvements.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve the safety for all road users and reduce the annual collision frequency and severity ratio on the M3 Junction 9 <p>In addition, since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant amended its proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>The Applicant has developed its proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions in consultation with the host authorities, parish councils and walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups.</p>
Local community	Just wanted to comment on your pedestrian/cycle proposals.	Y	<p>The Applicant has noted this response. The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.
Local community	Please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths. Overall, I think the money would be better spent on public transport infrastructure.	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant amended its proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.
Local community	Please consider the needs of cyclists to travel around the area, to miss this out would go against the country's efforts to reduce CO2.	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant amended its proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length. <p>Furthermore, the Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase of emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Specifically, Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate. During operation, the main source of greenhouse gas emissions is from end-user traffic. However, with the incorporation of enhancement planting, active travel routes encouraging sustainable modes of transport and technological changes including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the Scheme is not anticipated to have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon reduction targets and therefore, there would be no significant effect.</p>
Local community	It is imperative in respect of climate change and reducing carbon emissions that active travel is facilitated in your new scheme at Winnall roundabout. A safe cycling/walking route is badly needed between Winnall roundabout and	Y	The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Kings Worthy. Please reinstate plans for cycle travel which had disappeared from your proposal.</p>		<p>consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route • The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.
Local community	<p>Disappointed that you've gone against your promises on providing decent and safe transport links for active and alternative transport- especially as the government aims to double cycling activity and reduce deaths and injuries on UK roads by 2025.</p> <p>Please can you restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths. This way we could encourage young children and students to cycle into Winchester for school, shopping and socialising. For adults it would be ideal for reducing the amount of traffic that is caused by short journeys for commuting and leisure. In Holland these routes between smaller settlements and cities are very common and they serve the population well. Children gain a sense of independence, improved physical fitness, mental health and wellbeing. It's also a great opportunity for walkers and horse riders to gain a quiet route away from the traffic too.</p> <p>As well as this, I would like to remind you that your upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 should meet the latest Government guidelines (document LTN 1/20).</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route • The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length. <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on population and human health, resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. The assessment considers the impacts on walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p>
Local community	Frustrated by the lack of adequate facilities for cyclists	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant amended its proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.
Local community	<p>The Netherlands took an opportunity after WWII to create a cycle infrastructure that is the envy of the world. Britain once created an entire canal network, then shortly after a huge rail network. Later still the motorways. Maybe now is the time for British projects to start grabbing at chances to build sustainable transport links whenever possible. Failure to build these facilities into projects like this one diminishes the value of the project and is effectively a cost for future generations. Please take the chance and include a genuinely useable cycle link through the scheme.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.
Local community	Inadequate provision for cyclists.	Y	<p>A key objective of the Scheme is to improve provisions for walkers and cyclists. The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport (to help reduce individual car journeys over short distances) through the provision of high-quality accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes. The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded as part of the proposals. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An improvement to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23 An additional footway, cycleway and horse riding route on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new combined footpath and cyclepath for the western side of the Scheme to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.
Local community	<p>It's very disappointing that you only provide a downloadable PDF form which most people would find hard or impossible to edit, even in Word format. Very wasteful having to print out then post (or rescan and email). Why on earth isn't there also an editable Word document as well as a web form?</p> <p>The derogation of the original cycle provisions is appalling and these all need to be reinstated. This is a once in a life time opportunity to actually provide improved cycle infrastructure at a time when ebike use is growing (as is cycling in general) and the needs of climate change should be prioritised over short term cost. That allegedly is gov policy - as well as scientific need - and it's quite appalling that the Treasury can be so short sighted as to reduce rather than enhance cycle provision.</p>	Y	<p>A key objective of the Scheme is to improve provisions for walkers and cyclists. The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport (to help reduce individual car journeys over short distances) through the provision of high-quality accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes. The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded as part of the proposals. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An improvement to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23 An additional footway, cycleway and horse riding route on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages
Local community	We want cycle paths. I was really looking forward to the cycle paths to aid commuting using bikes. Why is this so out of thinking with the lack of cycle routes?	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new combined footpath and cyclepath for the western side of the Scheme to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane.
Local community	Better consideration should be given to promoting cycling. The proposed footpaths should be upgraded to cycle paths.	Y	<p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length. Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.
Local community	The removal of very inexpensive cycle / bridleway provision seems to show a lack of commitment to active travel which I find quite puzzling.	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length <p>Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.</p>
Local community	Make sure the infrastructure for non motorised traffic is of a very high standard. in terms of the total cost of the scheme it won't be much but has a real opportunity to be good.	Y	<p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the current provisions and introduce new routes and connections. All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>The use of tactile paving (both blister and corduroy types) is also proposed to cater for the visually impaired, and wayfinding signage will also be provided along the footway/cycleway/bridleway routes as part of the Scheme proposal.</p> <p>NCN Route 23 would be upgraded. On both sides of the gyratory (east and west), the existing walking and cycling route which links both parts of Easton Lane, would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders would be improved with a widened 3m route (with 4m wide underpasses), which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway to enable rider dismounting for leading horses through to continue the route to the existing bridleway extent (which currently ceases within the existing roundabout). Future provision for horse-riders is allowed for (beyond the existing cessation point within the roundabout) by providing a wider 3m width bridge over the M3, and space for future mounting block provision either side of the western subway which would be sufficient to lead horses through.</p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. The route runs parallel to the west of the A33 with the route to be constructed within the existing verge. A signalised (unlit) Toucan crossing is proposed adjacent to the proposed National Highways depot roundabout, to provide a link to this route through the north-western side of the gyratory roundabout. The route then transitions to utilise the existing A34 northbound and A33 carriageways which are to be abandoned as part of the Scheme. The existing informal link to the existing PRow would also be upgraded from its connection to the A33.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>For the first River Itchen crossing (i.e. most northern), the route follows the existing A33 and is accommodated on the existing bridge deck abandoned carriageway. For the second river crossing (i.e. most southern), the Scheme includes a new cycle/footbridge to be constructed across the River Itchen, with the route extending south along the east of the new A34 alignment, crossing under the A34 in a new 4m wide subway which would then traverse around new attenuation basins, then progressing to the existing depot junction and towards NCN Route 23 via a new subway under the northern arm of the gyratory roundabout. The new cycle/footbridge would be approximately 3.5m wide.</p> <p>Four proposed subways would be required to accommodate existing and improved provision of routes in the area. The two new subways at the gyratory roundabout would cater for existing users of NCN Route 23, one additional subway would link with the western walking and cycling route, while a subway under the A34 northbound catering for the pedestrian/cyclist users of the new route.</p> <p>The new subways would comprise of in-situ or precast reinforced concrete box structures. In-situ or precast reinforced concrete splayed wing walls are proposed on corners of the new subways. Lengths vary but the longest subway is approximately 28m in length with a clear width of 4m with clear site lines to the exit to maximise user comfort and safety. Furthermore, all subways are to be appropriately lit during day time and night time hours.</p> <p>An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. The bridleway has been designed to a gradient of no more than 1:20. The route would be an unbound surface (i.e. crushed basalt or similar) to allow for a free draining surface which is suitable for the range of users. A swale would be included adjacent to the path (on the upward side of the landform), to informally collect surface water (following heavy rainfall) to ensure the bridleway remains accessible. The route would provide for a varied visual experience for users accessing the South Downs National Park and connect to the wider rights of way network within improved access via the M3 Junction 9 gyratory.</p> <p>The Applicant has reduced the size of the loop on the western side of the gyratory and incorporated the provision of steps within the loop to enable a more direct and quicker route for walkers. The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved. The footway/cycleway through Junction 9 and along the entirety of the A34 section will have a form of separation by means of a Vehicle Restraint System.</p>
Local community	The money spent on this could go a lot further in supporting alternative modes by which to move goods and people that do not entail net increases in emissions and energy use.	Y	Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant amended its proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The development of these proposals is incompatible with the pragmatic reality of climate emergency.</p> <p>The renegeing of promises WRT to cycling and equestrians seems inexplicable, given that the difference appears to be negligible in terms of budget provision or any other factor that I can think of.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length. Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length. <p>Furthermore, the Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase of emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Specifically, Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate. During operation, the main source of greenhouse gas emissions is from end-user traffic. However, with the incorporation of enhancement planting, active travel routes encouraging sustainable modes of transport and technological changes including the increased uptake of Electric Vehicles, the Scheme is not anticipated to have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon reduction targets and therefore, there would be no significant effect.</p>
Local community	I want to reiterate the lack of cycling provision in this plan. I cycle to work everyday through Winnall roundabout and I'm appalled at the lack of consideration for cyclists in this plan	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.
Local community	<p>Whilst I am broadly in agreement with the current proposal for Junction 9, and in particular the removal of the lane-drop onto the A33 northbound, I am concerned about the designation of the new footpath that will run from the Winnall roundabout to Kings Worthy. It is inevitable that this 'footpath' will be used by cyclists, regardless of the signage. Personally, I feel that cycling is to be strongly encouraged and that this route should be for shared use by pedestrians and cyclists. This may mean that headroom for the new underpass where this path goes under the A34 should be to the same height as will be provided for the NCN cycle route. This footpath should also share the same tarmac surface and be clear of obstructions such as bollards.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant welcomes the comment regarding the removal of the A33 merge/diverge. The Applicant had amended the design for the 2021 statutory consultation to address concerns raised about road safety at the 2019 consultation.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme. The use of tactile paving (both blister and corduroy types) is also proposed to cater for the visually impaired, and wayfinding signage will also be provided along the footway/cycleway/bridleway routes as part of the Scheme proposal.</p> <p>All proposed underpasses will be 4m in width and have sufficient headroom for cyclists. Furthermore, the footway/cycleway through Junction 9 and along the entirety of the A34 section will have a form of separation by means of a Vehicle Restraint System.</p> <p>Further details are presented on the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	<p>Welcome the changes in general, however there is one area in regard to footpaths that could maybe be improved. Imagine you are somewhere to the northwest of Winchester - e.g. Hyde - and you want to get to the other side of the roads towards Easton. This could and should be a pleasant walk. The most</p>	Y	<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>obvious route if you want to avoid walking along busy roads is to go along Nuns Walk towards Kings Worthy. There is then a footpath on the other side of the A33 but that leaves the problem of crossing that busy road which doesn't seem to have been addressed in these changes. But I see you have added a link to a new footpath which you can then follow back along the A34 until it joins up with the existing footpath which runs underneath the A33 and A34 and from where you can reach the lanes towards Easton. But this is quite a convoluted route involving you going back on yourself. Would it be possible for instance to make the Nuns Walk footpath branch alongside the river and underneath the existing river bridges to join the new footpath? Even better would be if it followed the river under both the A33 and A34 and then joined up with the existing footpath on the other side over to the east. It seems there is a lack of more direct east west footpaths.</p> <p>One other point - as a cyclist living in Hyde, it's very hard to reach the countryside to the east without going on busy main roads - up to Winnall roundabout for instance. These plans do nothing to help cyclists. Nuns Walk is just about cyclable - and people do cycle along it - but it appears a chance has been missed to make the new footpaths cycle paths. With a little bit of improvement to the existing Nuns Walk path you could potentially have an off-road cycle path all the way from the north of Winchester over to Easton.</p>		<p>concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route. A link is also proposed to the existing Nun's Walk Public Right of Way. The A33 is to be reconfigured to a bidirectional carriageway and it is expected that traffic flows will be less than existing. The existing informal crossing of the A33 is to be amended by the provision of carriageway build outs, tactile paving and reflective bollards, which will make the crossing point more desirable for pedestrians / cyclists. The proposed footway/cycleway is an improvement upon the existing scenario. The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>Further details are presented on the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	<p>Concerns about the plans for Junction 9 with respect to cyclists. The plans originally envisaged a cycle path from Winnall to Kings Worthy but this has now been downgraded to a footpath. Why? A cycle path would encourage people in Kings Worthy to use their bike to visit the Winnall shops rather than use their car.</p> <p>The plans should go further and facilitate an off-road cycle route from North Winchester over to the Easton area. In the past if I'd wanted to cycle with my young children from Hyde over to the quiet country roads near Easton, it either means going up the very busy road to Winnall or go via Kings Worthy with its completely unsuitable pavement designated as a cycle path and crossing the busy Basingstoke road.</p> <p>This is a once in a generation chance to get this right.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p>
Local community	<p>The plans for the improvement look better, there are a few things that could further improve it. Could the proposed walking route between Junction 9 and Kings Worthy be a mixed use path to allow access for bikes as well, there are very few cycle routes into Kings Worthy that avoid busy roads, especially for kids.</p> <p>The other would be to make beneficial use of the soil and to use this to create a mountain bike or BMX pump track in the central or Southern spoil locations. This could then be a benefit to the community after the works and would be</p>	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length. <p>The footway/cycleway through Junction 9 and along the entirety of the A34 section will have a form of separation by means of a Vehicle Restraint System.</p> <p>In relation to the deposition areas, since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant decided to remove all three deposition areas from its proposals. In re-</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>good for encouraging kids and others to cycle the South downs way. This would be accessible from the national cycle way too.</p> <p>It isn't very clear from the plans where access to the north bound M3 from the Easton Lane is, presumably this is from the A33 route?</p>		<p>profiling the landform between Easton Lane and Long Walk, in response to South Downs National Park Authority and Natural England's comments, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>The description of joining the M3 northbound from Easton Lane is correct, via the A33.</p>
Local community	<p>On the whole the scheme represents a good solution to the Junction 9 problems. However, I cycle regularly to Winnall from Kings Worthy so am disappointed to see that only a footway (with revised route) is being provided. I spoke to your representatives about this when they were at an exhibition in Winchester and have replied to the earlier consultation suggesting a dual use pedestrian/cycle path. There is still an opportunity/room to provide a dual use pedestrian and cycle path between Winnall and Kings Worthy - should only a footway remain in your plans, with no cycling rights, I will have to cycle into Winchester and back to Winnall. This is no way to encourage sustainable transport.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route • The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.
Local community	<p>What would it take to support the installation of a cycle way to Kings Worthy? I believe the attached papers show that Winchester City Council, and indeed also HCC's commitment to the addition of a cycle route to the incomplete footway route that exists at present. The R123 list was shared and operational between both councils.</p> <p>Following a petition many years ago, the need for a cycle route from Kings Worthy to Winnall was established and listed on the R123 list. The Reg 123 lists were superseded by the Infrastructure Funding Statements in 2020, but the principle of the needs identified are there for all to see and should be used as a basis to identify infrastructure needs by the city and county councils. The cycle route is highlighted. You will see a little further down the junction itself!</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane was revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, was revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.</p> <p>The Cart and Horses junction is owned by Hampshire County Council and lies outside the Application Boundary. The M3 Junction 9 strategic model includes the Cart and Horses junction. The 2047 traffic forecasts predict an increase in traffic flow</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>I'd like to discuss the footway routes in more detail. It is my understanding that any Highways NSIP must consider fully the needs of NMU. Highways England will always consider the vehicles- it is up to us as local residents to consider the rest!</p> <p>At what point does the A34 gain motorway status? And could we meet with HCC officers to discuss the implications of the new road changes to the area around and at the Cart and Horses junction?</p>		<p>along the A33, a decrease in traffic flow along the B3047, and a reduction in delay at B3047 approaches with the introduction of the Scheme.</p> <p>The A34 southbound gains motorway status after the diverge (directly after exiting the proposed M3 underpass) which leads to the M3 southbound / Gyratory.</p>
Local community	<p>The Winchester Movement strategy work suggests that improvements to the capacity of and flow through this junction will have a positive impact on the city's traffic issues, air pollution, carbon footprint etc. I remain unconvinced, because in many cases, the issues are caused by accidents on the M3 or A34 outside the proposed plan area. I do not see any data in the consultation report to show expected movements, % of non polluting vehicles by 2035, etc in the papers. This leads to build up of traffic which is avoided by going through Winchester instead. Unless these plans reduce accidents on the feeder trunk roads (the M3 and A34,) the traffic build ups will still occur, all too often as traffic levels are returning to pre pandemic levels.</p> <p>These are my specific points for your consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The layout is better for local people using the A33 who were worried about crossing heavy traffic, but it now means that all local users will have to use the new junction every time (which wasn't the case in the previous design). This may lead to congestion so it has not served our needs as well as we would hope. The north exit from the A33 on to the M3 north brings faster traffic movements closer to the communities that I represent- hence potentially noisier, which is unacceptable. • The positioning of the soil deposits has been done to suit HE/landowners. It is a missed opportunity to mitigate the noise of the road in operation all along the route from south to north. (see also point 12) Princes Mead has concerns about the setting of the listed building too. There is no assessment of flood risk when these soil heaps are in place. • The omission of the cycle route to Kings Worthy when it was so clearly described in the first proposal is a failure in this design. It is a need that is clearly described in the WCC/HCC Infrastructure Funding Statement (previously the R123 list) which I have already sent to the design/project team. I believe it is a duty to consider the needs of Non Motorised Users to be taken into account in any NSIP scheme, so this omission is disappointing. • The lack of traffic lights may be ok initially, but inevitably, there will be a need to control traffic flows in years ahead. Please include electricity schemes to enable traffic lights to be fitted later. 	Y	<p>The Applicant has noted these comments and sets out its response to the matters relating to design below. Other matters raised in this response are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p> <p><i>Responding to point 3 and 6:</i></p> <p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route • The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length. <p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the current provisions and introduce new routes and connections. All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme. The use of tactile paving (both blister and corduroy types) is also proposed to cater for the visually impaired, and wayfinding signage will also be provided along the footway/cycleway/bridleway routes as part of the Scheme proposal.</p> <p>NCN Route 23 would be upgraded. On both sides of the gyratory (east and west), the existing walking and cycling route which links both parts of Easton Lane, would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to show signage and gantries in the scheme means that we cannot tell what views these will present to local people, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area. Already, the traffic lights of the junction can be seen from miles away in my division, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area, and cross motorway gantries can be viewed from Martyr Worthy in the national park. • If this country is to embrace walking and cycling for local commuting use, then the 3m wide cycle routes are inadequate to pass and should be wider. This includes actually on the roundabout where at one point, the walk/cycle way is alongside the main road. The Winnall area will continue to provide employment opportunities as well as retail etc. Other larger lorries go into the city from this junction. The paths created should not be shared for walkers and cyclists on planned bridleway that connect and to the NCN 23 where cyclists can be riding faster than is safe for walkers sharing the same surface (all should be at least to LTN1/20). • Impact on Cart and Horses junction traffic going onto the A33 from the B3047 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The design has no traffic breaks in traffic moving north on the A33 from Junction 9. Currently, there are traffic breaks (traffic lights create this) which create gaps in traffic to allow people to exit from the Cart and Horses junction, allowing it to function. This is particularly important at peak times when traffic entering and leaving Winchester is heavy on both routes. The new arrangement may create congestion, reduce safety and even more confusion at this junction. (It is also an opportunity to improve the gateway into the National Park at this point.) ○ The road layout of the A33 is changing, with one lane in each direction, and a bike lane coming into/through the junction. Currently there are sections of two lanes for filtering etc. These changes will impact on the junction itself which will need redesign to ensure it is safe, congestion doesn't occur and ideally actually improves for traffic going south (Morning Basingstoke traffic into Winchester), and Worthys /Winchester traffic going north and south at all times of day, but particularly at peak times, and traffic from the B3047 east going north. • The project statement states that one aim is to reduce Spitfire Link congestion, which severely impacts drivers there. There is no evidence in the project plan that the team have provided that shows how the new design will reduce congestion. At present, large traffic accelerates from a stop slower than smaller vehicles which results in no gaps for Spitfire Link traffic. There is no evidence provided that this will improve, because although much of the heavy traffic will be on the through road, not all of it will take that route; daytime traffic in particular, includes a considerable amount of large and small vehicles into Winnall. 		<p>provision for horse-riders would be improved with a widened 3m route (with 4m wide underpasses), which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway to enable rider dismounting for leading horses through to continue the route to the existing bridleway extent (which currently ceases within the existing roundabout). Future provision for horse-riders is allowed for (beyond the existing cessation point within the roundabout) by providing a wider 3m width bridge over the M3, and space for future mounting block provision either side of the western subway which would be sufficient to lead horses through.</p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. The route runs parallel to the west of the A33 with the route to be constructed within the existing verge. A signalised (unlit) Toucan crossing is proposed adjacent to the proposed National Highways depot roundabout, to provide a link to this route through the north-western side of the gyratory roundabout. The route then transitions to utilise the existing A34 northbound and A33 carriageways which are to be abandoned as part of the Scheme. The existing informal link to the existing PRow would also be upgraded from its connection to the A33.</p> <p>For the first River Itchen crossing (i.e. most northern), the route follows the existing A33 and is accommodated on the existing bridge deck abandoned carriageway. For the second river crossing (i.e. most southern), the Scheme includes a new cycle/footbridge to be constructed across the River Itchen, with the route extending south along the east of the new A34 alignment, crossing under the A34 in a new 4m wide subway which would then traverse around new attenuation basins, then progressing to the existing depot junction and towards NCN Route 23 via a new subway under the northern arm of the gyratory roundabout. The new cycle/footbridge would be approximately 3.5m wide.</p> <p>Four proposed subways would be required to accommodate existing and improved provision of routes in the area. The two new subways at the gyratory roundabout would cater for existing users of NCN Route 23, one additional subway would link with the western walking and cycling route, while a subway under the A34 northbound catering for the pedestrian/cyclist users of the new route.</p> <p>The new subways would comprise of in-situ or precast reinforced concrete box structures. In-situ or precast reinforced concrete splayed wing walls are proposed on corners of the new subways. Lengths vary but the longest subway is approximately 28m length with a clear width of 4m with clear site lines to the exit to maximise user comfort and safety. Furthermore, all subways are to be appropriately lit during day time and night time hours.</p> <p>An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The levels on the project plans are difficult to follow, and I asked HCC to seek more traffic data, and full levels plan to see the implications for views, noise, pollutants fall out. The drive through video is poor, and difficult to follow : I requested an improved version but was told this was impossible. There is a considerable amount of biodiversity work to be considered: which includes interconnectivity between areas being 'managed' for biodiversity. I am leaving this to the experts at WCC, HCC and to SDNPA, but I do have concerns about the long term management of the water areas, set within the road system. The DEFRA 2016 noise map showed that improvement to noise mitigation were desirable at points through Winchester and for the A34 at the Headbourne Worthy site. A noise reference along Willis Waye is included in your scheme. Anything worse, even by a slight margin would be unacceptable in planning terms 'for the enjoyment of the property' and other properties affected in this way. Since Willis Waye was built, a considerable number of properties have been built in this area, alongside the A34 margins and I am seeking noise defence for these residents. Original tree planting is unsatisfactory: acoustic fencing is necessary here to mitigate noise. I must also express my regret that an 'open air' event wasn't organised for this consultation. With many other events taking place, this was a missed opportunity to engage the public face to face. 		<p>links to local villages. The bridleway has been designed to a gradient of no more than 1:20. The route would be an unbound surface (i.e. crushed basalt or similar) to allow for a free draining surface which is suitable for the range of users. A swale would be included adjacent to the path (on the upward side of the landform), to informally collect surface water (following heavy rainfall) to ensure the bridleway remains accessible. The route would provide for a varied visual experience for users accessing the South Downs National Park and connect to the wider rights of way network within improved access via the M3 Junction 9 gyratory.</p> <p>The Applicant has reduced the size of the loop on the western side of the gyratory and incorporated the provision of steps within the loop to enable a more direct and quicker route for walkers. The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved.</p> <p>Furthermore, the footway/cycleway through Junction 9 and along the entirety of the A34 section will have a form of separation by means of a Vehicle Restraint System.</p>
Local community	Has any consideration been given to making the proposed footway from Kings Worthy to Winnall a shared footway/cycleway? This change would allow residents at this end of Winchester/Abbots Barton/Kings Worthy to cycle to Winnall (Tesco's etc) without having to go into Winchester and back out up the narrow Wales Street and Easton Lane road to the various businesses located in the Winnall trading estate.	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route.</p>
Local community	Saddened that the previous proposed cycle and bridleways seem to have been abandoned. They were the only potentially good outcome in the whole project as far as I can see. I do not believe that changing the road layout will improve anything at this junction, just encourage more cars on the road. However, the silver lining was the potential to improve cycle provision. This is not likely to be a well-used footpath, few people which to walk alongside the M3, but it could be a useful cycle link for the area and enable joined up active journeys, surely there is greater benefit in upgrading the path to a bridleway?	Y	<p>The Applicant engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route
Local community	Highways England's updated M3 Junction 9 design abandons plans for a new cycle route and a new bridleway, reducing the options for cycling back to the bare minimum. Please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths. Please use this opportunity to safeguard cyclists and save a life or two.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users.
Local community	It is critical that accessibility for all is enhanced. Please restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths.	Y	<p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.
Local community	As a resident of Kings Worthy I am a very concerned that much of the proposed cycle route planned for in the development have been dropped. It is vital to restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycle way to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths and also to ensure the upgrade to National Cycle Route 23 meet the latest Government guidelines. In this way it will ensure cycling can continue from Kings Worthy to Winnall, enable the increase of cycling as a method of transport for work and leisure and to encourage cycling as the first choice as a means of transport.	Y	<p>All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme. The use of tactile paving (both blister and corduroy types) is also proposed to cater for the visually impaired, and wayfinding signage will also be provided along the footway/cycleway/bridleway routes as part of the Scheme proposal.</p> <p>Furthermore, the footway/cycleway through Junction 9 and along the entirety of the A34 section will have a form of separation by means of a Vehicle Restraint System</p>
Local community	<p>The road scheme is not appropriate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it will destroy and fragment important protected habitats for wildlife which is rapidly declining (State of Nature reports, RSPB) building roads induces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. traffic (SACTRA reports) b. CO2 emissions and noxious pollutants it contravenes government targets to reduce climate change and public efforts to deal with the climate emergency it contravenes cycling and walking strategies and need for investment in public transport it contravenes need for an integrated transport policy it contravenes government's 25-year Environment Plan (government earlier manifesto to leave the environment in a better place than the one in which they found it) it contravenes the SDNP nature plan where its efforts for nature's recovery would be an interconnected 'nature network it contravenes people's need for green spaces and landscapes for health, recreation and visual upliftment 	Y	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p><i>In response to point 4:</i></p> <p>The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes. In total, an additional 4.8km of public rights of way are to be provided as part of the Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	<p>Footpaths and cycle ways</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The original Itchen Way from the Fulling Mill into Winnall and the Nun's Walk (Allan King Way) into Winchester from St Mary's Church to the King Alfred should be preserved or improved. Both these original paths are important for local walkers and offer more attractive routes than the proposed new paths as they follow the course of river tributaries and also pass through protected wildlife areas. The new footpath following the existing northbound A33 of does not appear to offer much amenity. Such a path on a narrow strip of land between two fast moving carriageways does not seem very attractive for walkers. The plan suggests that for at least 300 metres of the path the distance between the northbound and southbound carriageways is less than 30 metres. If this path is installed it would be better if it was made into a cycleway to offer local cyclists a traffic free route into Winchester and the shopping area at Winnall. For walkers it would appear a better option would be to link to the Itchen Way where it crosses the Itchen. A generally better alternative for local amenity would be to run the northbound and southbound A34 adjacent to each other along the original Northbound route and put a footpath/cycleway along the old Southbound route away from the fast moving carriageways. The new path proposed on the east side of the M3 does not appear to be of much benefit for local walkers. It appears it would be elevated on the side of the hill, but recessed into the hillside. As such, it would mainly offer views over the motorways or no views. It is not clear what local demands this path meets. It would be better to save the cost of this and spend more to achieve a better arrangement for walkers and cyclists on the western side where higher utilisation can be expected. <p>Noise Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise pollution coming from the A34 on the east of Kings Worthy (e.g Three Maids Hill) has increased significantly in over recent years. With increased traffic flows, and higher speeds, steps should be taken to mitigate the increased noise pollution on this section of the A34. The sections of road forming the new junctions with the M3 are on higher ground and much closer to the village of Kings Worthy. Noise mitigation steps should be taken here to manage the increased noise pollution that will result. <p>Disruption</p>	Y	<p>The Scheme's rights of way strategy addresses National Highways design principle 2 (is inclusive), 3 (makes roads understandable), 4 (fits in context), and 6 (is environmentally sustainable).</p> <p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded and would retain the current provisions and introduce new routes and connections. All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with DfT's inclusive mobility impaired users. The range of opportunities and barriers to all forms of movements have been given due consideration in the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>The use of tactile paving (both blister and corduroy types) is also proposed to cater for the visually impaired, and wayfinding signage will also be provided along the footway/cycleway/bridleway routes as part of the Scheme proposal.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant continued to engage with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route The footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to also include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. <p><i>In response to point 1:</i></p> <p>In the early stages of preliminary design, a walking, cycling and horse-riding optioneering exercise was carried out by the Applicant and the contractor to assess the buildability, routing feasibility against the existing site constraints which include the River Itchen SSSI and floodplain. The outcome of this exercise defined the optimum routes as illustrated within the 2021 statutory consultation.</p> <p>As noted above, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane, has been revised to include a cycling route. A link is also proposed to the existing Nun's Walk Public Right of Way. The A33 is to be reconfigured to a bidirectional carriageway and it is expected that traffic flows will be less than existing. The existing informal crossing of the A33 is to be amended by the provision of carriageway build outs, tactile paving and reflective bollards, which will make the crossing point more desirable for pedestrians</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Local residents are very concerned about the level of inconvenience and disruption this project will bring to the area. The journey from Kings Worthy to the south side of Winchester (e.g. Bar End) is already difficult and can be expected to be much worse while these works are being carried out. There are only two southbound routes out of Kings Worthy, via J9 or via the Worthy Road and through the City. Since the recent Covid restrictions were introduced the traffic flow around the City's one way system has been further restricted by the closure of Hyde Street and lane narrowing on North Walls. This means all southbound traffic going through the City is routed past the "Albion" junction close to the railway station. There are now major hold-ups as a result. As an example the journey from Kings Worthy to the new Sports and Leisure Centre at Bar End (less than 3 miles in a straight line) can approach half an hour at busy times. Therefore, it will be essential to re-open Hyde Street and restore a proper traffic flow around the Winchester one-way system before J9 works commence in order to avoid effectively cutting off Kings Worthy residents at busy times.</p>		<p>/ cyclists. The proposed footway/cycleway is an improvement upon the existing scenario.</p> <p><i>In response to point 2 and 3:</i></p> <p>A new 3m wide combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane (a link is also proposed to the existing Nun's Walk Public Right of Way). The route runs parallel to the west of the A33 with the route to be constructed within the existing verge. A signalised (unlit) Toucan crossing is proposed adjacent to the proposed National Highways depot roundabout, to provide a link to this route through the north-western side of the gyratory roundabout. The route then transitions to utilise the existing A34 northbound and A33 carriageways which are to be abandoned as part of the Scheme. The existing informal link to the existing PRow would also be upgraded from its connection to the A33.</p> <p>For the first River Itchen crossing (i.e. most northern), the route follows the existing A33 and is accommodated on the existing bridge deck abandoned carriageway. For the second river crossing (i.e. most southern), the Scheme includes a new cycle/footbridge to be constructed across the River Itchen, with the route extending south along the east of the new A34 alignment, crossing under the A34 in a new 4m wide subway which would then traverse around new attenuation basins, then progressing to the existing depot junction and towards NCN Route 23 via a new subway under the northern arm of the gyratory roundabout. The new cycle/footbridge would be approximately 3.5m wide.</p> <p>Four proposed subways would be required to accommodate existing and improved provision of routes in the area. The two new subways at the gyratory roundabout would cater for existing users of NCN Route 23, one additional subway would link with the western walking and cycling route, while a subway under the A34 northbound catering for the pedestrian/cyclist users of the new route.</p> <p>The new subways would comprise of in-situ or precast reinforced concrete box structures. In-situ or precast reinforced concrete splayed wing walls are proposed on corners of the new subways. Lengths vary but the longest subway is approximately 28m in length with a clear width of 4m with clear site lines to the exit to maximise user comfort and safety. Furthermore, all subways are to be appropriately lit during day time and night time hours.</p> <p><i>In response to point 4:</i></p> <p>An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages. The bridleway has been designed to a gradient of no more than</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>1:20. The route would be an unbound surface (i.e. crushed basalt or similar) to allow for a free draining surface which is suitable for the range of users. A swale would be included adjacent to the path (on the upward side of the landform), to informally collect surface water (following heavy rainfall) to ensure the bridleway remains accessible. The route would provide for a varied visual experience for users accessing the South Downs National Park and connect to the wider rights of way network within improved access via the M3 Junction 9 gyratory.</p> <p>The proposed earthwork strategy and woodland planting on the valley slopes west of the proposed chalk grassland would also aid visual screening of the M3 corridor from areas of the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>Further details can be found in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>
Local community	<p>I have reviewed the new proposal and comments as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am very pleased to see the new proposal for the safety of the route from the Junction 9 roundabout to the A33, Kings Worthy. 2. I note that the A33/Kings Worthy B3049 (Cart and Horses) junction lies within the scheme boundary. I therefore comment that this junction is already very dangerous, a point I have made many times. It is incapable of handling the present traffic volume. This traffic will be greatly increased with the link from Junction 9 encouraging the use of this route for access to the city centre as well as for North Winchester, Barton Farm etc. This junction must be improved! 3. The footway/cycletrack system must encourage increased cycling. All paths must allow for this growth of cycling safely. 	Y	<p>A key objective of the Scheme is to improve provisions for walkers and cyclists. The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport (to help reduce individual car journeys over short distances) through the provision of high-quality accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes. The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded as part of the proposals. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An improvement to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23 • An additional footway, cycleway and horse riding route on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages • A new combined footpath and cyclepath for the western side of the Scheme to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. <p>In summary, the following new walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions have been included since the 2021 statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed walking and cycling route to the west of the Scheme – approximately 3,151m in length • Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding route to the east of the Scheme – approximately 1,717m in length.
Local community	<p>Letter setting out basis of the representation:</p> <p>These representations are submitted in specific response to one element of the proposed works at Junction 9 of the M3, notably the proposed areas of land identified as potential deposition sites for surplus soil from the works.</p> <p>The OBJECTION in the strongest terms is submitted on four principal grounds:</p>	Y	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to deposition areas:</i></p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>a) Process and Procedure b) Landscape Impact c) Heritage Impact d) Access Implications</p> <p>The order of the objections should not be regarded as conveying any order of significance to the objections being raised.</p> <p>a) Process and Procedure</p> <p>Despite the stated intention by Highways England that this is the final round of consultation prior to the submission of the formal application to government, it is our understanding that this is the first consultation that any consideration has been given to the important issue of how to deal with surplus soil generated from the works. This is clearly a critical matter that should have been addressed much earlier in the development of the scheme.</p> <p>Even at this stage, the proposals for the deposition of surplus soil are extremely vague and lacking in any detail. All that can be gleaned from the available consultation material is that three potential sites have been identified and that the land levels may be increased by 4m at two of them, with no detail of intent for the third northern site. However, if the 4m increase represents the envisaged level of excess soil requiring deposition, it would seem plausible that a similar amount of deposition may be envisaged for the northern site, potentially leading to an infilling of the natural valley. It is also not yet known whether 1, 2 or 3 of these sites might be required; the actual landfill requirements; the proposed profiles of the land after deposition and future uses apart from a vague indication of returning to agriculture.</p> <p>There is therefore no basis upon which the impact can be properly assessed and therefore a considered response made and submitted.</p> <p>There is also no understanding of how these sites have been selected; this should be compared with the earlier consultation versions on alternative options for the junction works themselves. It is assumed, but it is not clear, that a range of potential sites have been considered and analysed. It is also hoped that discussions have been held with local authorities and organisations who have a detailed knowledge of the local area and would most probably be able to identify potential sites for soil deposition and subsequent enhancement works.</p> <p>Whilst we understand that the process can be ongoing from now onwards, up to and during the application process, there is limited opportunity for individual landowners, local residents and organisations to be directly involved, notwithstanding that they will be directly affected by the proposals.</p> <p>An OBJECTION must therefore be raised to the unfair and unsound process and it is requested that the opportunity be provided for a further round of consultation when the proposals for the deposition of surplus soil have been</p>		<p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, all three deposition areas have been removed for the Scheme. In re-profiling the landform between Easton Lane and Long Walk, in response to South Downs National Park Authority and Natural England's comments, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>As a highly sensitive building the potential impacts upon Princes Mead School have been fully considered within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). No significant impacts have been identified. A programme of archaeological investigation to inform the baseline consisting of geophysical surveys and trial trenching was carried out to inform the assessment and no remains associated with the Morn Hill camp have been identified within the Application Boundary.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to walkers, cyclists and horse-riders:</i></p> <p>The effects on existing PRowS during construction are outlined in Chapter 12 (Population and Human health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The impacts of the construction of the Scheme on these routes are considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted an outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) as part of its DCO application. The Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) provides details of how the construction works will be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measure, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase. The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p>Due to the removal of the deposition areas, the existing walking, cycling and horse-riding routes within the vicinity of the Scheme would not be affected.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to cultural heritage:</i></p> <p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). The assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies outlined within the DMRB LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (National Highways, 2020) and the DMRB LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (National Highways, 2020) and agreed with key heritage stakeholders.</p> <p>It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>properly addressed and refined, taking into account the representations received from this stage of consultation.</p> <p>The following objections are therefore necessarily based on the limited information available and apply directly to the proposed northern area identified as a potential site for soil deposition. This site actually has the most limited information available; the flythrough of the scheme touches upon the central and southern sites but does not even refer to the northern site. The potential for the northern site is really only picked up from the site plans showing areas of land, which appear largely unrelated to the actual existing landforms.</p> <p>b) Landscape Impact</p> <p>Please refer to the attached assessment undertaken by the terra firma Consultancy Ltd. Terra firma are a well-respected firm of landscape architects advising on a local and national basis and who have advised the Trust on a number of projects over many years.</p> <p>The report concludes that there is the potential for significant harm on landscape character of and visual amenity within the SDNP, as well as on the setting of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>c) Heritage Impact</p> <p>Please refer to attached Heritage Impact Assessment from LJE Planning Ltd. This concludes the potential for significant harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* designated heritage asset of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>d) Access Considerations</p> <p>The northernmost site is within an existing agricultural field with very limited access. Existing access to the site is via narrow country lanes, most of which have to go through the very attractive and historic village of Easton. These existing routes cannot be contemplated as any means of access to the northern site.</p> <p>Looking at the plans that have been submitted it can only be deduced that the intention would be to create a new haul route parallel to the south side of the M3. This is not shown on any of the plans; only the final environmental improvements along this land. Its potential use as a haul route would need its own environmental assessment given the proximity to the River Itchen SSSI and there is no indication that such work has been undertaken. Noise, contamination and air quality issues in such a sensitive environment must also be considered.</p> <p>On the basis of the access limitations and considerations which would apply to the introduction of a new haul route, the access to this northern identified site would seem unrealistic and impractical.</p> <p>Summary</p>		<p>Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to Worthy Park House:</i></p> <p>Worthy Park House is recognised as a designated built heritage asset in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). An assessment of the impact on this receptor is provided in the chapter. It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p> <p>Specifically, a very small part of the area between the A34 and M3 is visible in long distance views from the listed building and overall, it is considered that construction activities are unlikely to be visually or audibly noticeable from the listed building and the current character experienced from the listed building would be retained. Therefore, the impact of magnitude would be negligible to Worthy Park House, resulting in a temporary slight adverse effect which is not significant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the LVIA concludes that the construction phase will have a slight effect that is also not significant on Worthy Park House during construction. By summer year 15, there will be no change of effect on Worthy Park House. See Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) for further details.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to landscape and visual:</i></p> <p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on landscape and visual amenity and likely significant effects following implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>At the foremost the Scheme proposals look to avoid impacts and the Scheme retains as much existing vegetation as possible, with landscape mitigation measures including extensive areas of native woodland planting, linear planting, roadside tree planting, species rich grass verges, and areas of chalk grasslands creation (which all complement biodiversity and respond to the key characteristics of the landscape in which the Scheme is located). There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape.</p> <p>The Scheme also includes re-profiling of existing landform to create sympathetic features and reinforce existing characteristics and aid visual screening together</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Significant OBJECTION must necessarily be raised to the proposals in so far as they relate to the deposition of excess soil as a result of the J9 changes. There is just insufficient information available to enable a proper assessment to be made of potential impacts, which is a major objection in itself to the process and procedures.</p> <p>However, and even on the limited information available, there would be significant landscape, heritage and access impact issues arising from the proposed use of the northern site. These are sufficient that this site should not be progressed any further as a potential soil deposition site. The site would be returned to agricultural use but leaving an irreversible impact on landscape and heritage which could and would not be mitigated by environmental measures.</p> <p>The enhancements along the line of the haul road, if indeed this is the intended means of access cannot be construed to be enhancements as they would appear to being promoted generally as part of the overall enhancement works and not specific to the deposition of soil at the northern site.</p> <p>There may be other sites (and not necessarily the other two identified sites) which would be much better suited with less adverse impacts and where there could be environmental benefits to be secured. It is understood that other objectors, including the South Downs National Park Authority have recommended other sites for consideration, where tangible and long lasting enhancements can be achieved.</p> <p>It is very much hoped that the next stages of the process will not only take account of these objections but also find a way to involve all those parties, including individual residents and landowners who will be directly impacted by these proposals.</p> <p>Summary of report on Landscape Impact:</p> <p>The element of the proposals that is covered by this report is the deposition of spoil, in particular to the potential northern site as identified on the extract below from the 'Indicative Land Uses' plan. The PEIR states at section 7.7.2 that 'The landscape of the areas of search for potential excess spoil management is defined by undulating arable farmland bounded by hedgerows and hedgerow trees. These areas of search for potential excess spoil management lie within the boundary of the SDNP' and at 7.7.6 that 'post construction the 'landscape east of the M3 within the SDNP would continue to exist as arable farmland with associated crop and land management changes.'</p> <p>PEIR states at 2.4.42 that 'The construction process would re-use excavated materials as fill (where possible) to reduce the number of construction vehicles travelling on the network.'</p> <p>There are three areas being considered for spoil deposition from the construction works. Our response concerns the northern area.</p> <p>The potential extent of the northern spoil deposition site is included within the Indicative Application Boundary on the proposals plans. However there is</p>		<p>with improving the network of public rights of way and new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes). These mitigation measures are presented in detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been included as part of the application to deliver any mitigation required. This describes the proposed outline management and monitoring of the landscape and ecological mitigation elements with detail of the objectives, and success criteria for the establishment to achieve its environmental function. This would be updated into a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) during detail design and would include further detail on the long-term management.</p> <p><i>Response in relation Landscape Character Areas:</i></p> <p>Landscape Character Areas considered in the study area for the Scheme are outlined in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Scheme and study area lies within three of the landscape character areas (LCAs) identified in the <i>South Downs Landscape Character Assessment (South Downs National Park Authority, 2020)</i>. These are LCA A5, LCA F5, LCA G5. The study area, as described in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), extends up to 3km from the Application Boundary, has been informed through consultation with stakeholders, visibility analysis and site survey. The published national, county and local character areas within the study area are shown on Figure 7.3.1 (Landscape Character Areas) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p><i>Response in relation to viewpoints:</i></p> <p>View Locations are shown on Figure 7.4 (View Locations) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2). Baseline photographs (winter and summer) are presented on photo sheets at Figure 7.12 (Photosheets (Daytime Winter and Summer)) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>In Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) view location 23 is recorded to have a negligible adverse magnitude of effect during construction. This is due to the fact that the deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme and the Application Boundary has been revised to reflect this change.</p> <p><i>Points in relation to South Downs National Park and its special qualities:</i></p> <p>The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Scheme design avoids introduction of tall bridge structures or elevated embankments and instead the Scheme is positioned within cutting with structures and associated headwalls set within the landform at as low an elevation as possible.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>limited further information; on viewing the flythrough of the scheme it is clear that, whilst this covers the central and southern spoil deposition sites and a raising of levels by approximately 4m to accommodate spoil, it does not refer to the northern site.</p> <p>The northern boundary line of the site runs immediately adjacent to the bridleway that links the western edges of Easton village with the subway below the M3 linking through to the Itchen Way and the Itchen Valley to the west of the M3.</p> <p>The site lies across a dry valley on the side of the downland, with the northern extent set at between approx. 50m AOD at the north-west corner rising to approx. 60m AOD at the north-east corner. The southern boundary at set at approx. 70m AOD at the south-west corner, dropping down to approx 66m AOD before rising up again to 80m to the south-east boundary.</p> <p>Worthy Park House is listed Grade II* and its Coach House separately listed Grade II; its grounds are listed on the Hampshire Register of Gardens Parks and Landscapes of Historic Interest.</p> <p>The site is located to the east of Abbots Worthy between the A33 and the M3 road corridors. The buildings, which include Worthy Park House, are set to the north of the B3047 beyond intervening agricultural land and school playing fields. Vehicular access is from a private drive that runs from the B3047 I and also serves adjacent residential properties to the east of the site. To the west and north of the site lie areas of deciduous woodland, with the northern woodland within the ownership of our client. Sports pitches and courts are situated to the south and southwest of the school buildings.</p> <p>The site lies on ground falling towards the southern boundary with the B3047 on the north side of the River Itchen valley floor. The building is set at approximately 64m AOD, with the road set at approx 51m AOD. On a direct line between the House and the northern deposition site the Itchen Valley falls to a low point of approx 42m AOD.</p> <p>With reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011), the northern spoil deposition site lies in the Landscape Character Area (LCA) A5 East Winchester Open Downs.</p> <p>Relevant key characteristics of this character zone include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the open character of the East Winchester Open Downs, there are expansive views over Winchester and the Itchen Valley. • Open rolling upland chalk landscape of rolling Downs reaching 176m at Cheesefoot Head. • Dominated by large 18th and 19th century fields of arable and pasture, bounded by sparse thorn hedgerows creating a very open landscape supporting a range of farmland birds. 		<p>Views of the Scheme from the designated landscape have been considered with the aim where possible to minimise any adverse effects.</p> <p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p> <p>Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the special qualities of the South Downs National Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p><i>Response in relation to public consultation:</i></p> <p>As part of the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant presented a variety of plans and figures (including; the Indicative Application Boundary, a General Arrangements plan and environmental baseline figures). A 'red line' was included on all figures to illustrate the proposed site boundary of the DCO application.</p> <p>The 2021 PEIR and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the information presented in 2021 PEIR and supporting figures aligns with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements and the Infrastructure EIA Regulations 2017.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large open skies ensure that weather conditions are a dominant influence creating a dynamic, moody landscape, particularly on higher ground e.g. at Cheesefoot Head. • A strong sense of remoteness and tranquillity away from the major transport routes (M3, A31, A272) which cross the landscape. • Other characteristics to note are: • Transport routes carve up the area – the M3 runs along the western boundary and the A31/A272 cut across the character area in an east-west direction. The sense of tranquillity and remoteness of this character area is diminished in the vicinity of these major transport routes. Also associated with the major transport routes out of Winchester is ribbon development, as seen along the B3404. • Of particular sensitivity is the remote and tranquil character of the East Winchester Open Downland which is threatened by its proximity to Winchester and numerous transport routes. • Given the proximity to, and views over, Winchester, this area is also sensitive to changes in the urban area and on the urban fringe beyond the South Downs study area. Also of particular sensitivity are the prominent scarps and open undeveloped skylines. • Observable changes in the past have included the introduction and upgrading of major roads, including the M3, A272, and A31 which have severed the landscape and created some incongruous cuttings and bridges. <p>Development considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent further fragmentation of the East Winchester Downs by roads and development. • Seek opportunities to reduce the visual impact of existing visually intrusive elements such as the infrastructure and traffic associated with the M3, A272, and A31, and prominent built elements on the edge of Winchester. • Maintain the open and undeveloped scarps and skylines – avoid siting of buildings, telecommunication masts, power lines and wind turbines on the sensitive skyline. • With reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011), Worthy Park House lies in the adjacent LCA E4 Itchen Valley. Characteristic points to note include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This character area includes the rural part of the valley of the River Itchen in two locations north east and south of Winchester. The boundaries are strongly defined by the topography and are drawn along the apparent skyline of the valley sides as seen from the valley floor. ○ Crossed by the M3 and A roads which interrupt the otherwise tranquil landscape. A sequence of settlements occur along the lower valley sides. 		<p><i>Response in relation to construction:</i></p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) present assessments in relation to air quality, contamination and noise, respectively.</p> <p>As part of the DCO Application, Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) has been produced to show the haul roads and temporary construction compounds.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Although the valley has an overall tranquil quality this is disrupted in place by the audible ‘hum’ of traffic. <p>Key landscape sensitivities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The smooth form of the intact valley sides which reveal dramatic chalk landforms. • The setting of, and uninterrupted views to churches tower/spires, which are often seen against the rising downland backdrop of the valley sides are also important. • Designed landscapes which provide evidence of gentry houses and landscape parks of the wealthy population of the past. • The woodlands and • hedgerows generally limit visual sensitivity of these valley landscapes. However, the visibility of the chalk valleys from the adjacent downs increases their visual sensitivity. From within the valleys, the valley crests are seen against an open sky and are particularly visually sensitive. <p>Landscape management considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve the intact smooth form of the valley and its dramatic chalk landforms. • Conserve historic designed landscapes, and their settings, which provide evidence of gentry houses and landscape parks of the wealthy population of the past. <p>Development management considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the effects of incremental change to buildings and land, and minimise such change by providing design guidance and encouraging applicants to enter into discussions at an early stage in the preparation of their proposals. • Conserve the open skylines of the valley crests which are particularly sensitive in views from the valleys. Consider views from the adjacent downs in relation to any change in the chalk river valleys. <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House are on the southern facade, with all the rooms, including the key internal spaces, looking out over the landscape to the south across the top of the lower level Itchen Valley, much of which is hidden in the intervening woodland on the valley floor, along with the M3 corridor. The eye is drawn beyond to the open arable downland above the valley floor where the rolling nature is clearly visible in the views from Worthy Park House, accentuated by the presence of the characteristic valley, central to views, which give rise to a distinctive contouring of the landform. The presence of the valley is also accentuated by the patterns of the arable farming landscape with straight lines seemingly folding and curving around the contours of the landform.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The PEIR Heritage Chapter includes at section 6.8.13 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) states ‘Worthy Park House is located to the north of the IAB. Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape including south across land within the IAB. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding landscape, which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped retaining part of the views described in the nineteenth century and contributes towards the historic interest of the listed building. The construction of the Proposed Scheme, particularly areas of search for potential excess spoil management, potential construction compound areas and areas proposed for environmental mitigation on the eastern side of the M3 are likely to be prominent in views from the listed building introducing construction traffic and further eroding the character of the surrounding landscape which are part of the wider setting of the listed building. As part of the wider setting that has already been extensively altered the construction of the Proposed Scheme is likely to result in an impact of minor magnitude and a temporary slight or moderate adverse effect. This assessment will be reviewed in ongoing EIA work and reported in the ES following the decision on which areas of search for potential excess storage will be included and once further details about construction activities in this area are available.’</p> <p>Section 7.4.4.sets out the relevant landscape character areas, stating these cover all the relevant areas - but there is no mention of the LCA to the north that Worthy Park House lies within: SDLICA LCA E4 Itchen Valley.</p> <p>Topography is described as ‘a key characteristic of the undulating hills in the nationally designated SDNP. It is also important to the wider distinctive landscape of the River Itchen valley’ and is ‘therefore considered to be of medium to high value (sensitivity) depending on location relative to the SDNP and its setting’. Effects on topography are stated to be as follows: ‘Construction: Temporary adverse landscape effects are anticipated for the topography within the IAB as a result of construction activities and land reprofiling’ and ‘Operation: Adverse effects on topography are anticipated to remain during operation as result of the earthworks required to enable the Proposed Scheme. However, earthworks have been designed to sympathetically tie into existing levels and surrounding landform within the SDNP.’</p> <p>Vegetation is described as ‘The surrounding landscape contains numerous copses, blocks of trees, hedgerown trees and hedgerows alongside lanes, tracks and field boundaries. The area of the IAB contains fields of both arable and pastoral farmland, typically bounded by hedgerows’ and ‘is a key characteristic of the nationally designated SDNP and is fundamental to the distinctive landscape of the River Itchen valley. It is an important part of the</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>green infrastructure of the area and it is therefore considered to be of high value (sensitivity).’ No effects on vegetation are noted as being relevant to the northern spoil deposition site.</p> <p>Whilst Registered Parks and Gardens are assessed in this section, Heritage Statutory designations are not assessed as part of the landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>Landscape Statutory Designations include ‘The SDNP covers around 117ha of the area of the IAB, principally around its northern and eastern lengths (see Figure 7.1, Appendix 7.1). The SDNP incorporates the more intimate local landscape of the River Itchen to the north-west, the north-east of the area of the IAB and also covers the downland to the east. Consideration will be given to both the direct and indirect effects upon this designated landscape, including effects upon its special qualities and representative views. Special qualities of the SDNP are defined by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA); those special qualities which have the potential to be affected by the Proposed Scheme are as follows: Diverse, inspirational landscapes and breath-taking views. This is in part a function of the downland topography, and tranquil; and unspoilt places.’ and is stated to be ‘a nationally designated landscape resource of very high value (sensitivity).</p> <p>Points on perceptual aspects include ‘Noise, lighting, vehicle movement and the presence of infrastructure, all associated with the urban fringe of Winchester and the transport routes including the M3, A34/Winchester bypass and A272/Spitfire Link all erode tranquillity in the area’ and that ‘Built development and transport corridors have also affected the pattern and texture of the landscape over time’ and that tranquillity ‘is a perceptual quality of the landscape, and is influenced by things that people can both see and hear in the landscape around them’ and that ‘Tranquillity and a sense of remoteness are important aspects of the nationally designated SDNP and the River Itchen valley and are of high value (sensitivity).’</p> <p>The PEIR states that relevant landscape character assessments will also be examined and used to inform the landscape assessment.</p> <p>The assessment methodology states that the assessment of the magnitude of impacts on landscape receptors, the evaluation of the significance of landscape effects and the reporting of residual landscape effects for each landscape receptor are all to be reported in ES.</p> <p>Table 7-11 sets out the 24 viewpoints selected and the potential visual effects. There are two that are likely to include views of the northern spoil deposition site: 23 and 24, both from public rights of way. No photographs are available at this stage for review.</p> <p>There are no views from Worthy Park House included.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The assessment methodology states that assessment of the magnitude of visual impacts, evaluation of the significance of visual effects and reporting of residual visual effects are all to be reported in ES.</p> <p>Effects during operation for Viewpoint 23 area noted ‘Adverse effects would reduce over time as the landscape mitigation takes effect. Longer term beneficial effects are expected as a result of the landscape mitigation.’</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Mitigation Design Plan makes no reference to mitigation proposals for the northern spoil deposition site .</p> <p>The section states that ‘Anticipated further assessment relevant to landscape and visual matters, which will be submitted with the ES to accompany the Development Consent Order (DCO) process is as follows: A full assessment of landscape and visual effects on receptors and reporting of significance will be undertaken as part of the ES’ alongside continuing design work.</p> <p>The public consultation is being held with a considerable lack of information for review; proposals are diagrammatic, indicative and in some aspects simply not available. This gives very little scope for a full understanding of the nature of the proposals by the public. This information provided is not a full landscape and visual impact assessment and is subject to design development. Therefore the full proposals cannot be properly reviewed and commented on.</p> <p>The figures included in the information include a red line that covers the entirety of the proposals for the construction and operational stages. This gives rise to difficulties in reviewing specific areas of the proposals and their effects.</p> <p>The statement that the ‘earthworks have been designed to sympathetically tie into existing levels and surrounding landform within the SDNP’ is not backed up by any proposals available for review. The information on the spoil deposition sites is very limited. The amount of spoil being relocated to the northern spoil deposition site will determine the final ground levels, however this is not known at this stage and therefore the form of the proposals cannot be determined. It should be noted that the central and southern spoil deposition sites are far more level in nature than the northern site which dips considerably in the middle and the blanket spreading of a 4m layer of spoil may give rise to significant adverse effects in a valley situation. Indeed, without clarity on the proposals for the northern spoil deposition site, if there is considerable spoil to be deposited on the northern site then this may in effect be used to ‘fill’ the valley, giving rise to significant adverse effects on one of the main key characteristics of the landscape identified in the SDILCA.</p> <p>The PEIR notes that, as mitigation, the adverse effects on Viewpoint 23 will reduce over time, however the raising of levels and changes to topography are permanent and will remain constant over the long term. With the key landscape characteristics for the spoil deposition site noted as the ‘open rolling chalk’ downland with ‘sparse hedgerows, the nature of the landscape character gives little opportunity for mitigation or enhancement.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Any change in levels will affect the nature of the view from Worthy Park House. Regarding Worthy Park House, the PEIR Heritage section states that ‘Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape including south across land within the IAB. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding landscape, which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped retaining part of the views described in the nineteenth century and contributes towards the historic interest of the listed building.’</p> <p>It is exactly these views that have been identified as contributing to the historic interest of the House that will be affected by potentially significant adverse effects to the landscape character of the SDNP, identified by the PEIR as very highly sensitive.</p> <p>On the basis of the points raised above, this report concludes that there is the potential for significant harm on landscape character of and visual amenity within the SDNP, as well as on the setting of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>Report on Heritage Impact:</p> <p>LJE Planning Ltd was instructed to consider the impact of the Scheme on the significance of the designated heritage asset, Worthy Park House (Grade II*) with particular regard to the impact on its setting. The assessment is undertaken with particular regard to the inclusion of proposals for identified sites for the deposition of excess spoil, one of which would be on the south side of the Itchen Valley, directly ‘opposite’ Worthy Park House and its grounds.</p> <p>There is regrettably very limited information available about the precise details of the proposed scheme for this potential deposition site. All that can be gleaned from the available consultation material is that three potential sites have been identified and that the land levels may be increased by 4m at two of them, with no detail of intent for the third northern site. However, if the 4m increase represents the envisaged level of excess soil requiring deposition, it would seem plausible that a similar amount of deposition may be envisaged for the northern site, potentially leading to an infilling of the natural valley.</p> <p>In the absence of any more precise details and analysis of the proposals, this assessment has necessarily had to be made on the basis of this extremely limited information; namely the location of the site as identified by the overall extent of the application site for the proposed works including the deposition sites, the suggestion in the consultation material that land levels may be raised or changed by 4m and that the land would revert to agricultural use in the longer term.</p> <p>Client’s land occupies a 5.68 hectare site on the northern side of the B3047 approximately 1km to the east of the junction with the A33 and within the</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>countryside and South Downs National Park. The main building is Worthy Park House, a Grade II* listed, former residential house within a parkland setting, designed by Sir Robert Smirke and dating from the 1820s. The School has recently been successfully extended to the side facing the Coach House, but this extension is not generally visible from the southern side of the building.</p> <p>There are a small number of other buildings within the site, including the Coach House, which is separately listed Grade II to the immediate north-east of the house, and thought also to be by Smirke, as well as the much more recently built sports hall to the west. There is a hard surfaced play area / netball court to the immediate west of the main house and the main grassed playing fields, hard surfaced tennis courts/netball courts and play areas lie to the south.</p> <p>The grounds are also included on the Hampshire County Council's register of Historic Parks and Gardens (No 1550).</p> <p>There is a Scheduled Monument (Saxon Cemetery) in the woodland area to the west of the Site.</p> <p>In the 18th century, Worthy Park belonged to William Evelyn who constructed a mansion in 1722. The Worthy Park estate passed to Kingston's second wife Isabella, whose son by a previous marriage, Sir Chaloner Ogle, inherited in 1761.</p> <p>Sir Charles Ogle, grandson of Sir Chaloner Ogle constructed the present Worthy Park House in 1820 to a neo-classical design by Sir Robert Smirke. The layout of the property plot was redeveloped at this time. The west wing of the existing 1722 mansion was demolished and the new house built over its foundations (Butchart 1989). The existing rectangular plan building was retained and incorporated into 1820 house as the east wing and used as a service range. The stable block and stable yard wall were constructed at this time, also believed to be by Smirke.</p> <p>Ogle sold the Worthy Park Estate to Samuel Wall in 1825; it remained with his descendants (the Rivers, Fryer and Butchart families) until the late 1950s. During WWII it was used as the southern command headquarters for the Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers and accommodation for the Auxiliary Territorial Service.</p> <p>Following WWII, Worthy Park House was still owned by the Butchart family, although they did not live there. In the late 1950s it was sold to Currys Ltd and became their regional office and staff training centre. Currys left the property in 1985 and the house stood vacant for four years until T. S. Frobisher Ltd. bought it to use as a business centre. Prince's Mead School took over the Site in 1999 and continue to occupy the site.</p> <p>There is a statutory duty to have regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any special architectural or historic features that they possess.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) defines the setting of a heritage asset as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral. <p>Worthy Park House is listed Grade II* and its significance relates to both features of special architectural interest as well as historic interest relating to the design by Sir Robert Smirke. In addition, and of particular relevance to this issue under consideration, the setting adds to the overall significance of the listed building.</p> <p>Country houses defined their owners' relative social standing and the setting of a country house, in the landscape, was of considerable consequence. The site for an nineteenth century house was most particularly chosen for its potential views across parkland and where there might be some view of water or a water feature created.</p> <p>With respect to Worthy Park House, commentary in "Selected Illustrations of Hampshire" published in 1834 describes the importance of the southerly view from the house. 'Below the south front of the mansion winds the river Itchen, on the opposite banks of which rise beautiful eminences, partly covered with wood, beyond, are the more romantic downs.' The historical relationship between the house and the landscape should therefore not be underestimated.</p> <p>Worthy Park House, in its elevated position on the north side of the Itchen Valley gives it a commanding location over the valley. This relationship has not largely changed in character and appearance since the house was first built despite the changes to the use of the building and intervening development. The setting of Worthy Park House and its relationship to the landscape remains an essential part of the significance of the designated heritage asset.</p> <p>The setting of Worthy Park House, both in terms of views out from the house and its south facing grounds as well as views of the house from the surrounding area largely comprise the rolling downlands of the River Itchen valley.</p> <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House and the landscape setting for the Grade II* listed building are described more fully at paragraph 6.2 of the report by the terra firma Consultancy on the landscape and visual effects of the M3 J9 proposals:</p> <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House are on the southern facade, with all the rooms, including the key internal spaces, looking out over the landscape to the south across the top of the lower level Itchen Valley, much of which is hidden in the intervening woodland on the valley floor, along with the M3</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>corridor. The eye is drawn beyond to the open arable downland above the valley floor where the rolling nature is clearly visible in the views from Worthy Park House, accentuated by the presence of the characteristic valley, central to views, which give rises to a distinctive contouring of the landform. The presence of the valley is also accentuated by the patterns of the arable farming landscape with straight lines seemingly folding and curving around the contours of the landform.</p> <p>Despite the paucity of available information on the details of what is proposed for the possible northern deposition site, it is clear that the use of this site for the deposition of excess spoil would result in changes to this existing landscape, including potentially through the artificial infilling of a natural valley. This would seriously detract from the setting which has been present since the house was built in the early nineteenth century. The rolling downlands are an integral part of the landscape character of this local area and the proposed infilling of the valley and raising of the land would be an artificial intrusion in that natural landscape.</p> <p>The proposed northern site for deposition of soils would be directly visible from the main building as well as from the grounds to the south of the building and the interrelationship of the building with its natural setting would therefore be harmed.</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (May 2021) (PEIR) produced by Highways England recognises at Table 6-5 that Worthy Park House, as a Grade II* listed building has 'high' sensitivity in relation to the proposals, and this is agreed.</p> <p>However, the Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline report undertaken by Highways England suggests at paragraph 5.2.17 and repeated in the PEIR at paragraph 6.8.13 that the existing setting has already been compromised by the construction of the M3 and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. It is contended that the effects of these later developments are overstated. The dominance of the house within the Itchen Valley and the relationship between the house and its setting is very largely unaltered since the time it was built and commented upon by the first owner, Sir Charles Ogle.</p> <p>Although it has been necessary to make certain assumptions about the extent of changes arising were the northern deposition site to be progressed, the conclusion is reached that there would be material impact to and therefore potentially significant harm to the setting of Worthy Park House. Such harm therefore would require to be offset by public benefits, which it is argued should be considered in the context of public benefits arising from the proposed northern deposition site. However, given that the proposal would appear to result in an artificial raising of the land and / or filling in of a natural valley, and its return to agricultural use, it is difficult to envisage any potential opportunities for landscape and / or environmental enhancements.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>This is of even more concern, given that it is noted that other parties submitting representations to this consultation exercise have raised the possibility of other areas of land for the deposition of excess soil, where there would be significant opportunities for landscape and environmental improvements.</p> <p>This report seeks to assess the potential impact of the works associated with the proposed northern site for the deposition of excess soils arising from the proposed works to J9 of the M3 on the setting and significance of Worthy Park House, a Grade II* listed building. Despite the serious shortcomings in the information available upon which the assessment necessarily has to be made, this report concludes that, on the understanding of the works envisaged, there would be significant harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* designated heritage asset of Worthy Park House.</p>		

K.2.U Legislation and policy

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure.			
Local community	<p>More information is needed on temporary and permanent impacts arising from the proposals, including in terms of noise impacts and noise mitigation. Additional noise reduction measures could beneficially be adopted as part of the scheme to reduce existing noise impacts on Kings Worthy from the combination of the M3, A33 and A34.</p> <p>It is not clear from the consultation material whether there are direct impacts (in terms of temporary diversion of closures of PROW) during the construction period. There is a very well used network of footpaths within the local area, including passing underneath the A33 and A34 from the Itchen Valley and Kings Worthy to Winchester and it is not clear if these will all remain open (even if temporarily locally diverted) during construction - they should be.</p> <p>It is not clear if there are any direct impacts in terms of loss of habitats associated with Winnall Moors during construction.</p> <p>It is not possible to currently conclude on the extent to which the proposals comply with the relevant National Policy Statement.</p>	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and the NPS NN Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) assess the Scheme against the relevant National Policy Statement.</p>
Local community	I imagine there are strong regulations that must be followed and they will suffice.	N	This comment has been noted. The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) sets out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.
Local community	I am delighted that Boris Johnson committed to '30 at 30' ie a 30% increase in biodiversity by 2030 and also to carbon reduction targets for the UK. These policies are completely incompatible with road upgrades such as the Junction 9 works on the M3. Furthermore, the A34 is at full capacity and already has a high accident rate. Pushing more volumes of traffic onto this road is simply unsafe. This money needs to go into public transport improvements and lower carbon ways of working ie working from home or in a virtual office. I would like to register my objection to these works going ahead, as we need to focus on stopping climate change and the collapse of the ecology on our country.	N	<p>The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase in emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>(Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate.</p> <p>Relevant biodiversity legislation is covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current Scheme programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>Section 4.11 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) show the the Scheme would reduce accidents.</p>
<p>D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme</p>			
Local community	<p>I am delighted that Boris Johnson committed to '30 at 30' ie a 30% increase in biodiversity by 2030 and also to carbon reduction targets for the UK. These policies are completely incompatible with road upgrades such as the Junction 9 works on the M3. Furthermore, the A34 is at full capacity and already has a high accident rate. Pushing more volumes of traffic onto this road is simply unsafe. This money needs to go into public transport improvements and lower carbon ways of working ie working from home or in a virtual office. I would like to register my objection to these works going ahead, as we need to focus on stopping climate change and the collapse of the ecology on our country.</p>	N	<p>The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase in emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>Relevant biodiversity legislation is covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current Scheme programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>Section 4.11 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) show the the Scheme would reduce accidents.</p>
Local community	Additional information is needed on the noise, PROW and direct habitat impacts associated with the scheme. It is not possible to determine if the environmental mitigation is adequate or appropriate currently, nor the extent to which the proposals comply with the relevant National Policy Statement.	N	<p>An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity, noise and PROW is set out in Chapters 8, 11 and 12 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), respectively. The ES includes details about the level of impact created and the mitigation proposed in relation to the Scheme. Further detail on the mitigation proposed is provided within Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and Appendix 7.6 (OLEMP) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3).</p> <p>Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p>
General commentary			
Local community	The proposals are long overdue. What is currently proposed appears to be an improvement over the previous proposals. Further detailed information is needed to be able to comment more meaningfully - as a number of key areas are still subject to further detailed work and assessment, with mitigation currently not finalised. It is not currently possible to conclude on the extent to which the proposals comply with the relevant National Policy Statement	N	Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with the National Policy Statement for National Networks.
Local community	Proposals for the expansion of M3 Junction 9 appear contrary to significant commitments to nature recovery networks by the Government, as set out in its 25-Year Environment Plan and draft Environment Bill. In addition, following the Government's recent announcement that the Environment Bill would be amended to require biodiversity net gain for new Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (such as Junction 9), Highways England should be including within this Scheme proposals to ensure nature recovery networks and to achieve the significant net gains in biodiversity at present missing.	N	Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current Scheme programme is that DCO decision would be made in September

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>2023, and as such the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity. See the Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Document Reference 6.3) for further details.</p>
Local community	<p>The road scheme is not appropriate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it will destroy and fragment important protected habitats for wildlife which is rapidly declining (State of Nature reports, RSPB) • building roads induces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. traffic (SACTRA reports) b. CO2 emissions and noxious pollutants • it contravenes government targets to reduce climate change and public efforts to deal with the climate emergency • it contravenes cycling and walking strategies and need for investment in public transport • it contravenes need for an integrated transport policy • it contravenes government's 25-year Environment Plan (government earlier manifesto to leave the environment in a better place than the one in which they found it) • it contravenes the SDNP nature plan where its efforts for nature's recovery would be an interconnected 'nature network' • it contravenes people's need for green spaces and landscapes for health, recreation and visual upliftment 	Y	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>In response to point 4:</p> <p>The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes. In total, an additional 4.8km of public rights of way are to be provided as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>In response to point 5:</p> <p>This comment has been noted.</p> <p>In response to point 6:</p> <p>The National Policy Statement for National Networks is the primary planning document against which the Scheme is assessed by the Secretary of State in deciding whether to grant a Development Consent Order. An assessment of the Scheme against the requirements of the National Policy Statement for National Networks is set out in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2). The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) also includes an assessment of the Scheme against other relevant national and local planning policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>In response to point 7:</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and the National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) set out how the Scheme complies with national and local policy. The Applicant has had regard to the South Downs Local Plan (2019) and has developed the Scheme design in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority.</p> <p>The Scheme constitutes major development within a National Park, and therefore strong justification for the project is required. The Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) demonstrates the rationale for the Scheme and the designs sensitive approach to the South Downs National Park, and how it has positively responded to the special qualities of the designation. Of particular note the Scheme increases opportunities for the public to access and enjoy by positively responding to severance issues caused by the existing M3.</p> <p>The Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors. The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental benefits, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes.</p>
Local community	<p>This road scheme should not be built because the proposals are a legacy from the road building era which is adding to our global warming emissions. Last year the National Park launched its Nature plan with 12 Investment Areas - one of these is where Highways England proposes to build a £130 million road scheme! They will destroy and fragment important protected habitats. This scheme affects the local nature reserve, which is home to rare and notable wildlife, and a SSSI site. In a recent press release from your authority, your own Countryside Director and Ecologist Andrew Lee said “.... <i>the South Downs National Park has a crucial role to play to lead nature recovery and be the hub of an interconnected ‘nature network’.....</i>”. The Highways England intrusion flies in the face of nature recovery.</p> <p>I support the Hampshire and IoW Wildlife Trust’s proposal for a green bridge to the National Park would reunite wildlife habitats that became disconnected by the 1990s M3 construction.</p> <p>More roads equals more traffic - when a new road is built, new traffic will divert onto it. Many people may make new trips they would otherwise not make just because of new roads. This well-known and long-established effect is known as 'induced traffic'.</p>	N	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with current and emerging national and local policy.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p> <p>Legislation, in relation to biodiversity net gain, is also covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The Highways England proposal will increase CO2 emissions by attracting more cars onto the roads! How are we going to meet the Government's commitment to net zero emissions in less than 30 years with road schemes like this? Transport accounts for 30% of all CO2 emissions. It is likely that there will still be 40 million petrol and diesel cars and vans on the roads in 2030 pulse diesel HGV!</p> <p>The UK's new climate target to cut our emissions by 78% by 2035 has now been put into law last month - the Highways England plan is out of step with this. As for nature, you have clearly never taken on board the Government's report by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta. He says, "Human demands on nature must be curbed" This statement is not in Highways England's vocabulary. Neither have you paid any heed to the Government's 25-year Environment Plan. The proposal does not include a landscape strategy. Please bear in mind the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this scheme.</p>		<p>separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current Scheme programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>A landscape strategy has been prepared for the Scheme. Details are provided in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.3), the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP), within Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets (including the 6th Carbon Budget). This assessment is reported in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. This chapter concludes that, when compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK's 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK's 5th and 6th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in isolation, would materially affect the UK's ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, in accordance with the DMRB LA 114 Climate, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.</p>
Local community	<p>I am delighted that Boris Johnson committed to '30 at 30' ie a 30% increase in biodiversity by 2030 and also to carbon reduction targets for the UK. These policies are completely incompatible with road upgrades such as the Junction 9 works on the M3. Furthermore, the A34 is at full capacity and already has a high accident rate. Pushing more volumes of traffic onto this road is simply unsafe. This money needs to go into public transport improvements and lower carbon ways of working ie working from home or in a virtual office. I would like to register my objection to these works going ahead, as we need to focus on stopping climate change and the collapse of the ecology on our country.</p>	N	<p>The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase in emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>Relevant biodiversity legislation is covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current Scheme programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>Section 4.11 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) show the the Scheme would reduce accidents.</p>
South Downs Network	<p>Objection The South Downs Network objects to the proposed M3 Junction 9 Development in its present form.</p> <p>Executive Summary: Move over to Sustainable Transport</p> <p>We respectfully suggest that this £180+ million road scheme should be referred back to be replaced by a sustainable transport version that will help us meet our climate change commitments, providing better bus services, bus and rail infrastructure, integrated green cycle and walking routes, safe crossing for active travel, green (car free) bridges, safer paths for access to schools and access to rail stations.</p> <p>Secretary of State for Transport guidance</p> <p>We would take this opportunity to remind Highways England of the words used by the Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps when launching the Government's 'Decarbonising Transport: Setting the Challenge,' said in the foreword that: "public transport and active travel will be the natural first choice for our daily activities" and that "We will use our cars less and be able to rely on a convenient, cost-effective and coherent public transport network".</p> <p>More roads - more traffic</p> <p>More roads equals more traffic - when a new road is built, new traffic will divert onto it. Many people may make new trips they would not otherwise make just because of new roads. This well-known and long-established effect is known as 'induced traffic'</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges South Downs Network's objection to the Scheme. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p>Response in relation to policy:</p> <p>The National Policy Statement for National Networks is the primary planning document against which the Scheme is assessed by the Secretary of State in deciding whether to grant a Development Consent Order. An assessment of the Scheme against the requirements of the National Policy Statement for National Networks is set out in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2). The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) also includes an assessment of the Scheme against other relevant national and local planning policy.</p> <p>Legislation in relation to biodiversity net gain is covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current Scheme programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Increase of emissions and global warming gases</p> <p>The Highways England proposal will increase CO2 emissions by attracting more cars onto the roads! Highways England's own report admits a significant increase in carbon emissions as a result of the project - some 534,628 tonnes of CO2 for user emissions. This doesn't include the emissions from the construction which doesn't seem to be reported on.</p> <p>How are we going to meet the Government's commitment to net zero emissions in less than 30 years with road schemes like this? Highways England say the project will be completed in 2026 so the timeline is even shorter at less than 25 years to achieve net zero! Wouldn't it be better to cancel the project and spend the £180 million on sustainable transport solutions?</p> <p>In 2020 transport accounted for 29.8% of all CO2 emissions. The majority is from road transport! How can Highways England advance a road scheme that will actively increase CO2 emissions?</p> <p>It is likely that there will still be 40 million petrol and diesel cars and vans on the roads in 2030 pulse diesel HGVs!</p> <p>The UK's new climate target to cut our emissions by 78% by 2035 was passed into law in June 2021 - the Highways England plan is out of step with this. The proposal does not include a landscape strategy. Road developments are not excluded from the UK's legally adopted climate commitment. The UK Government has a commitment to tackle climate change.</p> <p>Nature</p> <p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation Design Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that this design plan consists of just one page! We are concerned that there is no landscape strategy or detailed plan. The Mitigation Design Plan contains simply focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, we urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and biodiversity net gain. As part of this, we would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done. The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. We want</p>		<p>The Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging of options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</p> <p>Whilst the actual road design plan seems to be very firm there seems to be a lack of commitment by Highways England to the environment, an EIA and a landscape and biodiversity/habitats plan. Words such as ‘ongoing’ and “is being developed” keep cropping up. One gets the impression that the natural world is not important to Highways England.</p> <p>We are concerned that Highways England seemed to be avoiding a commitment to the production of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). In Para 1.5.4 of the PEIR Highways England says “It should be noted that at this stage the information is preliminary. An iterative process of scheme development and EIA is ongoing”. Surely a draft EIA should be available for public consultation now, and not be delayed until the DCO application? Indeed there seems to be a fudging of the commitment even at that stage to the production of an EIA. Highways England says “The final EIA work will be reported in the ES.”</p> <p>Indeed further fudging of commitment to environmental assessment is contained in the response to Natural England's submission of 9 November 2020. They highlighted that the impact of emissions to designated ecological sites is required. Highways England response was "Ongoing EIA work will include the assessment of the impacts of emissions from traffic on designated habitats."</p> <p>Avoiding say yes to Natural England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England said “The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies.” Highways England said “ongoing EIA work is to be reported.” • Natural England said they would welcome the opportunity to comment on the landscape, biodiversity and access enhancement plan. Highways England responded “A biodiversity and landscaping mitigation package is being developed.” But when? • Natural England advised that “the potential impact of the proposal upon features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for habitat creation/enhancement should be included within this assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance on such matters.” Highways England responded ""The Biodiversity chapter of the ES will identify all potential impacts on identified biodiversity features"" Further fudging." <p>SDNPA Nature Investment Areas</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The road site is where the South Downs National Park has identified one of its 12 nature investment areas. These nature recovery areas are part of a hub of an interconnected 'nature network.' The Highways England intrusion flies in the face of nature recovery and will destroy and fragment important protected habitats. This scheme affects the local nature reserve which is home to rare and notable wildlife, and a SSSI site.</p> <p>Previous environmental damage</p> <p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust's nature reserve at St Catherine's Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally. "</p> <p>SSSI and Special Area of Conservation</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network.</p> <p>Government Environmental Policy</p> <p>Highways England need to take on board Government policy on the environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government's Final Report of the Independent Review on the Economics of Biodiversity led by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta. Amongst other things he says "Human demands on nature must be curbed • We say - road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government 'Dasgupta Review' says, 'Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).' We should no longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to urbanisation pressures. 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also please bear in mind the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this scheme. <p>Green Bridge</p> <p>We support the Hampshire and IoW Wildlife Trust’s proposal for a green bridge to the National Park which would reunite wildlife habitats that became disconnected by the 1990s M3 construction.</p> <p>We want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature’s recovery despite modern transport development.</p> <p>Spoil</p> <p>The Highways England report says “We have not yet completed our junction design, so we do not know exactly how much material may need to be placed in these areas, or whether we will need all three areas”. Surely after at least two and a half years of preparation such civil engineering detail should be known? The amount of spoil will affect the landscape design. This should be known now; before Highways England applies for a Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>2019 consultation</p> <p>We have serious concerns about the previous stages of public consultations.</p> <p>Highways England says “There was a high level of support for the Proposed Scheme”. “We received 526 responses to our consultation”. Other than a few meaningless and valueless paragraphs the Public Consultation Summary Report does not provide any substantive information on exactly what those 526 respondents said. What organisations responded and what did they say? How many of the 526 comments were from individual members of the public. How many were car, commercial and HGV vehicle owners/drivers? Did horse riding, walking and cycling groups respond? Indeed were they invited to respond?</p> <p>References are made to ‘stakeholders.’ It is understood they were invited to workshops to give their input. Exactly who were they? and how were they selected? We hope it wasn't a question of selecting the appropriate stakeholders so that it assisted in giving the right answer to suit Highways England.</p> <p>Walking and Cycling Proposals Plan</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>We are concerned that there is little substance to walking and cycling provision. The plan just consists of one page. There seems to be very little reference to provision for horse riders.</p> <p>Walkers, cyclists and horse riders to be put in a 'subway'! Underground? Highways England say "On both sides of the motorway, the existing walking and cycling route links both parts of Easton Lane, which would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders will be improved with a widened 3m route, which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway..."</p> <p>This is unacceptable. This proposal is fraught with all sorts of problems. Who is going to police the subway to ensure the safety of users? Who will maintain it and how will it be lit? Will there be security cameras? Will there be traffic separation to ensure safety of different users such as horse riders and cyclists?</p> <p>Instead of hiding these active travel users away below ground highways England should provide a green bridge out in the fresh air above the pollution from the motorway style road.</p> <p>In any event Highways England should ensure that cycle provision is compliant with Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20 Published last year by the Government.</p> <p>Highways England must take account of latest Government policy</p> <p>The business case for this project should be rewritten taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Gov policy paper - A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment (pub Jan 2018) • DfT's policy paper - Decarbonising transport: setting the challenge (pub March 2020) • UK Gov policy paper: Gear change: a bold vision for cycling and walking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Gov policy paper: Bus Back Better: national bus strategy for England 		

K.2.V Lighting

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	Winnall roundabout to and from A33 a great improvement over previous scheme. Much safer. Provision for traffic light and possibly lighting at the Winnall roundabout should be made. (ie ducting for cabling). Should it be decided at a future date it will cause less disruption and be cheaper in the long term.	N	<p>Given the context of the Scheme's location with the South Downs National Park, which is sensitive to new lighting arrangements, avoiding and minimising light pollution is a key consideration for the Scheme.</p> <p>The carriageways, junction and the slip roads would not be lit. Lighting will be required within the underpasses and subways due to the length of these facilities and gantry-mounted signage which will be designed in accordance with the South Downs National Park <i>Dark Skies Technical Advice Note</i>. The approaches and exits to underpasses would not be lit.</p> <p>The effects of lighting have been considered within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	<p>Impact on local residents during construction, noise, light, disruption to local roads, paths, properties and businesses. Concerned about the amount of construction traffic that may use the lower end of Long Walk to access Northern Soil Dump. Long Walk is narrow and steep and unsuitable for heavy traffic. Using this route will also have an impact on Footpaths 20 and 21 and Restricted Byway 19.</p> <p>Preferred locations for spoil dump would be Central and Southern. Would there be scope for further infill in the field adjacent to the new path from Easton Lane to Long Walk, or an increase in the size of the bund?</p>	N	<p>The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p> <p>Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and PRoWs are assessed in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited as works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p>
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	Further information is needed on the final proposals for cut and fill, the areas proposed for the deposition of surplus material, and the extent and details of proposed noise and other fencing and lighting .	N	The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited. Works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	<p>There is insufficient detailed information on potential compound 3 to be able to understand the potential impact arising from its use. It is located in an area where there could be potentially significant noise, landscape and visual and other impacts arising from its use. Further detailed information on the detailed proposals for the pound are needed, including uses, proposed hours of operation, visual screening, fencing, noise mitigation, lighting and other measures to be able to provide conclusive comments.</p>	N	<p>The construction of the Scheme would require a small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities. Details of the other construction compounds required to construct the Scheme can be found Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) provide details on the proposed construction working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme. The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited. Works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p>
Local community	<p>Concerns regarding light, noise and security with the location of Compound Number 1. Could the compound be hidden within the valley and behind the existing tree line? The plan looks as though it could extend outside of this in a northerly direction in which case it will be seen from properties along Easton Lane and it also looks as though existing trees may be removed which would seem unnecessary.</p>	Y	<p>The main construction compound would be to the immediate east of Junction 9 (presented as number 1 in the 2021 statutory consultation). Activities within this compound would include plant storage, car parking, fuel and water storage, 'skills school', staff welfare facilities, waste segregation areas and a wheel wash. The area would also be used for material storage, a tree and hedging nursery area and material processing (earthworks and pavements) and storage of topsoil. Details of the other construction compounds required to construct the Scheme can be found Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The Applicant has reduced the impact of the central construction compound by reducing its footprint and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant has reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area of the tree line.</p> <p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) provide details on the proposed construction working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme. The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited. Works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.
General commentary			
Local community	There's no mention of the lighting of the scheme. Good lighting will be important particularly as there are more junctions and decision points for drivers than previously.	N	<p>Given the context of the Scheme's location with the South Downs National Park, which is sensitive to new lighting arrangements, avoiding and minimising light pollution is a key consideration for the Scheme. The carriageways, junction and the slip roads would not be lit. Lighting will be required within the underpasses and subways due to the length of these facilities and gantry-mounted signage which will be designed in accordance with the South Downs National Park <i>Dark Skies Technical Advice Note</i>. The approaches and exits to underpasses would not be lit. The effects of lighting have been considered within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited. Works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p>
Local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please can you outline how you plan to help protect villages such as Easton from being completely overwhelmed by sudden masses of traffic either trying to avoid this area or being diverted. This is a great concern for many residents. The village is small, the lanes are narrow and it's not designed to cope with over 700 vehicles as it was last time there was an issue in that area. • What plans for lighting both on the roundabout and also the old spitfire link roundabout area please. It's far too dark and accidents have occurred. 	N	<p>Given the context of the Scheme's location with the South Downs National Park, which is sensitive to new lighting arrangements, avoiding and minimising light pollution is a key consideration for the Scheme. The carriageways, junction and the slip roads would not be lit. Lighting will be required within the underpasses and subways due to the length of these facilities and gantry-mounted signage which will be designed in accordance with the South Downs National Park <i>Dark Skies Technical Advice Note</i>. The approaches and exits to underpasses would not be lit. The effects of lighting have been considered within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>
Local community	<p>In general we are in favour of improving the junction configuration to create free-flow traffic from the A34 to the M3 and vice versa. More importantly, we support the separation of local traffic and the strategic road network around the junction with the creation of a separate link road. This will make driving to Winnall from Itchen Abbas a safer and more accessible journey. However, there are areas of the proposals we have specific concerns about. Our feedback is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction compound Number 4 would inevitably add construction traffic to the likely traffic management routes through the construction site, namely down the A34. There are no other sensible options to build 		<p>The Applicant acknowledges the support of the Scheme in principle and the range of views expressed.</p> <p><i>Response to point 7:</i></p> <p>Given the context of the Scheme's location with the South Downs National Park, which is sensitive to new lighting arrangements, avoiding and minimising light pollution is a key consideration for the Scheme. The carriageways, junction and the slip roads would not be lit. Lighting will be required within the underpasses and subways due to the length of these facilities and gantry-mounted signage which will</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>either off highway haul roads or use local lanes to avoid the A34 with this construction traffic (narrow railway underbridge on Down Farm Lane, local villages not appropriate for HGVs and LGVs). This location seems unnecessary given the scale of other potential construction compounds in the vicinity. We recommend this compound Number 4 is dropped from the plans. If it is retained, we would expect to see in the DCO application/examination a detailed assessment and findings based upon how this site had been selected. This should include detailed traffic modelling results for the construction period to demonstrate minimal ill-effect from other traffic to local surrounding roads from the addition of construction vehicles leading to and from compound Number 4 and the Junction 9 site. Adding construction vehicles from this remote location up the A34, which is highly likely to be congested during extended periods of the construction phase, would compound delays on this already busy section of A34 and risk sending traffic heading south along the A34 on rat-runs using either the city of Winchester or local village roads in the Itchen Valley. This is avoidable with better choice of onsite or existing compound choice.</p> <p>2) Construction compound Number 3 is a poor choice of construction compound given the immediate proximity to the sensitive River Itchen. This ground form slopes towards the river giving direct pathway from a proposed construction compound to the internationally designated river. This would likely be a very challenging location to confirm through the DCO application/examination on Habitat Regulations Assessment grounds alone. This site should be dropped from the plans and all efforts be made to distance the construction sites from River Itchen wherever practicable.</p> <p>3) We are surprised there is no mention of using the existing R&W materials compound site situated right next to Junction 9 between the M3 SB Onslip and the Spitfire spur road. This site is run by an established Highways England contractor; it is full of potential engineering fill material that will have come from elsewhere on the strategic road network over recent years; and, now that very 'recycled' fill material is piled to its current height the plant, other machinery and lighting used in that compound is a visual eyesore on the edge of the South Downs National Park. It would be bordering on disingenuous for Highways England not to look at the opportunities this compound offers both in terms of construction compound site location (instead of compound Number 3 or 4) and the reuse of fill material borne from years of 'recycling' from other Highways England schemes. Again, as in my point 1/ I would expect to see full assessment and reasoned findings in the DCO application, as to what the selection criteria against using</p>		<p>be designed in accordance with the South Downs National Park <i>Dark Skies Technical Advice Note</i>. The approaches and exits to underpasses would not be lit. The effects of lighting have been considered within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>this location with the potential use of the engineering fill material within, all of which is quite literally already on site.</p> <p>4) Given the constrained location of the proposed development site between the historic city of Winchester and the South Downs National Park and over the River Itchen, construction mitigation would have to be extremely well planned out, with best practice mitigation strategies and pollution prevention controls in place. This scrutiny over the construction phase should extend to design and logistics and include maximising off-site prefabrication of as much infrastructure as possible, delivering to site for installation in a quick and controlled manner. For example, the deck for the new footbridge over the River Itchen should be prefabricated offsite and dropped into place overnight from the adjacent A34 NB carriageway once pier footings have been installed. The underpass taking the A34 SB under the M3 could be built in square shape box sections and slid into place on rails. New junction infrastructure on Junction 9 itself ought to be prefabricated as far as possible and the onsite build be on as accelerated a timeline as possible to improve potential impacts on traffic movements during the construction phase. Prefabrication offsite would enable greater control of materials transfer and storage (reducing the potential for pollution incident) in the constrained development location between Winchester and the South Downs National Park, while having the potential to improve construction times for the overall project. With the construction site being on two significant highway routes (being the A34 and M3), there is ideal opportunity to bring in large elements of prefabricated infrastructure onsite, using appropriate abnormal indivisible load protocols, without need to go through local towns and villages.</p> <p>5) Re. landscaping, topsoil ought not be used where swathes of chalk grassland are intended. It should be made clear to landscaping contractors through means of detailed soil management plans, environmental masterplans and landscape design secured through the DCO that chalk grassland requires in part denudated substrate free of nutrients. Good case study here is the Weymouth Relief Road in Dorset where swathes of wildflowers complement the highway inclusion in the local landscape and has resulted in greatly reduced maintenance regimes. There is plenty of local expertise in this area with Butterfly Conservation (who manage the excellent Magdalen Hill Down butterfly reserve in line of sight of the M3 Junction 9 proposals), Hampshire and IOW Wildlife Trust, the Bumblebee Conservation Trust and the very local Wild Valley Verges group all in the county and who can advise appropriate design and management. Topsoil is a precious commercial resource nowadays and could be used agriculturally in the vicinity.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>6) With Biodiversity net gain for DCO consented schemes now in proposed amendments to the Environment Bill, all proposed biodiversity habitats created towards the end of construction should be maintained in line with an appropriate Handover Environmental Management Plan in perpetuity, if not by Highways England then by a suitable local agent who could acquire the areas in concern. This would secure real environmental legacy for the area.</p> <p>7) I could not find any detail about operational lighting proposals in the consultation material. I would expect highway lighting to be minimal unless absolutely required for safety. This view is to contribute to the dark night skies over South Downs National Park.</p> <p>8) It is not easy to see from the indicative general arrangement plans whether the proposed M3 Junction 9 improvements scheme goes as far north up the A33 as the 'Cart and Horses junction'. There is a most fantastic opportunity here for collaboration between Hampshire County Council, Winchester City Council and Highways England to incorporate the long needed upgrade of this awful staggered junction between the B3047 and A33 (which has seen so many road traffic accidents over many years) into the wider proposals, while Tier 1 contractors are on site. More detail on this would be welcome if it is being considered – from a local's perspective it certainly should be.</p>		

K.2.W Principle of development

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
B7. Please expand on your answers to questions B1-B6 if there is anything we should consider.			
Local community	<p>The improvements were urgently required before the move to home working triggered by COVID 19. The amount of traffic has now reduced substantially and I am not sure that the enormous investment is still justified. It is essential that the economic case for the scheme is revised taking into account post pandemic traffic flows. I do like the idea to improve cycle access around the junction.</p>	N	Currently potential pandemic impacts on travel demand and behaviour have not been considered. Low and High traffic growth tests have been undertaken as part of the economic assessment in line with Department for Transport guidance and are reported in Section 5 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) .
Local community	<p>The rationale for this improvement may have been sound a few years ago and at the last consultation I generally agreed. But with the rapid change to more home working and flexible working plus the increasing urgency to reduce carbon emissions, it is clear to most people that more road building and improvements will not be needed in the future. I therefore consider this scheme should be scrapped and the re-thought.</p> <p>I think some improvements could be made to the existing junction design to ease flow at much lower cost. There should be full bicycle path to Kingsworthy along the A33.</p>	N	
Local community	<p>Previous concerns regarding access to Kings Worthy from the Junction 9 roundabout have been considered. It is difficult to see the impact in context of the surrounding businesses and housing. I can't fully accept the design until we can see the new junction as an overlay to a map or actual image rather than design mock-up.</p> <p>Concerned that this junction expansion may not be needed in the post-Covid world with more people working flexibly i.e. from home, which should reduce the overall traffic meaning less delays and believe there are cheaper and quicker changes that could be made while the traffic volumes are reassessed - one of the main issues is with M3 northbound backing up is due to the A34 / A33 off slip. If the A34 remained dual carriageway with a right hand off-slip rather than a filter lane, that would ease the flow with traffic not needing to merge into one lane.</p>	N	
Local community	<p>Stongly agree with the revised design. It achieves the strategic objective of providing free flowing connections for the A34 while eliminating the weaving on the A34 between Junction 9 and the A33 junction that the previous design would have introduced. Nevertheless there are aspects of the design that could be improved, as described below.</p> <p>A34 southbound route to the M3:</p>	N	<p>The support for the Scheme has been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10), which set out the economic appraisal of the Scheme and present the expected benefits and disbenefits.</p> <p><u>A34 southbound route to the M3:</u></p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently the M3-A34 southbound merge is shown as a single lane gain plus tigertail. This provides lower merging capacity than the previously consulted double lane gain. This does not seem acceptable given the very high merging volumes from the A34 (around 30k AADT). The current proposal has the fourth lane instead joining from the J9 roundabout, which seems unnecessary as only 9k AADT uses this link. In addition the combined M3 southbound+A34 southbound volume will be around 60k AADT on opening according to PEIR figures*, which exceeds design capacity for a three lane carriageway. Presumably this is why the northbound M3 has four lanes at this point. In short, providing only three lanes southbound through J9 creates an unnecessary bottleneck. <p>Improve connections to/from the A33?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First, the proposed NMU route towards Kings Worthy, utilising the current A33 northbound carriageway, is an excellent idea. However, its benefits are limited in the current proposal as the route does not allow cycle access. A route for pedestrians and cyclists would better deliver on HE's objectives of promoting active travel. Ideally it would also start further south, using much of the current A34 northbound carriageway. Second, I disagree strongly with the new roundabout for access to the Highways England compound. The A33 at this point is projected to have 13k AADT, which is a lot of traffic being forced to brake and then accelerate for what is, essentially, a property access. This will have non-negligible CO2 and safety impacts, not to mention the cost of building the roundabout. These surely cannot be justified by any convenience to the comparatively tiny amount of traffic accessing the Highways England depot; at any rate, I have found no evidence in the published material that the costs and benefits of this element of the scheme have been considered. Giving such high priority to Highways England depot traffic, without presenting any economic or social case for this, could be perceived to reflect a conflict of interest. There are options that would much better serve general traffic and the taxpayer, such as using a simple priority T-junction in place of the proposed roundabout, or simply retaining the current access arrangements. 		<p>DMRB CD 122 (Geometric Design of Grade Separated Junctions), defines several options for merge layouts. These options are dependent upon forecasted traffic flows. Using a combination of the annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) in vehicles per hour (VPH) for a mainline flow of traffic and the AADT in VPH for a merge flow of traffic, a required layout option type for a merge layout can be determined within DMRB CD 122. From an assessment of the forecasted traffic flows (contained within the Scheme transport model), the layout currently shown, follows the requirements of DMRB CD 122 and that a double lane gain is not required. The scheme has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. Further details are presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p><u>Improve connections to/from the A33:</u></p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route.</p> <p><u>National Highways Proposed Roundabout:</u></p> <p>Consideration was given to the proposed roundabout to the National Highways depot during the preliminary design and a 'left in, left out' junction configuration was considered. The main clear routes for vehicles entering and leaving the depot are the A34 and the M3. The provision of a 'left in, left out' junction arrangement has the following disbenefits:</p> <p>Disbenefit 1 - The introduction of a left in / left out junction could encourage higher speeds within the proposed A33 link road, leading to enforcement issues.</p> <p>Disbenefit 2 – With the left in / left out arrangement, vehicles exiting at Junction 9 wishing to enter the depot would need to travel to the proposed A33 roundabout and back on themselves. This is an additional 1200 metres (0.7 mile) journey for vehicles. If a left in / left out junction was introduced, a form of central reserve would be required to prevent vehicles from attempting to make a right turn into the depot (avoiding the need to travel to the proposed M3 northbound onslip roundabout and back), which would increase (widen) the scheme footprint within this area.</p> <p>Disbenefit 3 - In addition, vehicles exiting from the depot intending to travel north via the M3, would need to circumnavigate the proposed J9 gyratory and travel back on themselves. This is an additional 1025 metres (0.6 mile) journey for vehicles and would be pertinent for maintenance vehicles (undertaking winter salt runs, etc).</p> <p>The Applicant considered a 'left in/left out' junction configuration during the preliminary design, which has the following disbenefits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction of a left in/left out junction could encourage higher speeds within the proposed A33 link road which could lead to enforcement issues. 2. With the left in/left out arrangement, vehicles exiting at Junction 9 wanting to enter National Highways' depot would need to travel to the proposed A33 roundabout and back on themselves. This would be an additional 1200m (0.7

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>mile) journey for vehicles. Furthermore, if a left in/left out junction was introduced, a central reserve would be required to prevent vehicles from attempting to make a right turn into National Highways' depot which would result in an increase of the Scheme footprint.</p> <p>3. With the left in/left out arrangement, vehicles exiting from National Highways' depot who intended to travel north via the M3 would need to circumnavigate the proposed Junction 9 roundabout and travel back on themselves. This would be an additional 1025m (0.6 mile) journey for vehicles.</p> <p>Following design reviews, the Applicant considered that the proposed roundabout to the depot was most appropriate.</p>
Local community	<p>Nearly all the approaches to the present junction causes hours of delays and environmental pollution due to regular and excessive queuing traffic. The cost in lost time and wasted fuel must be eliminated.</p>	N	<p>Hampshire County Council identified in 2013 that infrastructure improvements were necessary to reduce congestion levels and assist with the strategic movement of traffic at Junction 9 of the M3, a key arterial intersection with the A34, to make sure that traffic congestion and increased journey times do not compromise the scale of potential future economic growth in the sub-region.</p> <p>The proposed improvements contribute to national transport objectives by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing additional capacity (via dedicated new free flow links on the A34 – M3 southbound and M3 northbound to A34, reducing the need for traffic to interact with the gyratory roundabout at Junction 9) 2. Enhancing journey time reliability (through reducing congestion at Junction 9) 3. Supporting the development of housing and the creation of jobs, as set out in the existing and emerging Local Plans (through the potential to accelerate local development sites by improving marketability and mitigation potential capacity constraints, increasing adjacent commercial and industrial land value and the potential to accelerate ongoing trends towards densification and new development in Winnall) <p>Upgrading Junction 9 of the M3 would help improve safety, improve the capacity of the road network in this location by reducing delays and congestion which in turn would improve journey time reliability. Combined these elements would support local growth in the area as established through requirements of local policy. This would bring significant benefits for road users, local communities and local businesses.</p> <p>Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1), which sets out the need case for the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>The Consultation Brochure states that one of the reasons for the proposed changes to Junction 9 is to <i>'support economic growth by making capacity for more jobs, business and housing'</i> - whereas the adjacent South Downs National</p>	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) presents an assessment of how the Scheme complies with the Scheme objectives. It is considered that the</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	Park and Winnall's Moors SSSI should surely make the Winchester area one of significant development restraint?		<p>Scheme performs well when assessed against the Scheme objectives, as described in Table 3.1 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1).</p> <p>Furthermore, the Scheme design has responded to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors (including South Downs National Park). The assessment of these is provided within the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and has contributed to the design narrative set out in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9). The Scheme proposals are integrated with the sensitive landscape and appropriate mitigation has been included. In addition, the Scheme results in a number of environmental enhancements, including improved habitat connectivity through newly created habitats including chalk grassland creation, and increased accessibility via the new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. Details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p>
Local community	I disagree with building more roads when we should be reducing traffic on the roads not encouraging more vehicles. I'm also appalled at the fact that the cycle lanes have been reduced to walking paths only.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	I'm conscious of the safety problems especially with northbound M3 to A34 traffic. I have reservations about the effects of building for anticipated demand without exploring every possible way of reducing that demand, and don't think I know enough to balance the benefits of the highway aspects of the scheme, hence a neutral answer on some aspects.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	Strongly disagree with the idea that increasing traffic capacity and flow is desirable or sensible, or that it will improve traffic problems or environmental considerations in the long term. All the evidence is that increasing traffic capacity and flow does not decrease traffic, it increases vehicle use and all 'spare capacity' is soon used up. The only long-term solution is to reduce dependency on vehicles and particularly lone occupant journeys, by providing alternatives including public transport, cycling and walking and rail freight, and by discouraging measures such as road pricing and taxation. Investing enormous sums of public money in encouraging vehicle use during a climate emergency is an insane and insulting response.	Y	<p>The objection to the Scheme has been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1), which sets out the need case for the Scheme.</p> <p>A key objective of the Scheme is to improve provisions for walkers and cyclists. The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme are to be upgraded as part of the proposals. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An improvement to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23 • An additional footway, cycleway and horse riding route on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk. Such a route would provide a circular leisure path for those using the South Downs National Park with a link to the other paths around Long Walk with their links to local villages • A new combined footpath and cyclepath for the western side of the Scheme to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane.
Local community	<p>The Scheme is not needed. Sure you will smooth the traffic flow at Junction 9 by taking out the roundabout/lights etc, but this just moves the bottlenecks up and down the network due to weight of traffic. e.g. at the Junction 27 split off heading south near Eastleigh which is already a pinch point or up the A34 at Oxford or M3 Camberley. The solution is to reduce traffic and spend the money on improving the quality of local roads so more people feel it is safe to walk/cycle.</p> <p>Secondly, the proposals seem to keep reducing the provision for walking/cycling</p>	Y	<p>In total, an additional 4.8km of public rights of way are to be provided as part of the Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	where as this should be a great opportunity to increase provision for sustainable transport. e.g. restore the original plans for a properly-surfaced cycleway to Kings Worthy and a bridleway to Long Walk, not just footpaths		
Local community	I used to commute from Basingstoke to Oxford and did so at the time of the A34/M4 improvements. That project was a huge success and has been for a long time now. I travel from Basingstoke to Winchester now for work and am often stuck idling in the M3 southbound slip road waiting for the traffic from the A34 to pass. Heading North on a summer weekend is often chaos as well. The A34 is a major freight link to the ports and also for travellers going aboard and coming home. Removing the queuing and creating a free flow will be a huge boost to the environment and economy a win/win on all counts. I realise it takes years for these major projects to be completed and hope this one can be completed as efficiently as possible.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	To reduce congestion, you need to reduce car use! It's time to start addressing the real issue with roads round here - cars. Car use needs to be reduced and is the only way to sort out congestion etc etc. Reducing car use is much more cost effective and actually works and would benefit people & the environment. The area around this junction is environmentally sensitive and you've done enough damage already.	N	Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) , which sets out the need for the Scheme. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.
Local community	We fully support your desire to reduce congestion at the junction. We believe that this should be done in a way that reduces, to a minimum, carbon emissions associated with construction and with the subsequent ways people use the facility. It has been established that widening roads inevitably increases traffic, and that after a honeymoon period congestion returns. This happened when the M3 replaced the Winchester bypass and will happen again. We must develop alternatives to obviate the need people feel to use the M3 and A34, and keep to a minimum both infrastructure construction emissions, and operational emissions. Emissions will probably increase in proportion to the increase in carriageway area (50 to 100%) and it will be a disaster. We should be allocating the £175m budget to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrifying the complete railway freight route from Southampton the Midlands and North through Oxford to eliminate all intermodal HGV traffic • Improving the local railway service from Basingstoke to Portsmouth and Solent Area to reduce M3 commuting • Investing in high quality, high frequency bus services throughout Hampshire to reduce private car use and congestion • Developing good rail-served freight distribution centres throughout Hampshire to decarbonise and remove logistics distribution from the M3 and A34 and facilitate zero-carbon local delivery. 	N	The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget period. The assessment is reported in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application, and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) concludes that carbon emissions will increase as a result of the Scheme. Section 14.10 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) states that, when compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK's 4 th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK's 5 th and 6 th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in isolation, would materially affect the UK's ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, in accordance with the DMRB LA 114 Climate methodology, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanding local infrastructure for walking and cycling to create modal shift in local transport that will free up vehicle access to the junction from Winchester and the surrounding area and obviate future expenditure on local access roads, when traffic volumes increase post 2026 on M3 and A34. <p>This will remove congestion from the junction and its approaches.</p>		
Local community	<p>While the consultation material is extensive, nowhere has the business case been made that the proposals are necessary or proportionate. It is likely that vehicles will indeed be able to speed through from M3 to A34 and vice versa ... but, er, so what ... the benefits are minimal, yet the costs - both to the taxpayer and environment are immense. You have not demonstrated a positive business case. For example the proposals claim there will be 'economic growth' ... but this is an unsubstantiated claim ... how will this growth accrue?</p> <p>The absence of a business case makes the negative impact on the environment even worse. To counter climate change we should be thinking how to manage the crisis ... not spend huge amounts of money making our environment worse; in principle you should be discouraging travel, not encouraging it.</p>	N	The Scheme economic impacts have been monetised and a Benefit Cost Ratio produced this is detailed in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) and the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) .
Local community	As a long-term commuter Junction 9 was not usually an issue rather the junction joining at barend was more problematic, and driving through Badger Farm.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Local community	Strongly disagree with public spending on road widening and 'improvement' schemes which will allow for and encourage greater road traffic, at a time of climate emergency when spending on local and national public transport is woeful. However, many 'mitigations' and 'appeasements' are put in place, this move is in the wrong direction.	N	This objection has been acknowledged. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) , which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	These changes are not needed.	N	
Local community	Some of the slips roads are in the wrong place and do not need to be there. In addition with a new Green Agenda from the Government and the new park and ride in Winchester there will be a reduction in car use and therefore less of a need for the proposals.	N	This comment has been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) , which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	<p>This is a key junction on the freight corridor between the port of Southampton, the midlands and the North. Improved journey times and reliability will produce economic benefits for Southampton, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The development of the Free Port - with better and more efficient links to the Port of Southampton (both in city and future expansion to Waterside). Cruise access - with more reliable journey times for passengers. Growth in Southampton - e.g. Development of our waterfront and Mayflower Quarter. Access to Southampton's new Park & Ride service. 	N	The applicant acknowledges this comment. Wider economic impacts have been estimated and are presented in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10)

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	5. Economic benefits associated with safety improvements and reductions in collisions.		
Local community	<p>Information about the scheme states that your aim is '<i>support economic growth – improving road capacity</i>'. Increasing road capacity means making room for more traffic meaning the increased capacity will fill up and lead to extra journeys ('induced traffic') and in turn lead to demands for still more capacity.</p> <p>This process of unending road building in an attempt to escape traffic jams must stop - first, because it does not work, second, because it creates more carbon emissions. Wales has recently frozen most road schemes because of climate change. The UK government is being urged to do the same. There are two legal actions in progress against its roads programme and the refusal of the Minister for Transport to revise the outdated NPSNN which takes no account of climate change.</p> <p>Some of the supposed improvements you put forward, such as a new link for a cycle path, could be actioned without the need to improve capacity at this junction.</p>	N	<p>The Scheme is expected to address capacity issues on key routes to international gateways and help provide more efficient routes to global markets through reduced travel costs. The Scheme is also expected to increase business productivity by reducing travel costs and improving accessibility. Full details of these can be found in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10).</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase of emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) for further details.</p>
Local community	<p>Hugely disruptive and expensive project that will, within a short period of time be congested again if you continue with an approach of accommodating traffic. Increased capacity leads to increased demand.</p> <p>The current environmental mitigation plans from extremely limited and lack any ambition to make the project a net gain for nature. It is a farce that the South Downs National Park is split by the M3 and Junction 9. Twyford Down continues to be a landscape disaster and road widening and lack of routes for wildlife across the road (eg a green bridge), will make this worse.</p>	N	<p>Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1), which sets out the need for the Scheme</p>
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	<p>Several respondents objected the need for the Scheme including requests that the application is withdraw and that construction does not commence.</p>	N	<p>The views expressed, including objections to the Scheme have been acknowledged. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1), which sets out the need for the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>How you will reduce traffic. How you will reduce the number of road journeys. How you will dramatically reduce vehicle emissions and overall road pollution, including litter. How you will protect and progressively enhance the environment. How you will use sustainable materials and avoid fossil-derived tars etc</p>	N	<p>The Scheme reduces the delays at key areas currently congested. The Scheme also reduces journey times from the M3S to the A34 and the A34 to the M3S in the AM and PM peak period. Furthermore, there are reductions in journey times from the A33 to Easton Lane and Easton Lane to the A33.</p> <p>The Transport case for the Scheme in Section 4 of this Case for the Scheme and the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) provide more details regarding the traffic improvements.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Car use will decrease in the UK and public transport is invested in. Look at what the Government is doing to increase bus use and their new bus strategy. Details can be found on the Government website. Therefore the plans should be scaled back.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Is this development really worth the millions of pounds you will have to spend? All this will mean that southbound travelers will reach the hill at Twyford Down even sooner thereby making the holdups caused by traffic there even worse. Northbound traffic is not so delayed by junction 9 to justify this spending. At a time when we are meant to be heading towards a zero-carbon environment should we be encouraging yet more cars on the roads?	N	The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase of emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate.
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure.			
Local community	You are making an effort with the plans and I hope they come to fruition, but obviously increased traffic flow could undo that work.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	To be better for the environment you have to reduce total network traffic not just move it from one junction to another and also increase provision for sustainable transport.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. An assessment of traffic impacts are reported in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13).
Local community	As stated, I'm not sure that this scheme is now required due to different ways of working post Covid. The extended area used for the junction, and disruption to fields will cause issues with wildlife. The increase of electric vehicles will reduce pollution and noise anyway... it would be a better use of tax payer money to invest in charging points and extending EV subsidies.	N	Currently potential pandemic impacts on travel demand and behaviour have not been considered. This can be considered at later stages of the scheme development. Low and High traffic growth tests have been undertaken as part of the economic assessment in line with Department for Transport guidance and are reported in Section 5 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) .
Local community	You are missing the point altogether. The environment will suffer massively no matter what mitigation measures you put in place. The current 'car is king' mindset has to change or we are faced with environmental disaster. Don't make road travel easier. Spend the huge sums involved on best quality integrated public transport instead. And encourage active transport for local commutes.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Car use in the UK will go down as can be seen from the Government's new bus strategy and with the new park and ride in Winchester car use will go down. The present proposals are too big.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Strongly disagree with public spending on road widening and 'improvement' schemes, which will allow for and encourage greater road traffic, at a time of	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	climate emergency when spending on local and national public transport is woeful. However, many 'mitigations' and 'appeasements' are put in place, this move is in the wrong direction.		The views expressed, including objections to the Scheme have been acknowledged. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) , which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	The scheme should not go ahead, so the impacts should not be suffered.	N	
Local community	Money would be better spent improving public transport, particularly the railways.	N	
Local community	It will not reduce congestion it will encourage it and devastate local green land.	N	
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	Just get on with it	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Encouraging faster journeys by road is in opposition to encouraging wildlife and a cleaner, quieter environment.	N	A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design to avoid or reduce significant adverse environmental effects arising, where practicable, which are summarised in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) .
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	Just get on with it	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The whole plan should be scrapped.	N	The objections to the Scheme have been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	The scheme should not go ahead, so the proposals should not be needed.	N	
Local community	The benefits of this proposal are minimal and I'm happy to spend that extra minute or so (northbound) and extra minutes (southbound) in the knowledge that the reserves I visit and the habitats are not being even more degraded.	N	
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			
Local community	Just get on with it	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Totally unnecessary if the alterations are abandoned.	N	This objection has been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.
F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.			
Local community	Just stop it	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Just stop the project.	N	The objections to the Scheme have been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	If you withdraw the plan there will be no need to have to do this	N	
Local community	The scheme should not go ahead so plans should not be needed.	N	
F.4: Please let us know the reasons for your response to question F3 and any other views about the locations we've identified			
Local community	Just get on with it	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	This work should not be happening.	N	The objections to the Scheme have been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	The road building should take place.	N	
Local community	Disagree with the general premise that the work should go ahead.	N	
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	Just get on with it	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The project is unnecessary and should not happen	N	The objections to the Scheme have been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	The need to do this should be reason enough to stop the project	N	
General commentary			
Local community	It's planned to take a very long time and cost a huge amount of money	N	This comment has been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) , which sets out the need for the Scheme.
Local community	The improvements to both Junction 9 roundabout and the intersection of A34/M3 is well overdue. Main concern is by making the traffic more free-flowing, it will move the problem elsewhere, for example traffic backing up M3 to London due to volume coming down A34 and the M3 between Hockley and Eastleigh being at a standstill.	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. An assessment of traffic impacts are reported in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13). This indicates a reduction in congestion and journey times through M3 Junction 9. Traffic flows on a number of local roads within Winchester City are predicted to decrease.
Local community	Future proof it! Think about what we need in 30 years, not just now.	N	Due to the lifespan of the proposals, the Scheme design considers potential change from future climate change, including designing in appropriate water attenuation features for extreme events, specifying durable materials, and including a diverse soft landscape species for resilience.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	While I accept some sort of work is needed at Junction 9 I am not convinced by the current plan.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Focus on trains and sustainable transport instead of encouraging road use and aim to maintain existing roads, remedy old habitat loss rather than building more. Become a world leader in building wildlife highways, for example, bridges to connect the downs either side of the M3.	N	<p>The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme is enhancing the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 through the gyratory, enhancing the footway along the west of the Scheme through the provision in a segregated footway and cycleway, and adding a new bridleway link to the east of the Scheme connecting Long Walk and Easton Lane. The provision of a high quality, fully segregated and accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes would encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant is working hard to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been worked collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that 'embedded avoidance and mitigation measures' for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it evolved. These measures include the selection of less damaging options for the walking and cycleway adjacent to the A34, avoidance of permanent structures in the River Itchen, and an ecologically informed Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) providing habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment. It is calculated that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity, refer to the assessment in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). This report concludes the results of the assessment and finds that the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity</p>
Local community	As a regular user of this route, I perceive that this upgrade is definitely needed to improve route reliability and journey times.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the views expressed, including support for the Scheme.
Local community	Don't take any notice of the people trying to stop the scheme, many of whom are not really interested in the local problems at Junction 9, but are just trying to stop any road improvements. They are misguided.	N	
Local community	It is well overdue and is a very necessary improvement to what is one of the worst junctions on the motorway.	N	
Local community	Please, please, please get this built, it looks like an amazing plan that MUST not be downgraded, all new slip-roads, and added capacity must be added for a prosperous tomorrow, let's hope Grant Shapps approves this!	N	
Local community	The sooner the better!	N	
Local community	Not really - but do get on with it soon!	N	
Local community	Please get on with it as quickly as possible	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Just get on with it	N	
Local community	Much needed especially at the weekends/evenings. As well as help Junction 9, this will help reduce local traffic as currently to get onto the M3 from Littleton its quicker to drive down Stockbridge Road and go through the city and join at Junction 10 or 11 than risk the A34/M3 junction.	N	
Local community	This scheme is needed.	N	
Local community	Go...Go....Go.....	N	
Local community	No - just get on with it.	N	
Local community	Junction improvements here are well overdue so I look forward to them being completed.	N	
Local community	The benefits of the scheme are weak; the costs high. Why is this still being done?	N	The value for money assessment is presented in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) where the Scheme represents 'Medium' Value for Money based on the economic assessment and the DfT's Value for Money Framework.
Local community	The scheme is a waste of time and money. It will not reduce congestion it will just move it somewhere else and encourage more traffic to use this route,	N	An assessment of traffic impacts is reported in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) . The assessment indicates a reduction in congestion and journey times through M3 Junction 9. Traffic flows on a number of local roads within Winchester City are predicted to decrease with the Scheme in place.
Local community	Strongly support the need for a major revision of Junction 9 to create free-flowing links between the A34 and M3 primary routes, and - with some specific exceptions - I broadly support these latest proposals by Highways England.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Road building to improve traffic flow and increase vehicle turnover, within a National Park, is not what is needed in a climate emergency. Furthermore, it is wasted opportunity to repair the damage of previous road-building dating from the creation of the M3, with woefully inadequate and unimaginative ecological mitigation or compensation. This is not good enough!	N	In relation to climate, the net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published 'The Road to Zero' which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme. The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change,

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.
Local community	Motorways trunk roads etc inevitably increase traffic. Yet we are facing an environmental crisis and is this really the time to be encouraging yet more traffic by 'improving' a notoriously bad planning judgement made decades ago. This needs far more radical thinking and surely reinstating railways that could carry freight from Southampton to a central distribution site between Oxford and Birmingham would ultimately be a cheaper and far more effective reduction of noise and pollution.	N	An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the proposal on the environment. This includes details of the environmental mitigation and management such as Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) . The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) , with Chapters 5 and 11 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) reporting the likely significant effects of the Scheme on air quality and noise, respectively. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need case for the Scheme.
Local community	I fully support this scheme for the economic benefits	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	I do not believe there is need for any changes to the junction 9 changes on the M3. Encouraging extra road travel is a backwards step to a carbon neutral society so I would reject any planned changes. There is also no way that more roads makes any positive environmental difference. It will always be negative.	N	This objection has been noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need case for the Scheme.
Local community	This scheme is fine, is sorely needed, and the revised A33 northbound to Kings Worthy is a big improvement, albeit with increased land take and presumably cost. In 2019 you said the scheme would be open for traffic in 2023; now you say 2026. I sincerely hope that you will not all have retired by the time you get permission to actually build something. The new 3D flyover video is not as good as the 2019 one, and is much more difficult to find. The new one has too much text on it, and it doesn't show the new roundabout on the A33 at all, nor anything from the perspective of someone going north or south on the A33 or A34.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The proposed scheme for alterations to Junction 9 on the M3 is driven by the fact that this particular junction is a " <i>key transport interchange</i> ", where the volume of traffic has been increasing, as has the size and weight of many vehicles. Previous consultations have been held, resulting in some positive	Y	Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with current and emerging national and local policy.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>changes and there have also been more recent changes, indicating that Highways England (HE) are listening. But there is still much to concern many.</p> <p>The real announcement of this revised Plan was made it the Hampshire Chronicle on 3 June. To quote the Hampshire Chronicle, “.....<i>this scheme is proving controversial, including safety fears and encouraging more traffic.....</i>” The HE Senior Project Manager is also quoted as saying “.....our Plan.....will increase capacity, help reduce journey times, and improve safety.....”. Apparently this will be achieved by, amongst other things, widening the current junction, building bridges and underpasses....”. Personally, I have no wish to “encourage more traffic” as that is going to happen anyway – on return to “normality, let alone the establishment of a “Freeport” on the South Coast, fewer people using the trains and the re-opening of Southampton Airport.”</p> <p>If this Revised Plan is given the “go ahead”, the necessary work is going to take a very long time to complete, and thus inconvenience many – both using the M3/A34 as well as local inhabitants. In the initial Leaflet there is no mention of “Time” (the work will take), or any plan for “diversions” (which will clearly be required) – one can already perceive that one obvious diversion will go through the city centre thereby causing much inconvenience and even greater congestion in an already congested and busy city centre.</p> <p>I do hope that all those currently involved with the proposed scheme read the Editorial Comment, in a recent edition of the Hampshire Chronicle, headed “Incidents on M3 increase” ! To quote, “.....the closure of the 10 mile section caused travel disruption and delays on nearby roads.....and the roads in Winchester City Centre were suffering some time later with very heavy delays across the one-way system...! Hopefully this situation has been taken on board !</p> <p>Further Editorial Comment highlights the fact that lessons are not always learned – reminding us that the “..missing link of the M3 through Twyford Down was completed in the 1990s when many people pointed out that, in time, the M3 / A34 interchange would become congested. So it has proved.....” !! Might it now get even worse ?”</p> <p>Even now, it is not too late to re-think the plan as physical work has not yet started. That said, with seemingly ever increasing “bills” for particular Railway Lines, Climate Change, Pollution, etc, might the bill for this scheme actually cause a delay anyway ?</p> <p>In summary, the Motorways / Highways in the area of Winchester need to be reviewed – and particularly because of the ever increasing volume of heavy-goods traffic through the area, not just via Junction 9 on the M3. Thus the aim should be to decrease that volume at that particular “interchange”. If towns /</p>		<p>As presented in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1), the Scheme will deliver extensive benefits including a reduction in congestion and delays; improving journey times; economic benefits; safety improvements; improvements to visual amenity and landscape character over the long-term; wildlife and green infrastructure enhancements; enhanced pollution and run-off control; and enhanced provision for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) demonstrates that any unavoidable adverse environmental effects which may remain following mitigation are outweighed by the public benefit that will accrue as a result of the Scheme and the Government’s commitment to upgrading the SRN.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. This chapter concludes that, when compared with UK carbon budgets, the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK’s 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the UK’s 5th and 6th carbon budget. This is considered a small increase in the magnitude of emissions from the Scheme, and it is deemed unlikely that this Scheme, in isolation, would materially affect the UK’s ability to meet its carbon budgets. Therefore, in accordance with the DMRB LA 114 Climate, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate.</p> <p>Legislation, in relation to biodiversity net gain, is also covered in Appendix 8.2 (BNG Assessment Report) of the ES Technical Appendices (Document Reference 6.3). Following a 2-year transition period, the Environment Act 2021 (EA 2021) would mandate projects in England consented through the Planning Act 2008 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The 2-year transition period is likely to come to an end in autumn 2023, however it is understood that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) would not be mandated to deliver net gain until the relevant National Policy Statement commits to it, or a separate Biodiversity Gain Statement is produced and agreed in Parliament. The current Scheme programme indicates that the Scheme is unlikely to be mandated to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed in relation to the historic impacts on Twyford Downs. An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapters 6 (Cultural Heritage), 7 (Landscape and Visual) and 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES assess the likely significant effects on</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>cities such as Salisbury, Basingstoke, Oxford and London can have a “RING ROAD”, why not Winchester ? Parts of it are already in place but one suggestion might be to create a larger “interchange” at the current Junction 11 and swing North and East to join the A34 in the area of Three Maids Hill // Bullington Cross.</p>		<p>designated sites such as the SAC / SSSI, scheduled monuments and the South Downs National Park with mitigation developed through consultation with statutory consultees. Mitigation measures proposed to reduce likely significant effects are also included in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3).</p> <p>The Applicant is working to maximise biodiversity improvements on the land available and has been working collaboratively with Natural England and other environmental bodies. Since the 2021 statutory consultation the Applicant revised the landscape strategy and Environmental Masterplan (see Figure 2.3 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2)) to respond to the environmental constraints presented by statutory and non-statutory designations and receptors.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been ecologically informed, such that ‘embedded avoidance and mitigation measures’ for ecology were contained within the Scheme design as it has evolved. These measures include the provision of habitats of ecological value which are appropriate for the local environment.</p> <p>Habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme. New areas of woodland and scrub towards the north of the Scheme, mostly located adjacent to existing habitats, would enhance connectivity for bats and dormice and other wildlife. The provision of substantial areas of chalk grassland, woodland and scrub along the eastern boundary of the Scheme would improve connectivity for a range of wildlife including bats, dormice, and terrestrial invertebrates in a north-south direction. The proposed habitat provision would enhance connectivity for wildlife within the Scheme and the Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant has removed parts of the A34 Northbound and A34 Southbound from the Application Boundary meaning the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and is not affected by the proposals</p>
Local community	<p>I object to the proposed changes. I already made a full objection to your previous consultation.. My grounds are the same:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport should be encouraged to be carbon neutral e.g. public transport.. No more money should be spent on hugely expensive schemes like this which will encourage people to use their cars more. Expensive in terms of money and carbon. • Concerns about contributions to climate change. 	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase of emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budget. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>Climate change is real threat to the health of the planet and us, the people who drive cars and buy goods transported by lorries. Our future health is more important smoother and faster journeys on the M3. Fossil fueled transport has a very limited future. In a few years roads will be less busy as more people work for home and struggle with climatic extremes. PLEASE Divert money away from</p>	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	road “ improvements” and invest in green transportation eg cycle lanes and good public transport.		
Enterprise M3 LEP	<p>The Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership welcomes the opportunity to respond to the consultation on the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme. Whilst we understand that the consultation is focusing on the detail around the delivery of the scheme and that the principle of the need for the enhancement scheme has already been established, we considered it worthwhile re-emphasising the value the proposed improvements of the highway network to the local and regional economy.</p> <p>Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership recognises the benefits of effective and reliable strategic highway network, which is vital to the success of the UK economy and believe the Network should be key in providing the connectivity that enables and supports continued economic prosperity and recovery. The Network should also be developed to cope with forecast growth in demand for business movement, requiring the provision of additional capacity where appropriate, so as to support the economic growth potential of our area.</p> <p>The cities and large towns of Southampton, Portsmouth, Bournemouth, Poole and Winchester are anticipated to play a key role in economic recovery and should also be engines for growth in the future, able to accommodate planned growth in housing and jobs. The future economic performance and success of these urban centres is reliant on the continued provision of efficient and reliable strategic transport links by road and rail.</p> <p>Enterprise M3 LEP strongly agrees that the proposed improvements to M3 Junction 9 are needed. The benefits of this improvement would be experienced both in our area and beyond. We recognise the important role played by the motorway and trunk road network in providing connectivity. This scheme alongside the Smart Motorways scheme can provide a high quality strategic corridor, with the benefits to the national economy being significant</p> <p>M3 Junction 9 is a key junction on the M40, A34, M3 and M27 and A31 strategic corridor that links the Midlands with the economically important international gateway ports of Southampton, Portsmouth and Poole as well as the proposed new freeport at Southampton. These ports see large volumes of international freight movements. Southampton the UK’s second largest deep-sea container port and largest automotive import/ export port as well as being the UK’s largest passenger cruise liner terminal, with cross-Solent ferries to the Isle of Wight. Portsmouth and Poole are important cross-Channel ferry ports, with regular routes to a number of ports in northern France and in the case of Portsmouth, also to north east Spain. Each Port has produced a Masterplan setting out future growth forecasts in these markets.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges Enterprise M3 LEP’s comments.</p> <p>In relation to climate, the net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published ‘The Road to Zero’ which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) which sets out the need for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>In these strategies the ports have identified congestion on the A34 southbound approach to Junction 9 as a significant cause of delay to port-related HGV movements. This unreliability has an impact on the relative competitiveness of these ports, particularly in the deep-sea container port market, where there are a number of direct competitor ports such as London Gateway and Felixstowe. Whilst the LEP is therefore supportive of the proposed improvements; it is not at any cost. In the lead up to the emergency around Covid-19 there was a growing understanding of the impact of climate change and the impact that this would have to all our future lives and economy.</p> <p>It is impossible to overstate the importance and emphasis that needs to be placed on clean growth and the impact of climate change and our recent work around our Local Industrial Strategy has highlighted the importance of consideration of environmental aspects in all parts of the economy. This will also be a key feature in the Local Recovery and Resilience Plan the LEP has developed in response to Covid-19 to aid and support our economy going forward.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst the LEP is supportive of this scheme, our support is not unconditional. The LEP recognises the climate emergency and fully embraces clean growth and with it the overwhelming need to invest in sustainable and clean transport solutions for our future. Therefore, we would wish to see this scheme include a range of elements in support of the wider net-zero carbon agenda. This could include use road lighting powered by LEDs, extensive use of recycled materials and low-temperature asphalt production as well as commitment to environmental and biodiversity mitigation.</p>		
Local community	<p>Your consultation process has been excellent and the adjustments made for local traffic are well thought-through. The whole of Winchester will benefit. No-one in their right mind would say the A34 Newbury bypass was a mistake. Please, please..... just get on with the project and bring the environmental benefits (no highly polluting standing traffic) and the economic savings - time, money, safety to fruition.</p>	N	The Applicant has noted this comment.
Local community	<p>The website states in 'very vague' and general terms the benefits of the proposed changes as <i>"the changes we're proposing would reduce congestion at the junction and help make journey times more reliable"</i> and with less congestion there would also be fewer accidents and better air quality. However, there is no comment about the risks and disbenefits of the proposal to provide a balance Cost Benefit Analysis approach. Please confirm what is being lost in environmental and other terms?</p> <p>How can you say there will be less congestion anyway? Road traffic in the UK continues to increase. And the more roads that are built the more traffic is upon them.</p>	N	The breakdown of the Scheme monetised impacts are presented in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10) . A value for money analysis has been undertaken, which includes all monetised and non-monetised impacts, and is presented in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) .

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>There have also been claims that this "improvement" will increase safety. Looking at news reports, 1 serious accident was reported at Winnall in 2014. I will make a counter claim: this project will result in more accidents as vehicles will be travelling faster than now.</p> <p>The bottom line is that to save a few minutes of travel time for impatient people an ecosystem has to be destroyed for ever. Hardly a sustainable, long-term, sensible business practice for the human race.</p>		
Local community	<p>Several respondents have placed their objection to the Scheme on the grounds of the need for the Scheme and impacts to the environment. Many suggested that the Applicant should be encouraging more sustainable modes of transport.</p>	N	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1), which sets out the need for the Scheme.</p>
CPRE Hampshire	<p>CPRE Hampshire, The Countryside Charity, supports in principle the proposed improvements to Junction 9 on the M3 as they would improve traffic flow across the junction, with the following consequences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a reduced incentive for drivers to avoid queues at the junction by using rural roads and passing through the centre of Winchester, to the benefit of the countryside and the city centre 2. a reduction in standing traffic at the junction, to the benefit of air quality in the local area <p>We understand that there have been discussions with the South Downs National Park Authority to ensure that land taken will be minimised and that an agreement has been reached. The implementation of this agreement is a condition of our continued support</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges CPRE Hampshire's support for the Scheme in principle. An assessment of traffic impacts is reported in the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). This indicates a reduction in congestion and journey times through M3 Junction 9. Traffic flows on a number of local roads within Winchester City are predicted to decrease.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to liaise with South Downs National Park Authority as the Scheme develops.</p>
Winchester Friends of the Earth	<p>2021 Response</p> <p>This is another formal objection to the scheme in its entirety. It has no place in any sane world. It consumes unrenewable resources; it is unsustainable; it is socially exclusive and economically regressive; it contributes directly to global warming; it destroys landscapes and habitats; it poisons the air and kills people; it has negative economic consequences; it destroys proper public transport dispositions; it has no transport sense, no planning sense, no moral sense.</p> <p>Ironically, beyond all it does the opposite of what it claims to achieve – it does not remove congestion in the network as a whole, because it generates traffic; it does not save time because it merely disperses (Metz effect) the same activities over ever greater distances, consuming ever greater resources. Of course HE personnel must know this, but it is in their interest to always create work for themselves that generates more work for themselves.</p>	Y	<p>The range of views expressed by Winchester Friends of the Earth, including their objection to the Scheme, have been noted.</p> <p><i>Public consultation</i></p> <p>The planning regime established by the Planning Act 2008 places a significant importance on pre-application consultation. The Applicant has encouraged a range of stakeholders, including the local community, those with an interest in the land, local authorities and statutory consultees, to express their views on the Scheme through non-statutory engagement, non-statutory consultation and statutory consultation activities. The main stages of the Applicant's pre-application consultation is described in Table 2.1 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1).</p> <p>The Applicant developed its consultation strategy for the 2021 statutory consultation with Winchester City Council, South Downs National Park Authority and Hampshire County Council (see Chapter 10 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>We are not going to waste any more of our time on the Kafkaesque futility of trying to talk rationality to Highways England. We have had too much experience of how the agency treats consultation processes and the distance between the agency’s behaviour and any normal form of truthful discourse, to think that anything anybody says that does not map to HE’s ambitions or intentions, will be listened to or analysed in any way whatsoever.</p> <p>We respond now only for the reason that we cannot be accused in the future of tacitly agreeing with such irresponsible projects. We will have a locus standi for any examination in public that may take place, though we note how major infrastructure projects in this country are subject to less and less scrutiny and less and less public (cross) examination of evidence. But well beyond that rubber-stamping process, it is necessary that we show to future generations, who will gape in disbelief at what government and HE did to them, that some people told the truth at the time.</p> <p>Our formal objection reiterates our formal objection to the 2018 and 2019 ‘consultations’. We simply note that our predictions about how HE would treat the 2019 responses is entirely borne out by the latest M3 Junction 9 Improvements Public Consultation Summary Report – no analysis of points raised, no arguments to counter the objections.</p> <p>And so it goes on. Highways England have learned nothing and forgotten nothing in the last 50 years. They seem to believe they live on a different planet from the rest of us, so they simply don’t care what they do to our planet.</p> <p>2019 Response</p> <p>We wish to record (again) our objection to this scheme in its entirety. We hesitate to repeat the arguments we made in our submission to the consultation process last year except to say that we stand by them completely and world events and even government policy have so far moved on that the force of such arguments must be indisputable now even to the most blinkered purveyors of old-fashioned transport thinking.</p> <p><i>2018 CONSULTATION</i></p> <p>We also wish to put on record, for whatever rubber-stamping Examination in Public will take place for this scheme, that we regard the 2018 consultation as a travesty of process. Not only has Highways England assumed that the input from environmental groups with hundreds of members in the District should be tallied up in its superficial consultation arithmetic, as if each group were a single individual, but all argument against the scheme in principle has been entirely suppressed in the report on Public Consultation.</p>		<p>5.1) for further details). Due to the uncertainties posed by COVID-19, the Applicant adopted a digital first approach to the 2021 statutory consultation. In addition to digital methods, the Applicant endeavoured to consult using traditional methods, where safe and practical to do so, including using post and telephone communications methods. The Applicant also sought to provide further publicity and promotion of the 2021 statutory consultation prior to its commencement, including posting and maintaining 15 site notices at key locations around the Application Boundary, parking an ‘Engagement Van’ outside local venues and placing posters in local venues and newspapers. Paper copies of the consultation documents could also be requested. It is therefore considered that the Applicant made all reasonable endeavours to consult the community within the context of COVID-19 restrictions.</p> <p>Chapters 5, 9 and 12 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) provides an overview of the relevant responses received to the 2018 consultation, the 2019 consultation and the 2021 statutory consultation, respectively, and provides summary of how the Scheme has developed because of the responses received.</p> <p><i>Need for the Scheme</i></p> <p>M3 Junction 9 currently experiences a high level of congestion and delay with poor journey time reliability. Projected development of the region’s ports is anticipated to substantially increase heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements and as demand for freight grows, existing congestion on the M3 and A34 is likely to worsen. The need for the Scheme is presented in the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1). This report concludes that there is a strong need case for the Scheme in order to address the significant existing congestion and road safety issues on the M3. While is it recognised that great weight is attached to conserving the South Downs National Park, it is also considered that addressing the existing road safety issues and removing an impediment to strategic economic growth is in the public interest.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) presents an assessment of how the Scheme complies with the Scheme objectives. It is considered that the Scheme performs well when assessed against the Scheme objectives, as described in Table 3.1 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1).</p> <p>This document also outlines the economic appraisal of the Scheme and presents the expected benefits and disbenefits associated with the Scheme (see Section 5 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) for further details). In summary, the results of the transport economic analysis indicate that the Scheme is forecast to generate economic benefits, with the greatest benefit relating to travel time savings, which are predominantly due to the provision of the free-flow movement between the A34 and the M3. The accident assessment indicated a predicted reduction in accidents and corresponding monetised benefits. The full economic appraisal is</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p><i>We know that nothing we said gets mentioned at all unless it is imagined that those concerns can be disposed of by the following statements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 61% are concerned with environmental impacts of the scheme (Executive Summary) • Concern over environmental impacts – 10 respondents (Q11); 5 respondents Q15) • General comments on wider roads/Winchester city centre (Q13) • Environmental Impacts of proposed junction; air pollution; noise pollution; River Itchen (Q15) <p>Nothing at all about the climate impact; nothing at all about how this scheme clashes with SACTRA; nothing at all about the economic unreality of it; nothing at all about the ineffectiveness of any road building on reducing overall congestion. Yet these things were raised and not just by us - we know of at least one other group making similar points.</p> <p>HE may not agree with what we said, but that is no excuse for not addressing the points made. If it thinks we are wrong then it should say how we are wrong. Simply ignoring environmental and economic truths has always been the Highways England or Highways Agency way. It is lazy and dishonest and not the less disgraceful because we are habituated to it.</p> <p>2019 CONSULTATION</p> <p>Since the 2018 consultation was entirely phoney in its tendentious format and its ludicrously trivial pretence at analysis, we must expect the current 'consultation' to be equally dishonest in intention and that its results will be equally biased or trivialised in its interpretation. But we have to be able to say that we responded, even if our response will be entirely ignored by HE.</p> <p>OBJECTIVES</p> <p>The (standard) objectives are declared to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improve safety as a result of a reduction in delays and queue lengths • support economic growth by unlocking development capacity for jobs, business and housing creation • reduce congestion and increase journey time reliability • improve the environment by reducing adverse noise, improving air quality and making sure there is no net loss to biodiversity • improve accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders. <p>As always Highways England carelessly state these objectives with an intimation that the scheme will actually achieve them or is even designed to achieve them. But they either know this is not true or they offer no evidence that they might be true. We've gone over this time and again to continuing silence from HE.</p>		<p>provided in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 7.10).</p> <p><i>Traffic and transport</i></p> <p>The transport case for the Scheme is set out in Section 4 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and details of the traffic impacts are presented in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13). These documents display that the traffic on a number of local roads within Winchester City are predicted to decrease.</p> <p><i>Environmental impacts assessment</i></p> <p>This application is also accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p><i>Air quality</i></p> <p>Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the operation of the Scheme on air quality. The assessment confirms that the Scheme's operation does not have a significant air quality impact and does not affect reported compliance with the Air Quality Regulations.</p> <p><i>Noise</i></p> <p>An operational noise assessment has been undertaken and the findings are presented within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1).</p> <p>The Scheme objectives include consideration to reduce the number of households adversely affected by noise. Furthermore, to comply with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the Scheme must:</p> <p>Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; Mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and Contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effect management and control of noise, where possible</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p><i>Does the scheme improve safety?</i></p> <p>There is no evidence for this. The Department for Transport (DfT) has been asked for proof of accident benefit and it has never provided it. It has never researched the safety aspects of road building. The ‘cost-benefit analysis’ of road schemes usually assumes a benefit on the basis that the average accident rate (i.e. the probability of an accident per vehicle per mile) for a motorway, for example, is lower than that for a lower class of road. Even this assumption is dodgy – Newbury bypass was predicted to reduce fatalities on the corridor by 47%, but within 5 years fatalities had increased by 67%. But the DfT have never attempted to measure the changes in overall accidents in the network away from a scheme itself that may arise from speed habits on fast roads spilling into the rest of the network from junctions and will arise from the induction (see below) of new traffic across the whole network. Cross-correlation of national casualties and accident data with mileage of trunk road built actually seems to suggest that building roads tends to increase the accidents and their consequences.</p> <p><i>Does the scheme reduce delays and queue lengths?</i></p> <p>This is the same question as the congestion question below. The assumption is that congestion relief should only be measured at the locality of the scheme – it does not take account of the overall contribution to congestion in the network of the diversion, suppression relief and induction effects on other roads (or even at other sectors of the same road).</p> <p><i>Does the scheme support economic growth by unlocking development capacity for jobs, business and housing creation?</i></p> <p>This is highly contentious, not least because with the £100billion or so given to road building over the last 50 years, the DfT has never once spent money researching whether there is a net economic benefit to the nation from the projects. It is too complicated to go into here, but Winchester MP Steve Brine was challenged to get the DfT to provide evidence of such research and while it responded with many documents of a highly circular nature (assuming economic benefit in order to demonstrate it), it provided not a shred of real evidence to support its case. Also the case has been made that roadbuilding has the opposite effect to that claimed – this was made as a submission to the Transport Select Committee and later sent several times to the DfT and never answered or refuted.</p> <p>Essentially the problem of DfT’s economic analysis lies in the fact that motoring and road freight massively externalise their costs (pollution, policing, accidents etc., not to mention climate costs) – a subsidy that amounts to</p>		<p>Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) also sets out the measures that the Applicant proposes to mitigate adverse noise effects. The Scheme design includes the earth embankments and low noise roads surfaces where new roads surfaces are to be laid.</p> <p><i>Biodiversity</i></p> <p>Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents the findings of an assessment of the construction and operation of the Scheme on biodiversity. The assessment identified a number of residual adverse and beneficial effects to biodiversity receptors predominantly during construction (as by operation effects would have been mitigated) including, European Designated Sites (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation), other statutory designated areas (e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest), non-statutory designated areas, habitats, badgers, bats, hazel dormouse, otter, water vole, birds (breeding and over-wintering), reptiles, freshwater fish, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates and notable plants. Effects predicted were as a result of habitat loss and gain, fragmentation of populations / habitats, disturbance, habitat degradation, and species mortality. However, in all cases the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation during the construction and operation of the Scheme effects were predicted not significant.</p> <p>Impacts from dust during the construction phase and emissions from vehicles (NO₂) during construction as well as emission from the operational phase have been taken into account in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) with regard to nitrogen deposition.</p> <p>The Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is also considered in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The biodiversity assessment concludes that the construction of the Scheme would not result in direct effects through habitat loss or fragmentation to SSSI habitats, including habitats within the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve.</p> <p><i>Climate</i></p> <p>The net-zero ambition is set out in recent amendments to the Climate Change Act 2008. The Secretary of State supports delivering of emission reductions through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory for reducing greenhouse gas production to 2050. In response to the carbon budgets, the Department for Transport has published ‘The Road to Zero’ which sets out steps towards cleaner road transport and delivering the Industrial Strategy. The Applicant recognises the concern raised about the Scheme within the context of concerns about climate change and is aware of the changes which the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>around 3 times the total tax take on the activity. Economic benefit to the nation cannot be construed as arising from reducing the costs of a highly subsidised activity</p> <p><i>Unlocking development opportunity is also a highly suspect concept.</i></p> <p>Certainly roads bring development with them, usually of a very unenvironmental nature (megasheds, out of town shopping etc.), but it is not demonstrated that this does not suck activity out of more human-centred communities.</p> <p><i>The housing argument is even more concerning.</i></p> <p>Roads-based housing development means car-based communities. It always means green-field development instead of traditional town-centre renewal. For example West Wiltshire housing growth is entirely based around development of the A350 road – the road justifies the housing on green-field sites and the housing justifies the road and public transport is almost non-existent – yet the neighbouring town centres of Trowbridge and Westbury are in decay despite sitting on the investment-starved railway from Southampton to Bournemouth.</p> <p><i>Does it reduce congestion?</i></p> <p>This is the big claim and HE knows that it is false.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reassignment can lead to new congestion or new polluting activity on roads where this more important (e.g. central Winchester). HE haven't bothered to model traffic reassignment through Winchester presumably on the grounds that they think it doesn't matter. • Desuppression will mean motor journeys that would have been deterred by congestion become available - e.g. shopping at Tesco from across Winchester could occur more often (for the same economic activity) because the previous congestion on Easton Lane might have prevented this shorter journey previously. • Modal shift is a special sort of desuppression – e.g. journeys made by public transport revert to car journeys or freight moving by rail will move back to road. • Induction – journeys that have never been made or imagined, but which become possible as a result of capacity increase. The DfT denied this reality for years but finally conceded it following the SACTRA report. After that the DfT became fond of asserting that building roads therefore offers new opportunities, which is a benefit to the road user. Obviously new opportunities for car journeys means new opportunities to burn carbon. But there is also good reason to believe that an entirely different and even more undesirable thing happens. 		<p>2019 introduced, as well as, the climate emergency declared by Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council.</p> <p>The Applicant is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks to assess the effects of the Scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase in emissions within the context of the relevant UK carbon budgets. This assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Scheme. Chapter 14 (Climate) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations and the DMRB LA 114 Climate. The Scheme is estimated to lead to an increase in CO_{2e} emissions over a 60-year operational period. It is considered that the emissions from the scheme in isolation would not have a material impact on the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon budgets.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p><i>How will congestion be affected by this scheme?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reassignment: We do not know what reassignment effects will occur since Highways England do not have a detailed traffic model to tell us. So reassignment could increase or decrease traffic elsewhere on the network, within Winchester or outer settlements. Whatever effects there were would likely happen very soon after the scheme was in place. • Desuppression: HE has not revealed whether it has any idea what motor trips are being suppressed or whether the level of current congestion would imply significant suppression. The claim is that the congestion is significant so that significant suppression might be expected. Removal of congestion would result in suppressed trips taking place, but since this would involve a change of habits one might expect a slower response than with reassignment. • Modal shift: There is likely to be a significantly elastic response to congestion relief on the strategic corridors, both for commuter traffic and road freight. <p>The growth of rail commuting to London and the M4 employment corridor must have taken place against the competing dynamics of road commuting. Increasing road capacity would naturally shift the balance between these modes. One imagines a fairly swift reaction to this – perhaps over a year or so (and the annual biasing of the choice by greater-than-inflation rail fare rises).</p> <p>Over the last decade rail freight from Southampton to the Midlands has grown very significantly. The reason freight operators move from highly subsidised (i.e. cost-externalised) road infrastructure to rail (more commercially priced and with far fewer externalities) seems likely to be about time (driver costs) and reliability (delivery commitments). If cheap roads are accompanied by lower time costs the balance will be tilted towards reversing the modal change of recent years. The pace of this change may be over the same sort of timescale as the modal shift we have seen recently – and it will eventually peter out as the congestion on the road increases again through growth of all traffic and especially the planned (and HE-encouraged) growth of imports to Southampton docks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Induction: Trips being made possible that were not thought of before. This would include trips to new or expanded destinations (e.g. the planned expansion of Southampton Airport) or more distant destinations (see Metz below) for the same functionality (e.g. a leisure day-trip from Farnborough to Winchester might extend itself to the New Forest). Induced traffic takes some time to build up, but perhaps not so slowly as one imagines. The Newbury Bypass increased A34 traffic at twice the rate of that in the surrounding county and within 8 years of its 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>completion traffic levels in Newbury, that it was meant to relieve, had returned to pre-bypass levels.</p> <p><i>Overall congestion?</i></p> <p>When John Prescott finally shut down Mrs Thatcher’s great road building binge (Roads to Prosperity) around 1998, he pointed out that £70B of road expansion had resulted in increased overall congestion of the nation’s roads. He famously stated that ‘You can’t build your way out of congestion’ – a lesson that DfT has spectacularly unlearned.</p> <p><i>Does it improve journey time reliability?</i></p> <p>Well this depends on what is meant. Until induction, desuppression and modal shift bring back the congestion it is reasonable to suppose that there will be some increase in journey time reliability on the trunk roads in question. Nothing can be said about the effects on journey times across the rest of the network arising from the traffic induction or any of the other results of decongesting the trunk roads. But this criterion of success has another side to it:</p> <p><i>METZ: Does roadbuilding save journey time?</i></p> <p>That it does save journey time is the central plank of road economic appraisal. It is primarily why the DfT claims that road building is economically beneficial and it does so through a highly elaborate mechanism of counting millions of small time savings and declaring that people value those time savings enough that the sum of them outweighs the cost of building and maintaining the road. That this whole process is fraudulent is examined in footnote 1. But the fundamental time-saving premise is itself false.</p> <p>David Metz demonstrated the falsity of it by showing that for all the roadbuilding that was supposed to save time, the individual average motorist spent the same amount of his/her life driving as before – he/she simply drove further.</p> <p>It is not hard to see what this signifies. The DfT will claim that these extra miles amount to the realisation of greater opportunities. But to do what? Have we really got greater opportunities for leisure or shopping or employment or health service by travelling further towards them? Or isn’t the reality that these trip ends move further away from us? Shops in villages and towns move further away to out-of-town locations (taking them and their economies of scale out of the reach of the poorer car-less part of the population); housing locates away from facilities; longer distance commuting replaces local work; hospitals amalgamate at greater distances from population; the efficiency and social cohesion of urban population with local facilities is replaced by the entropic</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>distribution of population and activity that characterises much of transatlantic society.</p> <p><i>Does it improve the environment by reducing noise?</i></p> <p>We all know this is an old lie. The noise footprint of the M3 crossing the Itchen Valley between Hockley and Compton is far greater than it was 30 years ago both on urban Winchester and Twyford. The noise of both the A34 and the M3 in urban Winchester is almost unavoidable now – yet the Highways Agency said that it would be much reduced with the Twyford Down construction. The removal of the old bypass has led to the recovery of a visual downland scene of value but the real enjoyment of it on St Catherine’s Hill can only be reserved for the deaf.</p> <p>The claim appears to be centred on the notion that relief of congestion means that free-flowing traffic is less noisy, but this is largely due to an assumption that noise is primarily engine noise. Tyre noise is now the far greater contributor and free-flow actually increases that for the same number of journeys. And, of, course, traffic growth that results from the scheme simply multiplies the overall noise.</p> <p><i>Does it improve the environment by improving air quality?</i></p> <p>This is an absurd claim of the HE. For one thing it has no real information on air pollution resulting from the existing road. It relies on the most over-simplified diffusion modelling process imaginable, that has no prospect of saying what happens in urban streets (or even the leisure centre being built at Bar End) as a result of the increased traffic on the M3 and A34. The argument that congested traffic is more polluting is a simplistic one since we do not know what the average prevailing congestion is. If the overall average speed of flow goes up from 50mph to 70mph there could be an increase in pollution (certainly an increase in carbon emission). And the traffic growth resulting from the removal of the congestion will likely outweigh any savings from reducing the pollution from crawling traffic and eventually the system will congest again at a greater volume of traffic.</p> <p>We do not know the extent of the likely traffic increase across central Winchester, because HE has not bothered to model it. But it is likely to add to the air pollution problem in the places where it is currently at its worst, most lethal and most illegal. In any case HE has no way of estimating what these effects will be.</p> <p><i>Does it improve the environment by ensuring no loss of biodiversity?</i></p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>We have no idea what this assertion means. We know that the scheme impinges on an SSSI in the Winnall Moors. Network connectivity is a big determinant in whether species can survive or perish through isolation. Big roads prevent the crossing of species such as bats and butterflies. Watercourse pollution from carriageways is normally reasonably intercepted provided the structures are properly maintained. Nitrate deposition from vehicle emissions is a significant threat to both the important downland turf and the chalk stream habitats.</p> <p><i>Does it improve accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders?</i></p> <p>Yes it probably does briefly, but no credit is due to HE for this. The reason that J9 is so difficult to cross (for access to Easton, Avington etc.) for cyclists is because Highways England deliberately made it so only a few years ago by increasing the existing roundabout capacity, bringing the traffic much closer to the cyclists and forcing them to dismount . They consciously compromised the National Cycle Route to achieve that earlier capacity increase.</p> <p>CLIMATE EMERGENCY:</p> <p>Highways England appears to inhabit a different planet from the rest of us. The government has declared a Climate Emergency, both the District and County Councils have declared a Climate Emergency. There is a Climate Emergency. Even though it makes some questionably optimistic assumptions, the Science and Technology Select Committee has just reported:</p> <p><i>In the long-term, widespread personal vehicle ownership therefore does not appear to be compatible with significant decarbonisation. The Government should not aim to achieve emissions reductions simply by replacing existing vehicles with lower-emissions versions.</i></p> <p>It spells out that this means getting out of our cars. The 'long-term' apparently signifies by 2035 "at the latest". 16 years from today! And of course this M3 scheme will be appraised in the usual way by inventing time savings over 60 years, several decades after the planet has passed its tipping point. Why are we all wasting our time responding to the absurdity of consultations like this? If Highways England is incapable of discerning reality in the world today then the agency should be closed down and the management of the essential changes to our road network and its use should be put into the hands of those who can understand what is needed.</p> <p>2018 Response</p> <p><i>Summary</i></p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>This is an objection to this scheme, as a waste of public money at a time of continuing austerity and near-breaking-point pressures on health, social and educational services. It is worse than a waste of money since it makes the world a worse place, increasing pressures on climate, remaining mineral resources and the quality of the air we breathe, contributing more and more to landscape and biodiversity loss, diminishing of natural amenity and encouraging inactive lifestyles with long-term health disbenefit. It is worse than a waste of money because it is based on a false assertion of economic benefit. The scheme is represented as solving a local problem of congestion, yet it ignores the consequences here and elsewhere of the traffic it induces. It ultimately solves no problem but creates bigger ones. It fails to assess its pollution consequences or its effect on the traffic within Winchester City. We do not comment on the options presented since our position is that Do Nothing is the only proper fall-back if the Department for Transport cannot bring itself to move away from its last-Millennium policy direction.</p> <p><i>Background</i></p> <p>Almost exactly twenty six years ago, the then Highways Agency (HA) began the destruction of Twyford Down and the ruination of the Itchen Valley at Hockley. It systematically wiped out or severely marred five designations of so-called protection, ancient monuments, SSSIs and one of the most important landscapes in southern England. It brought traffic growth to the streets of Winchester; it left the City and its valley landscape with an insistent background of noise; it made the last western rampart of the South Downs, looking down on to the ancient capital of England (which ought to have been one of the glories of the National Park) a place of noise and visual intrusion; it blocked the waters of the Itchen Navigation, leaving it a soggy ditch; it brought air pollution to the south east of the City. Beyond Winchester it brought the noise and pollution of the traffic it generated to the southern towns and villages and into Southampton; it generated the traffic that has so much worsened the acoustic environment in the New Forest.</p> <p>The Highways Agency made promises of traffic reduction in Winchester – broken; it made promises to reduce traffic noise in Winchester – manifestly not kept; it made a promise to connect the Navigation to the Itchen at the railway viaduct – it cynically breached the banks to allow the waters to drain off through multiple channels across the water meadows; it made promises of restoring the old A33 to recreational land in mitigation for the loss of Twyford Down – it (or rather the Department for Transport [DfT] its masters) then allowed the City Council and the County Council to build car parks over significant chunks of it.</p> <p>The assault of the Highways Agency on Twyford Down and the Itchen Valley was almost certainly the key starting event in the great road protests of the</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>early-to-mid 1990s. These protests led to a profound questioning of the whole Roads to Prosperity programme and an almost complete retrenchment. By the end of the millennium those who cared for the state of the environment were beginning to feel some encouragement that, at long last, central government was taking seriously the dire consequences of road transport for planetary health.</p> <p><i>An Argument Won – But Ignored</i> The case against large-scale road-building was seemingly made irrefutable. The SACTRA report (1994) officially put paid to HA’s ridiculous assertion that road-building merely diverted traffic into more suitable channels, but clearly showed what everyone else in the world knew, that roads induce traffic – journeys that would not have been made otherwise. The DfT was quick to assert an economic benefit from this (new opportunity), though it did not go so far as to add this supposed benefit to its spurious appraisal methodology. But this was entirely to miss the point. By this time the carbon demands of the ‘Great Car Economy’ were also clearly apparent to even the most environmentally blinkered. It was clear then that, despite the improved carbon balance arising from the collapse of the coal industry and the move to hydrocarbon power sources, our international commitments on Climate Change were not going to be honoured. Even with the very welcome wide-scale adoption of renewable power generation, we are still not on course to meet our commitments and transport (both road and aviation) is increasingly seen as one of the major threats to planetary stability. The pretence of the DfT that the growth of traffic that it forecasts (and does its best to bring about) is planetarily sustainable (because road vehicles will be increasingly electric and increasingly efficient) shows an extraordinary failure to understand the physical limits of a finite world, the carbon cost of vehicle production and other elementary economic factors such as ‘rebound’.</p> <p>Another study punched a hole in the HA’s contention that road-building reduced journey times and therefore represents an economic benefit. David Metz demonstrated that what has actually happened with the post-war road-building frenzy is that people spend just as long travelling by road as they ever did; it’s just that they travel much further. Presumably this is related to the diffusion of economic activity away from traditional centres. How the national economy benefits from such entropic behaviour is anyone’s guess. GDP might be imagined to increase, since GDP is a measure of activity however mindless (it was never a measure of wealth production), and in any case the GDP-road-building correlation seems to be in the opposite direction – GDP rises lead to road-building, not the other way round. The DfT’s Eddington Report itself made it clear that no assumptions about the direction of the correlation (i.e. which cause precedes which effect) could be made, an essential point the DfT has ignored ever since. Eddington also stated that users of the road system should</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>pay the costs they externalise on society, another essential point conveniently ignored by the DfT and the Treasury ever since.</p> <p><i>A New Triumphalism</i></p> <p>Unfortunately, even though all the research and intellectual argument made the irrefutable case against roadbuilding as a sensible environmental and economic policy, the politics remains in denial. Eighteen years into the new Millenium and Highways England, with its new triumphalism, still talks the same primitive language – like Talleyrand’s Bourbons ‘Ils n’ont rien appris, ni rien oublié’. We look at the Consultation document and see no mention of traffic induction and the preposterous implication remains that road building will lead overall to less carbon emission, less noise, less congestion and less air pollution; and that all sorts of economic benefits will result (no mention of the peripheralities in encouraging more and more travel).</p> <p>Above all, we continue to see (as across the country and in our southern region) every damaging scheme that was rejected in the 1990s dragged out of some bottom drawer in Walnut Tree Close or Marsham Street and given a new zombie life in the evidence-free and value-free policy environment of the Treasury and the DfT. The South Coast, from Dover to Southampton, has had its railway deprived of proper investment for decades, with increasingly poor and expensive service, but the South Coast Superhighway ambition, long shown to be detrimental to meeting environmental and transport needs in the corridor, has been resurrected via the usual trick of stringing together a paternoster of ‘bypass’ schemes. Never mind that the South Downs has been recognised as a National Park of great landscape importance, since the HA was last minded to turn this region into a channel for megashed distribution centres and other inappropriate development.</p> <p>Amongst the zombie schemes in the south, to which the HA or DfT are apparently giving an encouraging ear, are along the A350 (Westbury, Melksham, Chippenham) and the A36. The threats to Constable’s Salisbury meadows, the Wylde Valley and to the supposedly highly protected Avon at Bath are all being made again. And Stonehenge! Highways England are seemingly dead set on carving an expressway across the most important prehistoric landscape in Europe. The Chief Executive of HE, Jim O’Sullivan, dismissed the objection of UNESCO’s Advisory Mission (the people who will decide whether the UK will have so neglected its duty as to put its greatest archaeological site on the World Heritage Sites in Danger list) out of hand as being of limited relevance: <i>“I don’t think so, I mean we have the support of the major stakeholders..... ...When you look at the people who are in favour of us doing something they are the people who live somewhere on that corridor and they know the</i></p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p><i>situation is desperate. When you look at the people who object they are, like UNESCO, from all over the world”.</i></p> <p>As if Stonehenge was not important to anyone outside Wiltshire (are the Buddhas of Bamiyan or the great artefacts of Palmyra of no meaning to the rest of the world? Are the Taliban or ISIS to be condemned for wanton Philistinism but Highways England allowed to plead some spurious reason of local need?). The project manager for the Stonehenge scheme (the delightfully named Derek Parody) went further by asserting that the UNESCO Mission had simply got it wrong and not understood its own guidelines for assessing impact on the World Heritage Area!</p> <p>This is the new Trump-like hubris of HE, where anything is confidently asserted without evidence, appropriately relevant data or argument, with a clear expectation that the public examination process is now so emasculated that no critical analysis will get near to establishing relevant facts.</p> <p>The message has gone wider. Away from the trunk road responsibility of HE, local authorities are being encouraged to think roads – build houses and allow megashed developments in inappropriate places in order to gain CLI, not to help with social or welfare needs or look after the economy and structure of town centres, but to build roads through green fields in order to create ever more road-based development opportunity. Key to this is the Local Enterprise Partnership. LEPs are unelected, unaccountable bodies, largely of vested interest, spending large sums of public money, much more likely than not on road projects. There is a self-reinforcing circularity in this – the Government tips the wink to the LEPs that road building would be very nice, wouldn't it? And HE then cites local LEPs as supposedly expert authorities as providing evidence of need for road building. And where is the control or accountability in all this when the Planning Inspectorate (and, infamously, the environmental protection agencies) now have to regard the developer as 'customer'?</p> <p><i>The Fallacy of Composition</i></p> <p>At the heart of all HE assertion is a logical fallacy that needs to be considered both in the appraisal methods (COBA etc.) and in the presentational arguments put to the public. Given that a particular scheme may have certain immediate benefits to a locality (though we would probably dispute some of them), the assumptions are firstly that the benefits endure; secondly that the effects of the scheme are confined to the locality; and thirdly (since HE is a national body) that the scheme contributes to an overall benefit to the nation. The first assumption is clearly not valid since we know that whatever happens elsewhere on the road network, traffic through this junction will increase (the cost-benefit analysis relies on this), through what the DfT is pleased to call 'natural growth' (though there is circularity in this – see footnote 1) and</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>primarily through induction. The HE makes specific reference in its Technical Appraisal to its desire to accommodate more road freight from Southampton (journeys that could not be made if the junction remained congested). Secondly, there are clearly concerns for unwanted effects in the locality from increasing capacity at this junction. For example the congested Spitfire Link and congested Easton Lane are likely deterring some local trips. Removing the deterrence (certainly from the latter) will have the consequence of imposing such deterred trips on the central streets of Winchester and contributing further to the traffic and pollution problem the local authorities are claiming they want to solve. The induction of traffic on to the A34 and M3 as a result of this significant capacity increase will also (together with the other capacity increases planned through hard-shoulder running) put pressure on the Twyford Down cutting and the Hockley embankment. We already know that HA have a report tucked away in their bottom drawer on how to widen Twyford Down (with high concrete walls). It is clear that this is where we are heading – ever more traffic through the blighted landscape of the western hills of the National Park. Thirdly and arguably more importantly, the induced traffic from this scheme will have trip ends all over the national network, contributing to new congestion (none of the road building programmes in the past has actually brought about a reduction in the total congestion of the network), new pollution, new resource consumption and new carbon emission. Nobody (least of all HE and the DfT) ever computes the consequences of this, but who can possibly say that the overall effect is beneficial.</p> <p>This is the fallacy of composition, often illustrated by the theatre story – a member of the audience stands up to get a better view – he has an immediate benefit but the cost is borne by the person behind, who seeks to mitigate that disadvantage by standing up himself – in the end almost everyone is standing up, nobody has an advantage and everybody is more uncomfortable. It is with these little immediate apparent advantages that HE always seeks to seduce local populations into agreeing to what will ultimately disadvantage the whole country including those who are seduced.</p> <p><i>Objection</i></p> <p>We see no justification for this network capacity increase. The argument for a local reduction of congestion is falsified by the congestion consequences elsewhere, arising from the traffic induced by the scheme. The arguments for reduced pollution and carbon emission are equally fraudulent if the boundary of concern is moved out to the whole network and are not even plausible in the local and immediate context. The construction of this scheme will of itself consume resources that shouldn't be wasted and burn carbon that shouldn't be added to the planetary burden. The argument on journey time savings is out-of-date and known to be falsified by the Metz research.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The argument for economic benefit has never been demonstrated – the DfT has never even carried out any research to discover whether an economic benefit exists. Eddington’s remarks on the correlation of road building with GDP and his stipulation that externalisation of costs by road users (essentially a regressive subsidy(10) since it benefits the better off and disadvantages the poorest in many ways) should be recovered to the public purse, have been consistently ignored. This scheme has all the hallmarks of that wilful disregard for its economic and environmental consequences.</p> <p>Because we see no justification for a capacity increase here, there is little point in our involvement in the discussion of options for achieving that increase. ‘Do Nothing’ (and spend the money on something socially useful) is our clear preference. We do not expect to be listened to, especially with a compliant Planning Inspectorate, since HE will effectively be judge and jury in the matter and its interest is self-reinforcing. But in whatever process of Examination in Public will take place, we expect that certain matters will have to be discussed, that HE seems unwilling to discuss at this ‘consultation’ stage. We briefly state them here.</p> <p><i>Winchester Traffic</i></p> <p>Winchester has a traffic problem that has a countable pollution mortality and morbidity consequence, leads to a forgoing of valuable urban space and the economic consequence of inefficient access in a constricted street pattern (much more footfall could be achieved through car restriction and public transport encouragement). The City and County Councils have undertaken a Movement and Access study which has yet to report. If sensible car restriction (e.g. through parking reduction etc.) policies are adopted there will be a need to ensure that through traffic does not increase as a result of capacity increases on the periphery.</p> <p>It is very difficult to predict the immediate re-assignment effects of any of the HE’s options on the City’s network. It will, therefore be essential for HE to create a fine-grained zonal traffic model that credibly shows the likely effects.</p> <p><i>Air Pollution</i></p> <p>The reliance of HE on DEFRA’s wholly inadequate modelling of air pollution is to be deplored. A simple free-space diffusion model can have something to say about the peripheral receptors (including the sports facilities at Bar End) of M3 pollution (though it must include the likely traffic multiplication by induction) but nothing to say about the infiltration of pollution into the complex of urban streets in the Bar End and Highcliffe areas. Whether better modelling of street pattern diffusion is achievable or not we do not know, but HE would need to</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>make a case that it will not add to the burden of pollution already in this area (indeed the DfT is under an obligation to reduce the burden). The DEFRA modelling is in any case still reliant on the thoroughly discredited emission figures given by vehicle manufacturers. And we are alarmed to see that HE considers that its only duty in respect of air pollution is to meet the legal threshold for Nox pollutants – it does not mention particulates. The HE must know that Public Health England has identified a formula for computing the mortality figures for particulate pollution and that the formula pertains at all levels ('goes through zero' in the words of its chief author). So there is a calculable effect on the local population and the effect will be significant (countable numbers of people are dying in Winchester as a result of such pollution). It cannot morally be ignored by HE on the presumption that the wholly inadequate thresholds set by law are not being exceeded. It must measure the levels of particulate pollution, compute its increase as a result of the induction of traffic by this scheme and model its diffusion into the outskirts of the town and its contribution to background levels within the town.</p> <p><i>Cycling</i></p> <p>We will leave comment on the cycling aspects of this scheme to others more informed on the subject, but we have to record a certain amount of displeasure that the scheme is representing itself as a benefit to cyclists. While there was never a good crossing of the junction by the NCN23, it must be pointed out that HE took it upon itself to make this crossing far more intimidating and dangerous than it was by its earlier increase of capacity at the junction. To now claim credit for remaking the link is a bit much</p>		

K.2.X Construction – general

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	That the construction is on the edge of the National Park, and also the Winnall nature area. While the improvements to the junction are needed, it will impact the walking and cycling routes around the area quite heavily. For the Kings Worthy/Micheldever/Itchen villages/Alresford area, there will be an additional problem while construction is taking place...getting into Winchester. Recently HCC and WCC closed Hyde St, which was a main useful route into the City Centre for traffic coming down the Worthy Rd, and traffic has to go through the busy City Rd junction. This has already contributed to gridlocks in the City, and if access via Winnall is limited during construction of the new junction, this will have a big impact.	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. The Applicant has undertaken an environmental impact assessment which assesses potential construction impacts of the Scheme on the environment including designated sites such as the SAC / SSSI, scheduled monuments and the South Downs National Park with mitigation developed through consultation with statutory consultees. Further details are presented in the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) .
Local community	Do not create any potential for traffic flow/safety criticisms or environmental complaint opportunities. As well as all the usual candidates Winchester has its own highly vocal and educated troublemakers who will do anything to stop progress. So be very wary of saving money it will come back to haunt you.	N	The Applicant has also submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) as part of its DCO application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) provides details of how the construction works will be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measure, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase. The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) .
Local community	The new route of the A34 should be the first priority for construction.	N	Section 2.8 of Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the proposed construction phasing for the Scheme.
Local community	The construction period of 3 years (not starting until 2 years from now) feels like a luxury, we need to set stretching targets to reduce the length of time over which we can expect disruption. 2 years starting from 2022 feels more than adequate.	N	The construction phase of the Scheme is estimated to commence in late 2024, with operation anticipated to commence in winter 2027. The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business and road users, as far as practicable. Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides further details on the construction for the Scheme.
Local community	The consideration of community and commuters rushing to work or delivery	N	The Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) sets out the proposed temporary traffic management measures during the construction of the Scheme.
Local community	Maintaining capacity by not reducing number of available lanes even if lanes are narrower with reduced speed during construction works.		
Local community	During construction there should be speed limits through the junction and clear signage for local traffic. What happens if there is flooding (A33 mainly)?	N	
Local community	Crack on as quickly as possible	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Speed of delivery (as soon as possible).	N	The Applicant acknowledges the range of comments received in relation to the commencement of the construction period.
Local community	Speed up the build and get it finished asap.	N	
Local community	No objection to - and indeed support - the very necessary remedial measures. However, there may be points of detail where I might favour adjustment.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	The methods seem in line with expectations for a scheme of this type but there seems very little detail on impact such as if works are intending to carry on during the weekends or late into the night which might affect local residents. On this basis, it is difficult to know the merits of the methods you have proposed.	N	Section 2.8 of Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides details for the construction period, including proposed working hours.
Local community	Consider not doing any construction. There will be huge disruption lasting years - what consideration have you given to the impact on the city centre which is already highly congested and will probably see additional local traffic diverting from the junction?	N	The Applicant has undertaken an environmental impact assessment which assesses potential construction impacts of the Scheme and is presented in the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) . The traffic impacts of the construction traffic management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13) . The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.
Local community	There are hefty regulations for anything like this project to adhere to - so am happy that those regulations will be followed to the letter.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	If the scheme goes ahead, you MUST do much better on reducing construction emissions. Comments in the consultation on this issue are vague, if not obfuscatory. How are we going persuade people to reduce emissions when public works such as this do not show the way?	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. The Scheme has been designed using PAS 2080:2016 Carbon management in Infrastructure (British Standards Institute (BSI), 2016) to manage and reduce embodied carbon and has been iteratively updated to refine and improve the proposals in relation to a range of design requirements and criteria, including the consideration of sustainability, material use and construction efficiency.
Local community	Impact on local residents during construction, noise, light, disruption to local roads, paths, properties and businesses. Concerned about the amount of construction traffic that may use the lower end of Long Walk to access Northern Soil Dump. Long Walk is narrow and steep and unsuitable for heavy traffic. Using this route will also have an impact on Footpaths 20 and 21 and Restricted Byway 19. Preferred locations for spoil dump would be Central and Southern. Would there be scope for further infill in the field adjacent to the new path from Easton Lane to Long Walk, or an increase in the size of the bund?	Y	The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable. Impacts during construction on local residents, businesses, local roads and PRowS are assessed in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) . Specifically, Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the effects of the Scheme in relation to noise.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited as works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	This is well planned for the completed project but it's not clear how much disturbance will be caused by the construction.	N	Impacts during construction are assessed in the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) .
Local community	Any construction will destroy what's been growing in this area (for years) and soil structure.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Further information is needed on the final proposals for cut and fill, the areas proposed for the deposition of surplus material, and the extent and details of proposed noise and other fencing and lighting.	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>
E2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to E1 and any other views you have on our plans for people who are not travelling through the area by vehicle.			

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Generally very favourable, but as a regular user of the cross M3 routes here: 1) Add cycling capability on new route to Kings Worthy 2) Add steps to remove the loop on the cycle path route for walkers on the western side of M3 3) Smooth / reduce the hill from the underpass on the eastern side of M3 4) Ensure same cycle and walker routes continue to be available during construction	Y	The range of views expressed in this comment have been acknowledged. Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. The provision of steps has also been incorporated within the loop enabling a more direct and quicker route for pedestrians. Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9) . Temporary diversions will be required during construction and this will be subject to design and approvals prior to construction commencing. Indicative details are presented in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Figure 2.6 (Temporary Diversion of Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Routes) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) and the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) .
Local community	Concerns at relate to potential temporary PROW impacts during construction.	N	Potential impacts on PROWs during the construction period have been assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13) . Temporary diversions will be required during construction and this will be subject to design and approvals prior to construction commencing.
Local community	As a walker I see little advantage in what is proposed over the existing pedestrian/cycle route through the junction to Easton Lane on the eastern side of the motorway. I am particularly concerned about disruption to that route during the construction phase of the project.	N	
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	Only if a considerable thought is taken.	N	The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Please refer to Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) for further details.
Local community	Don't want any construction anywhere	N	The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted.
Local community	There is insufficient detailed information on potential compound 3 to be able to understand the potential impact arising from its use. It is located in an area where there could be potentially significant noise, landscape and visual and other impacts arising from its use. Further detailed information on the detailed proposals for the pound are needed, including uses, proposed hours of operation, visual screening, fencing, noise mitigation, lighting and other measures to be able to provide conclusive comments.	N	The construction of the Scheme would require a small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) which would be used to for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities. Details of the other construction compounds required to construct the Scheme can be found Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) . Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) provide details on the proposed construction working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>Working hours would be restricted to the following core hours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07.00 to 19.00 Monday to Friday • 07.00 to 13.30 Saturday • No Sunday working <p>Works outside of the core working hours are likely to be required in certain circumstances and would be carried out following consultation with Winchester City Council.</p> <p>The temporary compounds would also be subject to surface water drainage measures to avoid significant environmental effects. Such measures would include (refer to the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) for further details):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the amount of topsoil stripping where possible and soil stockpiles would be located as far from watercourses as practicable • Use of silt fences • Plant and wheel washing and haul road damping in designated areas • Plant to be re-fuelled in designated locations at a safe distance from water courses and good practise to be in place with relation to pollution prevention (adequate bunding, storage etc) • Spill kits are to be positioned at strategic locations on site and thorough training provided for staff to ensure a rapid and effective response to any pollution incidents that occur on site • Use of an Ecological Clerk of Works / Environmental Manager, along with toolbox talks and training to promote contractor awareness of pollution risks <p>The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited. Works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p>
General commentary			

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Should be looking again at traffic volumes and how we reduce them. Agree that we need a scheme for the A34/M3 interface, but the rest of it feels over engineered, as a result the programme is too long and likely too expensive. The construction programme should start in 2022 and be completed in 2 years maximum in order to reduce disruption to the local economy and in order to realise the benefits more quickly.	N	<p>The preliminary design builds upon concept designs previously undertaken with a view to reduce congestion at Junction 9 and improve journey times. The proposed layout has been assessed using transport modelling which provides a forward forecast to 2047. Whilst the focus is Junction 9, this serves several connecting routes (providing connectivity for the A33, A34, A272 and Easton Lane into Winchester), all of which require careful consideration and inclusion into the junction layout.</p> <p>The DCO application was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in November 2022. If the application is accepted for examination, the Applicant expects a decision to be made by the Secretary of State in Q2 2024. Following development consent, the Applicant would be required to discharge a number of requirements associated with the Development Consent Order (Document Reference 3.1) and undertake detailed design (including all necessary technical approvals) prior to construction. The construction phase is estimated to commence in late 2024.</p> <p>The current estimated construction programme has been developed based upon the current presented scheme, which includes several structures. The construction programme (including expected temporary traffic management during the works), will be carefully planned and developed to minimise delay to the travelling public during the works.</p>
Local community	It looks like Kingsworthy will be impacted quite severely during construction work, and consideration to limiting this impact as much as possible should be given.	N	The Applicant has undertaken an environmental impact assessment which assess potential construction impacts of the Scheme. Please refer to the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1) for further details.
Local community	It will be difficult to keep the traffic flowing while the works re carried out.	N	This comment has been noted. The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) as part of its DCO application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) sets out the proposed temporary traffic management measures during the construction of the Scheme.
Local community	We would appreciate the opportunity to meet and discuss in detail how the proposals will affect us particularly during construction.	N	<p>As part of the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant offered telephone appointments to help members of the public understand the Scheme and supplement any face-to-face conversations that they would have had with the project team. Furthermore, the Applicant has engaged with relevant land interests affected by the Scheme as part of the pre-application process.</p> <p>In addition to this, as part of the 2022 ‘Scheme update’ activity (see Chapter 14 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1)) the Applicant held public information events for members of the public to attend to find out more information about the Scheme.</p>
Local community	Whilst I understand you will not wish to consider ideas and proposals on diversions until the scheme has been approved I remain concerned that the issue needs raising in principle so that you are aware of the considerable	N	An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been submitted as part of the DCO application and secured by Requirement 11 in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1) . The Outline Traffic Management Plan will be

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>damaging effects that could occur to Winchester. On the earlier scheme it was proposed Badger Farm Road (A3090) be used to divert traffic to/from J11 and A34 at Three Maids Hill. In such event the residents in Olivers Battery area (off Badger Farm Road) and other areas would inevitably find it virtually impossible to access/exit from it due to traffic levels; it is already difficult with the exit being on to a 40mph road. It is very important we do not find diversions that cost the least but have the worst impact upon us as residents. Are you able to give us any assurances as to your overall policy and intentions in this regard?</p>		<p>finalised pursuant to Requirement 11 for agreement prior to commencement of construction. The Outline Traffic Management Plan will set out the proposed temporary traffic management measures during the construction of the Scheme, including details of diversion routes.</p> <p>The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13). The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p>
Local community	<p>Have you identified possible traffic diversion routes, both northbound and southbound around Winchester and J9 that will be required whilst the work on the M3 J9 is undertaken?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When will these be published? 2. When would they come into effect and how long do you anticipate that they will be needed? 3. Will these diversions also be used during the conversion of the M3 into a 'smart' motorway? 	N	<p>In relation to the reference about the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Motorway Upgrade Project, following the ministerial statement on 12 January 2022, this all lane running (ALR) scheme was formally paused. National Highways is planning to upgrade the existing central reservation barrier to concrete, to deliver safety benefits. This scheme is known as the M3 Junction 9 to 14 Safety Barrier Improvement Scheme. The central reservation work is due to take place prior to the construction of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>Chapel lane is a single track road with passing places which passes through Easton where some houses which were built long ago about the road .</p> <p>Normally it carries 10 to 15 vehicles an hour but if the A34/M3 is blocked the traffic increases to 600 to 750 an hour . This is unpleasant to those of us who live on this lane.</p> <p>In our comments to the first consultation we raised the need for an effective plan to prevent the traffic which will build up when work causes queues on the M3/A34 during the course of construction using Chapel lane but did not receive a response which recognised the need for action. We are unable to see in the recent consultation material your proposals to address this issue. Would you kindly set out your specific proposals.</p> <p>I object to the scheme unless and until effective traffic management for Chapel lane is incorporated into your scheme's proposals.</p>	N	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been submitted as part of the DCO application and secured by Requirement 11 in the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1). The Outline Traffic Management Plan will be finalised pursuant to Requirement 11 for agreement prior to commencement of construction. The Outline Traffic Management Plan will set out the proposed temporary traffic management measures during the construction of the Scheme.</p>
Local community	<p>This scheme is fine, is sorely needed, and the revised A33 northbound to Kings Worthy is a big improvement, albeit with increased land take and presumably cost.</p> <p>In 2019 you said the scheme would be open for traffic in 2023; now you say 2026. I sincerely hope that you will not all have retired by the time you get permission to actually build something.</p> <p>The new 3D flyover video is not as good as the 2019 one, and is much more difficult to find. The new one has too much text on it, and it doesn't show the new</p>	N	<p>This comment has been noted. The construction phase of the Scheme is estimated to commence in late 2024, with operation anticipated to commence in winter 2027.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	roundabout on the A33 at all, nor anything from the perspective of someone going north or south on the A33 or A34.		
Local community	<p>The latest design with its direct safe link from J9 to the A33 Kings Worthy is a great improvement and I am pleased that you are now proposing this design. Some points of detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is of critical importance that the road route between Kings Barton development and J9 through the Cart and Horses junction be improved in order to meet the requirement, stated at the Barton Farm Public Inquiry, that this would be the route rather than a route through the City Centre. I ask that you work closely with HCC to provide improvements to the A33 Cart and Horses junction to achieve this. • The footway proposed between Kings Worthy and J9 should be a joint shared footway and cycleway to provide a direct route between Kings Worthy and Winnall and onward destinations. A cycle route requiring cyclists to use the J9 gyratory is not safe and is not acceptable. • The shared footway and cycleway through J9 should have a pedestrian barrier on the at-grade section immediately adjacent to the gyratory roadway to prevent pedestrians and cyclists accidentally moving onto the roadway. • There should be an approved Diversion Plan published by Highways England for when sections of the A34 and/or M3 are closed for maintenance or due to accidents. This Plan should ensure that traffic is not diverted through Winchester City Centre or along Andover Road and through the Kings Barton residential area. 	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the support for the scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cart and Horses junction is outside of the Application boundary and no work is proposed to this junction as part of the Scheme. The Applicant has engaged with Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council about this area of the Scheme. • Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. • The footway/cycleway through Junction 9 will have a form of separation by means of a Vehicle Restraint System. • To seek to promote the use of designated diversion routes by commercial vehicles in the area, temporary hard signage would be installed on the affected local routes in advance of any closures. In addition, this information would be added to overhead or temporary variable message signs as needed. There would be a news release by the National Highways press office as well as information added to the National Highways website and also social media. Diversion Plans will be set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan. An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been prepared for the DCO application.
Local community	<p>3D flythrough lacks detail on the proposals for the A33 and the cycle lanes albeit it seems ok. Lack of detail in the plans also means that it's not clear what will be happening at the Cart & Horses Junction on the northern end of the A33. Other than that, the proposals are fine from my point of view the only trouble is the delay in construction - it's now quite late and HE seems quite happy to keep on kicking the can down the road rather than getting the work completed. The work is required NOW not in 'X' years time.</p>	N	<p>The DCO application was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in November 2022. If the application is accepted for examination, the Applicant expects a decision to be made by the Secretary of State in Q2 2024. Following development consent, the Applicant would be required to discharge a number of requirements associated with the Development Consent Order (Document Reference 3.1) and undertake detailed design (including all necessary technical approvals) prior to construction. The construction phase is estimated to commence in early 2024.</p> <p>The current estimated construction programme has been developed based upon the current presented scheme, which includes several structures. The construction programme (including expected temporary traffic management during the works), will be carefully planned and developed to minimise delay to the travelling public during the works.</p>
Littleton and Harestock Parish Council	<p>Concerns about diversion routes that may be in place during the work on Junction 9. In particular the council would like to make sure that traffic is not diverted into Littleton as it is a small road and would not be able to take any volume of traffic that tries to avoid the M3 junction whilst the work is taking place.</p>	N	<p>Diversion Plans will be set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan. An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been prepared for the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Even when a diversion through Littleton is not in place, the council notes that lorry and other vehicle drivers will be guided by their SAT NAVS, and asks if there is anything you can put in place to help to mediate against traffic going through the small Littleton village roads.</p>		
Local community	<p>The footpaths and cycleways need to be wide enough to accommodate both cyclists and walkers and well separated from the traffic. If net zero CO₂ is to be achieved then walking and cycling need to be made as attractive as possible.</p> <p>The plans for the spoil are not clear - topsoil is valuable and should not be simply piled up on the chalk downland. It is vital that the precious habitat of the River Itchen is not damaged by the construction work, or by run-off from the roads once built - bearing in mind the likely increase in periods of very heavy rainfall as the climate becomes more volatile.</p> <p>The construction work will need to be very carefully managed because the volume of traffic already going through this junction is high and disruption will cause major problems.</p> <p>Would the £175M be better spend on improving rail networks so that freight can travel by rail instead of by road - combined with charging freight for the CO₂ impact of its transport?</p> <p>While construction work is being undertaken the different bodies should cooperate to sort out for the dangerous Cart and Horses junction of the B3047 and the A33. The public, do not see why each body has to operate independently and take turns digging up the road, instead of doing it all on a sensible schedule.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footpath on the western side of the junction, linking the A33/B3047 junction to Winnall Trading Estate on Easton Lane has been revised to include a cycling route. In addition, the footpath on the eastern side of the junction, linking Easton Lane with Long Walk, has been revised to include cycling and horse-riding provisions at a 1:20 gradient to enable use by all users. Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. Please refer to The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1), which sets out the need for the Scheme. The Cart and Horses junction is outside of the Application boundary and no work is proposed to this junction as part of the Scheme. The Applicant has engaged with Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council about this area of the Scheme.
Cycle Winchester	<p>NC23</p> <p>We welcome the continued inclusion of this route in the plan. It's a vital link between Winchester and the communities of the Itchen Valley. It also provides recreational access to the country lanes and bridleways and to the South Downs National Park more widely. It is already well-used by local cyclists, with peak time usage of up to 50 per hour¹ despite the current cyclist-hostile arrangements on the overbridge. However many local people are unaware of it and many others are put off by the narrow overbridge section, tight bends and poor sightlines. If the new path is properly designed, built and signed then we expect to see a substantial increase in usage.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p> <p><i>Walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions</i></p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with the host authorities and parish councils as well as walking, cycling and horse-riding interest groups to consider their suggestions for improved provisions to help address the concerns raised during the 2021 statutory consultation. Taking into account this feedback, the Applicant has decided to amend the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for the Scheme.</p> <p>The walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities around and within the Scheme will be retained and upgraded. This includes:</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>We are therefore concerned that the project team has declined to make a commitment to build this path to the latest LTN 1/20 standards. These standards are mandated by DfT for any project it funds (not just local authority projects). If this were a minor alteration to an existing route then there might be a case for bending the standards; as it is, it's effectively a new build and there is no reason to produce anything substandard. In the context of the overall costs of the project, the difference in cost between a to-standard cycleway and a substandard one must surely be trivial.</p> <p>At the launch presentation for this consultation round, one member of the project team suggested that LTN 1/20 conflicted with the DMRB standards in certain situations. We have not heard this claim from any other highways engineer either locally or nationally. Our offer from that presentation still stands: if the team would like to tell us what these conflicts are, we have contacts (via the Cycling UK campaign network) who may be able to approach the authors of the standards and seek a resolution.</p> <p>From the current drawings we can't see any details of what is proposed: this is disappointing considering that the project team has had more than two years since the WCH workshop to come up with a detailed plan. We would like reassurance that the path will meet LTN 1/20 standards for width, height, sealed surfacing, sightlines, turning circles and gradients based on the expected frequent usage. After looking at the latest plans we are especially concerned about several aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overbridge above the M3, on the southern section of the roundabout. The plans show the cycleway on this bridge alongside the carriageway lanes, but there is no sign of a physical barrier between the vehicle lanes and the cycleway. This was raised in the 2019 WCH workshop and it was agreed that a physical barrier here was very important: (a) for physical protection should a driver swerve off the vehicle lane or decide to use the cycleway as a place to pull over (not unusual elsewhere!) and (b) for psychological protection, ensuring that non-motorised users feel adequately shielded from the heavy traffic on the roundabout. We should also note that our view is coloured by experience from 2009, when HE's predecessor (the Highways Agency) decided it needed another lane on the roundabout and simply removed the buffer zone between the cycleway and the carriageway to make room for it. If there is no physical barrier in the new design, the implication will be that HE is once again treating the gap between carriageway and cycleway as a "spare" vehicle lane, to be pressed into use when required. There is also a history of highways contractors using the path on the existing overbridge as a 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NCN Route 23, with a widened 4m underpass and 3m route either side of the M3 junction 9 gyratory. A new minimum 3m wide (increasing to 4m) combined footway and cycleway for the western side of the Scheme is proposed to link the A33 / B3047 Junction to Winnall Industrial Estate situated on Easton Lane. An additional 3m wide bridleway (with unbound surfacing) is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. <p>The provision of new routes increases opportunities for recreational experiences with access from Winchester to the South Downs National Park, whilst the design of these routes provides for an improved user experience.</p> <p>All routes have been designed to allow all footway /cycleway gradients to be no more than 1:20 to comply with Department for Transport (DfT) inclusive mobility impaired users. The loop provides a connection enabling appropriate gradients for pedestrians / cyclists to be achieved. This has been reduced in size as the design has developed and the provision of steps has been incorporated within the loop enabling a more direct and quicker route for pedestrians.</p> <p>A footway connection to the Itchen Way is also proposed.</p> <p>Further details are presented in the Volume 2 Plans (Document Reference 2.1 to 2.14) and the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p><i>Closure/diversion arrangements during construction</i></p> <p>Potential impacts on PRoWs during the construction period have been assessed in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the Transport Assessment Report (Document Reference 7.13). Temporary diversions will be required during construction and this will be subject to design and approvals prior to construction commencing.</p> <p>Diversion plans will be set out in the Outline Traffic Management Plan. An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been prepared for the DCO application.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>dumping-ground for their equipment and supplies. A physical barrier would make it harder for them to obstruct the path in this way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entrance to the southern underpass, coming towards the junction from Tesco and passing beneath the roundabout. This appears to have a sharp bend in it, something that was avoided in the 2019 proposals. It's vital that there are clear sightlines when approaching the tunnel. • The circular loop at the south end, evidently put in place to raise the level of the cycleway to the overbridge. While the loop is a sensible way to ensure a gentle gradient for cycling and for wheelchair, mobility scooter or pushchair use, it was agreed in 2019 that this was a very long way round for pedestrians and that there should be a short-cut route (probably steps) allowing pedestrians to bypass that section. If a short cut isn't provided then pedestrians will create their own along the obvious desire lines, scrambling up and down the embankment. There is no sign of a pedestrian short cut in the new plan. • Path width. We understand that the plan is to provide a 3m-wide path. This is the "absolute minimum" allowed by current standards and is not adequate for a well-used shared path, especially in the underpasses and overbridge where useable width is reduced because of walls and barrier. The "desirable minimum" in the standards is 5m. Again as this is a new build, the marginal cost difference between a 3m and 5m path will be small. • Termination of bridleway halfway across. In the plan, provision for equestrians starts on the east side of the junction and extends under the eastern underpass before stopping dead just before the overbridge, where a turning area for horses is proposed. This makes no sense at all. We understand from the designers that this is because "the current bridleway stops there." As Highways England are aware, the current bridleway is the result of a dispute between the Highways Agency (later HE) and Hampshire County Council over the status of the path. HCC's rights-of-way committee formally designated the entire path across the junction as a bridleway. HE challenged this and the matter went to public inquiry. The inspector's decision was that there was sufficient evidence to designate part of the route as bridleway, but the status of the remaining part was not clear. The result was an awkward compromise that satisfied no-one. Now is not the time to slavishly replicate that pointless compromise: this is a chance for HE to improve the facilities available to non-motorised users by ensuring that the entire length of the crossing is not only designated as a bridleway but is usable as such. 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The Kings Worthy Path (the non-motorised route from Junction 9 (or nearby) to Kings Worthy, specifically the Cart & Horses junction on the A33)</p> <p>In the previous plans this was a cycle route. In this plan it has been downgraded to a footpath. This makes no sense at all. It should be restored to being a utility cycling route. This was originally proposed as a utility cycle route by cycling advocates way back in the first consultation round. At the WCH workshop in 2019 the project team agreed that a cycle route to Kings Worthy should be an integral part of the project, with the caveat that – at that time – the project boundary stopped at the Itchen river. The project team undertook to bid for a feasibility study to extend the scope of the project all the way to the Cart & Horses junction on the A33. From the new plans it's evident that the extension was agreed, but the reason for it seems to have been completely forgotten.</p> <p>This path can provide a direct, reasonably level cycle route between the large residential areas of Kings Worthy and the large business and retail areas of Winnall. Beyond Winnall it can form part of a cycle route that will link through to the new sports & leisure centre on the south side of the city. This is especially important as the old leisure centre was much closer to Kings Worthy; if we are to avoid substantial increases in motor traffic through the city centre and on the A33, it's important to provide ways that Kings Worthy residents can travel into and through town without using their cars. (The current main route from Kings Worthy into the city, Worthy Road, is both hilly and hazardous for cyclists, with high levels of traffic and an inadequate cycleway that's too narrow for two cyclists or pedestrians to pass each other safely.)</p> <p>The DfT's Propensity to Cycle Tool (PCT) suggests that in the "e-bike" scenario, provision of safe, direct cycle routes from Kings Worthy to Winnall could result in a 660% increase in the number of people commuting by cycle between these two locations.² This path is key to providing these routes (and in fact the PCT maps highlight the existing footway from Kings Worthy to Junction 9 as the most direct, convenient route for a cyclist, even though it's currently illegal to cycle on it)</p> <p>This path is about 2 miles long. That's an easy 10-15 minute ride for a regular cyclist and even easier for an e-bike user – an important factor given the explosion in e-bike ownership and use. However it makes little sense as a footpath: 2 miles is a long walk on a path that (in the latest plans) is sandwiched between major trunk roads. It's not a quiet stroll in the countryside. The route only makes sense as an all-year-round utility route for cycling as well as walking. The new route for this path seems almost to have been chosen to add to the cost of building it. Our original proposal involved upgrading the existing footway along the eastern side of the southbound A33/A34 slip road and providing a new underpass at the redesigned roundabout, to minimise the cost and provide the</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>most direct route. In the new plans, the Winnall-to-A33 link road provides another opportunity: an off-carriageway cycleway could be built alongside that link road, sharing its bridges and underpasses. This would surely be more cost-effective than a separate path with its own bridges. It would also be safer as a commuter route, being overlooked by passing traffic and benefiting from any lighting.</p> <p>In the 2019 WCH discussions the idea was raised of a footpath to the west of the A34 to connect Winnall to the existing Nuns' Walk path by the Itchen. The project team promised to look into it. This had merit as a recreational path, but it seems to have got mixed up with the cycle route proposals. The current plan provides neither a functional cycle route nor an attractive pedestrian route, but a mixture of the two that provides the benefits of neither and even manages to route itself right down the middle of the A34, between the carriageways.</p> <p>The Long Walk connecting path from Easton Lane</p> <p>In the previous plans this was shown as a bridleway. The latest plans have downgraded it to a footpath without explanation. It should remain a bridleway.</p> <p>This route was introduced specifically as a bridleway by the Highways England project team in the 2019 sessions. We understand that it was put in at the request of the South Downs National Park Authority specifically for the benefit of horse riders, who are deriving very little of value from the rest of the scheme</p> <p>Given the amount of engineering work required to build the path, the marginal cost of widening it to bridleway width must be very small by comparison. The main point of the path was to provide a pleasant, low-traffic circular route for horse riders starting from Easton village. As a side effect it also delivers a pleasant recreational route for walkers and offroad cyclists, but the main objective was always to provide an equestrian facility. We know that SDNPA has not changed its view and was not aware of the change of plan prior to the latest public consultation. Unless HE has some as-yet unrevealed reason for downgrading it, it should be restored to being a bridleway.</p> <p>Closure/diversion arrangements during construction.</p> <p>This is a major project lasting several years and we understand that closures and diversions of the existing cycle route will be required from time to time. However we were surprised that at this advanced stage – the third round of consultations – the project team was still unable to give us any information about the possible duration of such closures or the plans for diversions. We understand that the draft plans will only be prepared after the consultation period has finished.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The NCN23 route across Junction 9 is one of only four practical options available to cyclists wanting to travel east from Winchester. Two of the others are suitable for offroad biking only – and one of those includes a section that runs within inches of a busy bypass. The third involves use of the relatively busy B3047 and a crossing of the A33 at Kings Worthy – viable for experienced cyclists, but a major disincentive to less-confident riders and family groups. (The B3404 Alresford Road is not considered a practical option here as it is busy and narrow with fast traffic and is therefore rarely used by cyclists.)</p> <p>The route across Junction 9 is therefore of huge importance in providing an active travel link between Winchester and the Itchen Valley and the South Downs. It needs to be kept open as much as possible</p> <p>We would like to be able to see and comment on the closure/diversion plans well before they are finalised. We have the local knowledge to assess their impact and suggest alternatives where possible. We hope and expect that the project team will treat the subject of diversions for cycling with the same seriousness that it would treat diversions for motorists, with plans to minimise disruption and provide clear signage</p>		
Local community	<p>Pupils and parents walk to and from school along the B3047 that runs through Itchen Abbas. We would expect all possible efforts are made to avoid general traffic and construction traffic from increasing through the village due to the construction phase of the scheme, especially during the key times between 08:00 and 08:30 as well as 14:45 and 15:45 when pupils and staff are travelling to and from school.</p> <p>Safe passage between Junction 9 of the M3 and the B3047 ought to be maintained at all times.</p> <p>Any opportunities for outreach or a local primary school construction site visit for our pupils, with the appropriate safety protocols, would be most welcome.</p>	N	<p>This comment has been noted. The construction phase would be programmed and sequenced to reduce disruption to the local surroundings and the environment, residents, business, and road users as far as practicable.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) as part of its DCO application. The Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) provides details of how the construction works will be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measure, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase.</p>
Local community	<p>Letter setting out basis of the representation:</p> <p>These representations are submitted in specific response to one element of the proposed works at Junction 9 of the M3, notably the proposed areas of land identified as potential deposition sites for surplus soil from the works.</p> <p>The OBJECTION in the strongest terms is submitted on four principal grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Process and Procedure Landscape Impact Heritage Impact Access Implications 	Y	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to deposition areas:</i></p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, all three deposition areas have been removed for the Scheme. In re-profiling the landform between Easton Lane and Long Walk, in response to South Downs National Park Authority and Natural England's comments, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition. The removal of these</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The order of the objections should not be regarded as conveying any order of significance to the objections being raised.</p> <p>a) Process and Procedure</p> <p>Despite the stated intention by Highways England that this is the final round of consultation prior to the submission of the formal application to government, it is our understanding that this is the first consultation that any consideration has been given to the important issue of how to deal with surplus soil generated from the works. This is clearly a critical matter that should have been addressed much earlier in the development of the scheme.</p> <p>Even at this stage, the proposals for the deposition of surplus soil are extremely vague and lacking in any detail. All that can be gleaned from the available consultation material is that three potential sites have been identified and that the land levels may be increased by 4m at two of them, with no detail of intent for the third northern site. However, if the 4m increase represents the envisaged level of excess soil requiring deposition, it would seem plausible that a similar amount of deposition may be envisaged for the northern site, potentially leading to an infilling of the natural valley. It is also not yet known whether 1, 2 or 3 of these sites might be required; the actual landfill requirements; the proposed profiles of the land after deposition and future uses apart from a vague indication of returning to agriculture.</p> <p>There is therefore no basis upon which the impact can be properly assessed and therefore a considered response made and submitted.</p> <p>There is also no understanding of how these sites have been selected; this should be compared with the earlier consultation versions on alternative options for the junction works themselves. It is assumed, but it is not clear, that a range of potential sites have been considered and analysed. It is also hoped that discussions have been held with local authorities and organisations who have a detailed knowledge of the local area and would most probably be able to identify potential sites for soil deposition and subsequent enhancement works.</p> <p>Whilst we understand that the process can be ongoing from now onwards, up to and during the application process, there is limited opportunity for individual landowners, local residents and organisations to be directly involved, notwithstanding that they will be directly affected by the proposals.</p> <p>An OBJECTION must therefore be raised to the unfair and unsound process and it is requested that the opportunity be provided for a further round of consultation when the proposals for the deposition of surplus soil have been properly addressed and refined, taking into account the representations received from this stage of consultation.</p> <p>The following objections are therefore necessarily based on the limited information available and apply directly to the proposed northern area identified as a potential site for soil deposition. This site actually has the most</p>		<p>areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>As a highly sensitive building the potential impacts upon Princes Mead School have been fully considered within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). No significant impacts have been identified. A programme of archaeological investigation to inform the baseline consisting of geophysical surveys and trial trenching was carried out to inform the assessment and no remains associated with the Morn Hill camp have been identified within the Application Boundary.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to walkers, cyclists and horse-riders:</i></p> <p>The effects on existing PRowWs during construction are outlined in Chapter 12 (Population and Human health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The impacts of the construction of the Scheme on these routes are considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted an outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) as part of its DCO application. The Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) provides details of how the construction works will be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measure, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase. The traffic impacts of the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p>Due to the removal of the deposition areas, the existing walking, cycling and horse-riding routes within the vicinity of the Scheme would not be affected.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to cultural heritage:</i></p> <p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). The assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies outlined within the DMRB LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (National Highways, 2020) and the DMRB LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (National Highways, 2020) and agreed with key heritage stakeholders.</p> <p>It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to Worthy Park House:</i></p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>limited information available; the flythrough of the scheme touches upon the central and southern sites but does not even refer to the northern site. The potential for the northern site is really only picked up from the site plans showing areas of land, which appear largely unrelated to the actual existing landforms.</p> <p>b) Landscape Impact</p> <p>Please refer to the attached assessment undertaken by the terra firma Consultancy Ltd. Terra firma are a well-respected firm of landscape architects advising on a local and national basis and who have advised the Trust on a number of projects over many years.</p> <p>The report concludes that there is the potential for significant harm on landscape character of and visual amenity within the SDNP, as well as on the setting of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>c) Heritage Impact</p> <p>Please refer to attached Heritage Impact Assessment from LJE Planning Ltd. This concludes the potential for significant harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* designated heritage asset of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>d) Access Considerations</p> <p>The northernmost site is within an existing agricultural field with very limited access. Existing access to the site is via narrow country lanes, most of which have to go through the very attractive and historic village of Easton. These existing routes cannot be contemplated as any means of access to the northern site.</p> <p>Looking at the plans that have been submitted it can only be deduced that the intention would be to create a new haul route parallel to the south side of the M3. This is not shown on any of the plans; only the final environmental improvements along this land. Its potential use as a haul route would need its own environmental assessment given the proximity to the River Itchen SSSI and there is no indication that such work has been undertaken. Noise, contamination and air quality issues in such a sensitive environment must also be considered.</p> <p>On the basis of the access limitations and considerations which would apply to the introduction of a new haul route, the access to this northern identified site would seem unrealistic and impractical.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>Significant OBJECTION must necessarily be raised to the proposals in so far as they relate to the deposition of excess soil as a result of the J9 changes. There is just insufficient information available to enable a proper assessment to be made of potential impacts, which is a major objection in itself to the process and procedures.</p>		<p>Worthy Park House is recognised as a designated built heritage asset in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). An assessment of the impact on this receptor is provided in the chapter. It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p> <p>Specifically, a very small part of the area between the A34 and M3 is visible in long distance views from the listed building and overall, it is considered that construction activities are unlikely to be visually or audibly noticeable from the listed building and the current character experienced from the listed building would be retained. Therefore, the impact of magnitude would be negligible to Worthy Park House, resulting in a temporary slight adverse effect which is not significant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the LVIA concludes that the construction phase will have a slight effect that is also not significant on Worthy Park House during construction. By summer year 15, there will be no change of effect on Worthy Park House. See Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) for further details.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to landscape and visual:</i></p> <p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on landscape and visual amenity and likely significant effects following implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>At the foremost the Scheme proposals look to avoid impacts and the Scheme retains as much existing vegetation as possible, with landscape mitigation measures including extensive areas of native woodland planting, linear planting, roadside tree planting, species rich grass verges, and areas of chalk grasslands creation (which all complement biodiversity and respond to the key characteristics of the landscape in which the Scheme is located). There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape.</p> <p>The Scheme also includes re-profiling of existing landform to create sympathetic features and reinforce existing characteristics and aid visual screening together with improving the network of public rights of way and new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes). These mitigation measures are presented in detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been included as part of</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>However, and even on the limited information available, there would be significant landscape, heritage and access impact issues arising from the proposed use of the northern site. These are sufficient that this site should not be progressed any further as a potential soil deposition site. The site would be returned to agricultural use but leaving an irreversible impact on landscape and heritage which could and would not be mitigated by environmental measures.</p> <p>The enhancements along the line of the haul road, if indeed this is the intended means of access cannot be construed to be enhancements as they would appear to being promoted generally as part of the overall enhancement works and not specific to the deposition of soil at the northern site.</p> <p>There may be other sites (and not necessarily the other two identified sites) which would be much better suited with less adverse impacts and where there could be environmental benefits to be secured. It is understood that other objectors, including the South Downs National Park Authority have recommended other sites for consideration, where tangible and long lasting enhancements can be achieved.</p> <p>It is very much hoped that the next stages of the process will not only take account of these objections but also find a way to involve all those parties, including individual residents and landowners who will be directly impacted by these proposals.</p> <p>Summary of report on Landscape Impact:</p> <p>The element of the proposals that is covered by this report is the deposition of spoil, in particular to the potential northern site as identified on the extract below from the 'Indicative Land Uses' plan. The PEIR states at section 7.7.2 that 'The landscape of the areas of search for potential excess spoil management is defined by undulating arable farmland bounded by hedgerows and hedgerow trees. These areas of search for potential excess spoil management lie within the boundary of the SDNP' and at 7.7.6 that 'post construction the 'landscape east of the M3 within the SDNP would continue to exist as arable farmland with associated crop and land management changes.'</p> <p>PEIR states at 2.4.42 that 'The construction process would re-use excavated materials as fill (where possible) to reduce the number of construction vehicles travelling on the network.'</p> <p>There are three areas being considered for spoil deposition from the construction works. Our response concerns the northern area.</p> <p>The potential extent of the northern spoil deposition site is included within the Indicative Application Boundary on the proposals plans. However there is limited further information; on viewing the flythrough of the scheme it is clear that, whilst this covers the central and southern spoil deposition sites and a raising of levels by approximately 4m to accommodate spoil, it does not refer to the northern site.</p>		<p>the application to deliver any mitigation required. This describes the proposed outline management and monitoring of the landscape and ecological mitigation elements with detail of the objectives, and success criteria for the establishment to achieve its environmental function. This would be updated into a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) during detail design and would include further detail on the long-term management.</p> <p><i>Response in relation Landscape Character Areas:</i></p> <p>Landscape Character Areas considered in the study area for the Scheme are outlined in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Scheme and study area lies within three of the landscape character areas (LCAs) identified in the <i>South Downs Landscape Character Assessment (South Downs National Park Authority, 2020)</i>. These are LCA A5, LCA F5, LCA G5. The study area, as described in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), extends up to 3km from the Application Boundary, has been informed through consultation with stakeholders, visibility analysis and site survey. The published national, county and local character areas within the study area are shown on Figure 7.3.1 (Landscape Character Areas) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p><i>Response in relation to viewpoints:</i></p> <p>View Locations are shown on Figure 7.4 (View Locations) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2). Baseline photographs (winter and summer) are presented on photo sheets at Figure 7.12 (Photosheets (Daytime Winter and Summer)) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>In Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) view location 23 is recorded to have a negligible adverse magnitude of effect during construction. This is due to the fact that the deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme and the Application Boundary has been revised to reflect this change.</p> <p><i>Points in relation to South Downs National Park and its special qualities:</i></p> <p>The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Scheme design avoids introduction of tall bridge structures or elevated embankments and instead the Scheme is positioned within cutting with structures and associated headwalls set within the landform at as low an elevation as possible. Views of the Scheme from the designated landscape have been considered with the aim where possible to minimise any adverse effects.</p> <p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The northern boundary line of the site runs immediately adjacent to the bridleway that links the western edges of Easton village with the subway below the M3 linking through to the Itchen Way and the Itchen Valley to the west of the M3.</p> <p>The site lies across a dry valley on the side of the downland, with the northern extent set at between approx. 50m AOD at the north-west corner rising to approx. 60m AOD at the north-east corner. The southern boundary at set at approx. 70m AOD at the south-west corner, dropping down to approx 66m AOD before rising up again to 80m to the south-east boundary.</p> <p>Worthy Park House is listed Grade II* and its Coach House separately listed Grade II; its grounds are listed on the Hampshire Register of Gardens Parks and Landscapes of Historic Interest.</p> <p>The site is located to the east of Abbots Worthy between the A33 and the M3 road corridors. The buildings, which include Worthy Park House, are set to the north of the B3047 beyond intervening agricultural land and school playing fields. Vehicular access is from a private drive that runs from the B3047 I and also serves adjacent residential properties to the east of the site. To the west and north of the site lie areas of deciduous woodland, with the northern woodland within the ownership of our client. Sports pitches and courts are situated to the south and southwest of the school buildings.</p> <p>The site lies on ground falling towards the southern boundary with the B3047 on the north side of the River Itchen valley floor. The building is set at approximately 64m AOD, with the road set at approx 51m AOD. On a direct line between the House and the northern deposition site the Itchen Valley falls to a low point of approx 42m AOD.</p> <p>With reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011), the northern spoil deposition site lies in the Landscape Character Area (LCA) A5 East Winchester Open Downs.</p> <p>Relevant key characteristics of this character zone include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the open character of the East Winchester Open Downs, there are expansive views over Winchester and the Itchen Valley. • Open rolling upland chalk landscape of rolling Downs reaching 176m at Cheesefoot Head. • Dominated by large 18th and 19th century fields of arable and pasture, bounded by sparse thorn hedgerows creating a very open landscape supporting a range of farmland birds. • Large open skies ensure that weather conditions are a dominant influence creating a dynamic, moody landscape, particularly on higher ground e.g. at Cheesefoot Head. • A strong sense of remoteness and tranquillity away from the major transport routes (M3, A31, A272) which cross the landscape. • Other characteristics to note are: 		<p>The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p> <p>Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the special qualities of the South Downs National Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p> <p><i>Response in relation to public consultation:</i></p> <p>As part of the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant presented a variety of plans and figures (including; the Indicative Application Boundary, a General Arrangements plan and environmental baseline figures). A 'red line' was included on all figures to illustrate the proposed site boundary of the DCO application.</p> <p>The 2021 PEIR and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the information presented in 2021 PEIR and supporting figures aligns with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements and the Infrastructure EIA Regulations 2017.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to construction:</i></p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport routes carve up the area – the M3 runs along the western boundary and the A31/A272 cut across the character area in an east-west direction. The sense of tranquillity and remoteness of this character area is diminished in the vicinity of these major transport routes. Also associated with the major transport routes out of Winchester is ribbon development, as seen along the B3404. • Of particular sensitivity is the remote and tranquil character of the East Winchester Open Downland which is threatened by its proximity to Winchester and numerous transport routes. • Given the proximity to, and views over, Winchester, this area is also sensitive to changes in the urban area and on the urban fringe beyond the South Downs study area. Also of particular sensitivity are the prominent scarps and open undeveloped skylines. • Observable changes in the past have included the introduction and upgrading of major roads, including the M3, A272, and A31 which have severed the landscape and created some incongruous cuttings and bridges. <p>Development considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent further fragmentation of the East Winchester Downs by roads and development. • Seek opportunities to reduce the visual impact of existing visually intrusive elements such as the infrastructure and traffic associated with the M3, A272, and A31, and prominent built elements on the edge of Winchester. • Maintain the open and undeveloped scarps and skylines – avoid siting of buildings, telecommunication masts, power lines and wind turbines on the sensitive skyline. • With reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011), Worthy Park House lies in the adjacent LCA E4 Itchen Valley. Characteristic points to note include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This character area includes the rural part of the valley of the River Itchen in two locations north east and south of Winchester. The boundaries are strongly defined by the topography and are drawn along the apparent skyline of the valley sides as seen from the valley floor. ○ Crossed by the M3 and A roads which interrupt the otherwise tranquil landscape. A sequence of settlements occur along the lower valley sides. ○ Although the valley has an overall tranquil quality this is disrupted in place by the audible ‘hum’ of traffic. <p>Key landscape sensitivities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The smooth form of the intact valley sides which reveal dramatic chalk landforms. 		<p>accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) present assessments in relation to air quality, contamination and noise, respectively.</p> <p>As part of the DCO Application, Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) has been produced to show the haul roads and temporary construction compounds.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The setting of, and uninterrupted views to churches tower/spires, which are often seen against the rising downland backdrop of the valley sides are also important. • Designed landscapes which provide evidence of gentry houses and landscape parks of the wealthy population of the past. • The woodlands and • d hedgerows generally limit visual sensitivity of these valley landscapes. However, the visibility of the chalk valleys from the adjacent downs increases their visual sensitivity. From within the valleys, the valley crests are seen against an open sky and are particularly visually sensitive. <p>Landscape management considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve the intact smooth form of the valley and its dramatic chalk landforms. • Conserve historic designed landscapes, and their settings, which provide evidence of gentry houses and landscape parks of the wealthy population of the past. <p>Development management considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the effects of incremental change to buildings and land, and minimise such change by providing design guidance and encouraging applicants to enter into discussions at an early stage in the preparation of their proposals. • Conserve the open skylines of the valley crests which are particularly sensitive in views from the valleys. Consider views from the adjacent downs in relation to any change in the chalk river valleys. <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House are on the southern facade, with all the rooms, including the key internal spaces, looking out over the landscape to the south across the top of the lower level Itchen Valley, much of which is hidden in the intervening woodland on the valley floor, along with the M3 corridor. The eye is drawn beyond to the open arable downland above the valley floor where the rolling nature is clearly visible in the views from Worthy Park House, accentuated by the presence of the characteristic valley, central to views, which give rise to a distinctive contouring of the landform. The presence of the valley is also accentuated by the patterns of the arable farming landscape with straight lines seemingly folding and curving around the contours of the landform.</p> <p>The PEIR Heritage Chapter includes at section 6.8.13 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) states 'Worthy Park House is located to the north of the IAB. Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape including south across land within the IAB. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding landscape, which are</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped retaining part of the views described in the nineteenth century and contributes towards the historic interest of the listed building. The construction of the Proposed Scheme, particularly areas of search for potential excess spoil management, potential construction compound areas and areas proposed for environmental mitigation on the eastern side of the M3 are likely to be prominent in views from the listed building introducing construction traffic and further eroding the character of the surrounding landscape which are part of the wider setting of the listed building. As part of the wider setting that has already been extensively altered the construction of the Proposed Scheme is likely to result in an impact of minor magnitude and a temporary slight or moderate adverse effect. This assessment will be reviewed in ongoing EIA work and reported in the ES following the decision on which areas of search for potential excess storage will be included and once further details about construction activities in this area are available.'</p> <p>Section 7.4.4.sets out the relevant landscape character areas, stating these cover all the relevant areas - but there is no mention of the LCA to the north that Worthy Park House lies within: SDLICA LCA E4 Itchen Valley.</p> <p>Topography is described as 'a key characteristic of the undulating hills in the nationally designated SDNP. It is also important to the wider distinctive landscape of the River Itchen valley' and is 'therefore considered to be of medium to high value (sensitivity) depending on location relative to the SDNP and its setting'. Effects on topography are stated to be as follows: 'Construction: Temporary adverse landscape effects are anticipated for the topography within the IAB as a result of construction activities and land reprofiling' and 'Operation: Adverse effects on topography are anticipated to remain during operation as result of the earthworks required to enable the Proposed Scheme. However, earthworks have been designed to sympathetically tie into existing levels and surrounding landform within the SDNP.'</p> <p>Vegetation is described as 'The surrounding landscape contains numerous copses, blocks of trees, hedgerow trees and hedgerows alongside lanes, tracks and field boundaries. The area of the IAB contains fields of both arable and pastoral farmland, typically bounded by hedgerows' and 'is a key characteristic of the nationally designated SDNP and is fundamental to the distinctive landscape of the River Itchen valley. It is an important part of the green infrastructure of the area and it is therefore considered to be of high value (sensitivity).' No effects on vegetation are noted as being relevant to the northern spoil deposition site.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Whilst Registered Parks and Gardens are assessed in this section, Heritage Statutory designations are not assessed as part of the landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>Landscape Statutory Designations include ‘The SDNP covers around 117ha of the area of the IAB, principally around its northern and eastern lengths (see Figure 7.1, Appendix 7.1). The SDNP incorporates the more intimate local landscape of the River Itchen to the north-west, the north-east of the area of the IAB and also covers the downland to the east. Consideration will be given to both the direct and indirect effects upon this designated landscape, including effects upon its special qualities and representative views. Special qualities of the SDNP are defined by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA); those special qualities which have the potential to be affected by the Proposed Scheme are as follows: Diverse, inspirational landscapes and breath-taking views. This is in part a function of the downland topography, and tranquil; and unspoilt places.’ and is stated to be ‘a nationally designated landscape resource of very high value (sensitivity).</p> <p>Points on perceptual aspects include ‘Noise, lighting, vehicle movement and the presence of infrastructure, all associated with the urban fringe of Winchester and the transport routes including the M3, A34/Winchester bypass and A272/Spitfire Link all erode tranquillity in the area’ and that ‘Built development and transport corridors have also affected the pattern and texture of the landscape over time’ and that tranquillity ‘is a perceptual quality of the landscape, and is influenced by things that people can both see and hear in the landscape around them’ and that ‘Tranquillity and a sense of remoteness are important aspects of the nationally designated SDNP and the River Itchen valley and are of high value (sensitivity).’</p> <p>The PEIR states that relevant landscape character assessments will also be examined and used to inform the landscape assessment.</p> <p>The assessment methodology states that the assessment of the magnitude of impacts on landscape receptors, the evaluation of the significance of landscape effects and the reporting of residual landscape effects for each landscape receptor are all to be reported in ES.</p> <p>Table 7-11 sets out the 24 viewpoints selected and the potential visual effects. There are two that are likely to include views of the northern spoil deposition site: 23 and 24, both from public rights of way. No photographs are available at this stage for review.</p> <p>There are no views from Worthy Park House included.</p> <p>The assessment methodology states that assessment of the magnitude of visual impacts, evaluation of the significance of visual effects and reporting of residual visual effects are all to be reported in ES.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Effects during operation for Viewpoint 23 area noted ‘Adverse effects would reduce over time as the landscape mitigation takes effect. Longer term beneficial effects are expected as a result of the landscape mitigation.’</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Mitigation Design Plan makes no reference to mitigation proposals for the northern spoil deposition site .</p> <p>The section states that ‘Anticipated further assessment relevant to landscape and visual matters, which will be submitted with the ES to accompany the Development Consent Order (DCO) process is as follows: A full assessment of landscape and visual effects on receptors and reporting of significance will be undertaken as part of the ES’ alongside continuing design work.</p> <p>The public consultation is being held with a considerable lack of information for review; proposals are diagrammatic, indicative and in some aspects simply not available. This gives very little scope for a full understanding of the nature of the proposals by the public. This information provided is not a full landscape and visual impact assessment and is subject to design development. Therefore the full proposals cannot be properly reviewed and commented on.</p> <p>The figures included in the information include a red line that covers the entirety of the proposals for the construction and operational stages. This gives rise to difficulties in reviewing specific areas of the proposals and their effects.</p> <p>The statement that the ‘earthworks have been designed to sympathetically tie into existing levels and surrounding landform within the SDNP’ is not backed up by any proposals available for review. The information on the spoil deposition sites is very limited. The amount of spoil being relocated to the northern spoil deposition site will determine the final ground levels, however this is not known at this stage and therefore the form of the proposals cannot be determined. It should be noted that the central and southern spoil deposition sites are far more level in nature than the northern site which dips considerably in the middle and the blanket spreading of a 4m layer of spoil may give rise to significant adverse effects in a valley situation. Indeed, without clarity on the proposals for the northern spoil deposition site, if there is considerable spoil to be deposited on the northern site then this may in effect be used to ‘fill’ the valley, giving rise to significant adverse effects on one of the main key characteristics of the landscape identified in the SDILCA.</p> <p>The PEIR notes that, as mitigation, the adverse effects on Viewpoint 23 will reduce over time, however the raising of levels and changes to topography are permanent and will remain constant over the long term. With the key landscape characteristics for the spoil deposition site noted as the ‘open rolling chalk’ downland with ‘sparse hedgerows, the nature of the landscape character gives little opportunity for mitigation or enhancement.</p> <p>Any change in levels will affect the nature of the view from Worthy Park House. Regarding Worthy Park House, the PEIR Heritage section states that ‘Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>including south across land within the IAB. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding landscape, which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped retaining part of the views described in the nineteenth century and contributes towards the historic interest of the listed building.'</p> <p>It is exactly these views that have been identified as contributing to the historic interest of the House that will be affected by potentially significant adverse effects to the landscape character of the SDNP, identified by the PEIR as very highly sensitive.</p> <p>On the basis of the points raised above, this report concludes that there is the potential for significant harm on landscape character of and visual amenity within the SDNP, as well as on the setting of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>Report on Heritage Impact:</p> <p>LJE Planning Ltd was instructed to consider the impact of the Scheme on the significance of the designated heritage asset, Worthy Park House (Grade II*) with particular regard to the impact on its setting. The assessment is undertaken with particular regard to the inclusion of proposals for identified sites for the deposition of excess spoil, one of which would be on the south side of the Itchen Valley, directly 'opposite' Worthy Park House and its grounds.</p> <p>There is regrettably very limited information available about the precise details of the proposed scheme for this potential deposition site. All that can be gleaned from the available consultation material is that three potential sites have been identified and that the land levels may be increased by 4m at two of them, with no detail of intent for the third northern site. However, if the 4m increase represents the envisaged level of excess soil requiring deposition, it would seem plausible that a similar amount of deposition may be envisaged for the northern site, potentially leading to an infilling of the natural valley.</p> <p>In the absence of any more precise details and analysis of the proposals, this assessment has necessarily had to be made on the basis of this extremely limited information; namely the location of the site as identified by the overall extent of the application site for the proposed works including the deposition sites, the suggestion in the consultation material that land levels may be raised or changed by 4m and that the land would revert to agricultural use in the longer term.</p> <p>Client's land occupies a 5.68 hectare site on the northern side of the B3047 approximately 1km to the east of the junction with the A33 and within the countryside and South Downs National Park. The main building is Worthy Park House, a Grade II* listed, former residential house within a parkland setting, designed by Sir Robert Smirke and dating from the 1820s. The School has</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>recently been successfully extended to the side facing the Coach House, but this extension is not generally visible from the southern side of the building.</p> <p>There are a small number of other buildings within the site, including the Coach House, which is separately listed Grade II to the immediate north-east of the house, and thought also to be by Smirke, as well as the much more recently built sports hall to the west. There is a hard surfaced play area / netball court to the immediate west of the main house and the main grassed playing fields, hard surfaced tennis courts/netball courts and play areas lie to the south.</p> <p>The grounds are also included on the Hampshire County Council's register of Historic Parks and Gardens (No 1550).</p> <p>There is a Scheduled Monument (Saxon Cemetery) in the woodland area to the west of the Site.</p> <p>In the 18th century, Worthy Park belonged to William Evelyn who constructed a mansion in 1722. The Worthy Park estate passed to Kingston's second wife Isabella, whose son by a previous marriage, Sir Chaloner Ogle, inherited in 1761.</p> <p>Sir Charles Ogle, grandson of Sir Chaloner Ogle constructed the present Worthy Park House in 1820 to a neo-classical design by Sir Robert Smirke. The layout of the property plot was redeveloped at this time. The west wing of the existing 1722 mansion was demolished and the new house built over its foundations (Butchart 1989). The existing rectangular plan building was retained and incorporated into 1820 house as the east wing and used as a service range. The stable block and stable yard wall were constructed at this time, also believed to be by Smirke.</p> <p>Ogle sold the Worthy Park Estate to Samuel Wall in 1825; it remained with his descendants (the Rivers, Fryer and Butchart families) until the late 1950s. During WWII it was used as the southern command headquarters for the Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers and accommodation for the Auxiliary Territorial Service.</p> <p>Following WWII, Worthy Park House was still owned by the Butchart family, although they did not live there. In the late 1950s it was sold to Currys Ltd and became their regional office and staff training centre. Currys left the property in 1985 and the house stood vacant for four years until T. S. Frobisher Ltd. bought it to use as a business centre. Prince's Mead School took over the Site in 1999 and continue to occupy the site.</p> <p>There is a statutory duty to have regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any special architectural or historic features that they possess.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) defines the setting of a heritage asset as:</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral. <p>Worthy Park House is listed Grade II* and its significance relates to both features of special architectural interest as well as historic interest relating to the design by Sir Robert Smirke. In addition, and of particular relevance to this issue under consideration, the setting adds to the overall significance of the listed building.</p> <p>Country houses defined their owners' relative social standing and the setting of a country house, in the landscape, was of considerable consequence. The site for an nineteenth century house was most particularly chosen for its potential views across parkland and where there might be some view of water or a water feature created.</p> <p>With respect to Worthy Park House, commentary in "Selected Illustrations of Hampshire" published in 1834 describes the importance of the southerly view from the house. 'Below the south front of the mansion winds the river Itchen, on the opposite banks of which rise beautiful eminences, partly covered with wood, beyond, are the more romantic downs.' The historical relationship between the house and the landscape should therefore not be underestimated.</p> <p>Worthy Park House, in its elevated position on the north side of the Itchen Valley gives it a commanding location over the valley. This relationship has not largely changed in character and appearance since the house was first built despite the changes to the use of the building and intervening development. The setting of Worthy Park House and its relationship to the landscape remains an essential part of the significance of the designated heritage asset.</p> <p>The setting of Worthy Park House, both in terms of views out from the house and its south facing grounds as well as views of the house from the surrounding area largely comprise the rolling downlands of the River Itchen valley.</p> <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House and the landscape setting for the Grade II* listed building are described more fully at paragraph 6.2 of the report by the terra firma Consultancy on the landscape and visual effects of the M3 J9 proposals:</p> <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House are on the southern facade, with all the rooms, including the key internal spaces, looking out over the landscape to the south across the top of the lower level Itchen Valley, much of which is hidden in the intervening woodland on the valley floor, along with the M3 corridor. The eye is drawn beyond to the open arable downland above the valley floor where the rolling nature is clearly visible in the views from Worthy</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Park House, accentuated by the presence of the characteristic valley, central to views, which give rises to a distinctive contouring of the landform. The presence of the valley is also accentuated by the patterns of the arable farming landscape with straight lines seemingly folding and curving around the contours of the landform.</p> <p>Despite the paucity of available information on the details of what is proposed for the possible northern deposition site, it is clear that the use of this site for the deposition of excess spoil would result in changes to this existing landscape, including potentially through the artificial infilling of a natural valley. This would seriously detract from the setting which has been present since the house was built in the early nineteenth century. The rolling downlands are an integral part of the landscape character of this local area and the proposed infilling of the valley and raising of the land would be an artificial intrusion in that natural landscape.</p> <p>The proposed northern site for deposition of soils would be directly visible from the main building as well as from the grounds to the south of the building and the interrelationship of the building with its natural setting would therefore be harmed.</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (May 2021) (PEIR) produced by Highways England recognises at Table 6-5 that Worthy Park House, as a Grade II* listed building has 'high' sensitivity in relation to the proposals, and this is agreed.</p> <p>However, the Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline report undertaken by Highways England suggests at paragraph 5.2.17 and repeated in the PEIR at paragraph 6.8.13 that the existing setting has already been compromised by the construction of the M3 and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. It is contended that the effects of these later developments are overstated. The dominance of the house within the Itchen Valley and the relationship between the house and its setting is very largely unaltered since the time it was built and commented upon by the first owner, Sir Charles Ogle.</p> <p>Although it has been necessary to make certain assumptions about the extent of changes arising were the northern deposition site to be progressed, the conclusion is reached that there would be material impact to and therefore potentially significant harm to the setting of Worthy Park House. Such harm therefore would require to be offset by public benefits, which it is argued should be considered in the context of public benefits arising from the proposed northern deposition site. However, given that the proposal would appear to result in an artificial raising of the land and / or filling in of a natural valley, and its return to agricultural use, it is difficult to envisage any potential opportunities for landscape and / or environmental enhancements.</p> <p>This is of even more concern, given that it is noted that other parties submitting representations to this consultation exercise have raised the possibility of other</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>areas of land for the deposition of excess soil, where there would be significant opportunities for landscape and environmental improvements.</p> <p>This report seeks to assess the potential impact of the works associated with the proposed northern site for the deposition of excess soils arising from the proposed works to J9 of the M3 on the setting and significance of Worthy Park House, a Grade II* listed building. Despite the serious shortcomings in the information available upon which the assessment necessarily has to be made, this report concludes that, on the understanding of the works envisaged, there would be significant harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* designated heritage asset of Worthy Park House.</p>		

K.2.Y Construction – spoil deposition areas

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	To avoid putting spare soil/material at a “central” location right next to a school as it would bring a lot of additional disturbance to the school children. The other two locations (northern and southern) look more remote.	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>Other points raised in these responses are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p>
Local community	<p>Sustainable practices are important and suggest renewable energies should power the project.</p> <p>Local community concerned about increased traffic through Winchester as people would exit M3 northbound at junction 11 or junction 10 to avoid roadworks and wanting to understand what measures will be in place.</p> <p>Concerned about the location of construction compounds and deposition areas being on national park land and suggested that any scheme using them as ‘dumping grounds during construction’ should be rejected.</p>	Y	
Local community	Better disposal of spoil than indicated at present and avoiding use of narrow lanes by construction traffic in the South Downs National Park.	Y	
Local community	<p>Paths designated as footpaths or cycle ways need to be wide enough to ensure a family with children and the cyclists can pass safely and far enough from the road to be pleasant. Unless cycling is a safe and attractive option people will not stop using cars even for quite short journeys and the planet is in disaster.</p> <p>The location of the deposition areas is key. The contractors must not be allowed to do whatever is cheapest as topsoil is valuable, chalk downland habitats are priceless and the river is almost unique in the world.</p>	Y	
Local community	There should a definite plan as to how significant new areas of chalk downland could be restored using the chalk spoil excavated during construction, rather than it being simply dumped at three sites within the National Park in the vague expectation that it could somehow be utilised later.	Y	
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure			

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	The replacement of hedgerows and care for some areas is encouraging. However, I am concerned about the apparent excess earth, where it will go and what impact this will have both on the landscape and the environment. The information presented is vague and I am not sure which or how many deposition areas there will be and how these will be dealt with.	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>Other points raised in these responses are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p>
Local community	Since the decision about where spoil is to be put and where the construction compounds are to be is not made I am not sure what my opinion is. Constructions compounds 3 and 4 seem particularly unsuitable.	Y	
Local community	<p>The proposals entirely miss an opportunity to repair and improve environmental impacts that resulted from the creation of the early 1990s, when internationally important chalk grassland and wetland habitats were destroyed and fragmented, and worse, it compounds these issues by destroying further land and increasing fragmentation.</p> <p>It is completely unacceptable to propose the compulsory purchase and destruction of parts of the Winnall Moors SSSI and SAC, as well as building on parts of the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The proposed use of spoil, in spreading this to a depth of 5m on arable field, with no habitat creation or chalk grassland reversion, misses the opportunity to bring net environmental gain from the project which could go some way to offsetting any damage.</p> <p>There are such obvious opportunities for environmental gain, from a green bridge to reconnect St Catherine's Hill with Twyford Down or at the existing footbridge across the M3 & A31 link to Fivefields way, extensive chalk grassland restoration using the spoil, to wetland improvements at the Southern Water Morestead Works site. The proposals show a lack of imagination and ambition that show that the primary motivation is 'doing the bare minimum to get away with it' rather than any desire to make true environmental gains.</p>	Y	
Local community	There does not appear to be anything planned to link the biodiversity areas nor how the soil movement will affect the areas from which it is taken. This is a missed opportunity bearing in mind it is the gateway to the SDNP.	Y	
Local community	Better consideration should be given to encouraging active travel, rather than just focussing on cars. Better consideration to where spoil is deposited.	Y	
Local community	It is insufficiently developed at this stage. The framework you are using may be okay in principle but at this stage it tells us little about what the real impacts will be. There remain too many unknowns, for instance the volume of excess soil to be disposed of.	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
D4. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D3 and any other views you have on our approach to reducing the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme			
Local community	Concerned in regards to the excess earth deposits.	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>Other points raised in these responses are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p>
Local community	Concerned about the construction impact of the works on biodiversity, such as “skylarks and yellow hammers, birds, butterflies and plants”, and the use of “good agricultural land” for the spoil deposition areas . I do not agree that the environmental impact of the Scheme is justified and believe the benefits do not outweigh the disadvantages. The landscape plans do not cover the whole area affected – for instance any plans for embankments or planting beside the M3 Highcliffe/ Petersfield Road, South Downs Way pedestrian bridge.	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the range of views expressed.</p> <p>Potential construction impacts to biodiversity are assessed within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). No significant effects are reported following the implementation of mitigation measures described in Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). Since statutory consultation, all three of the soil deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme and therefore drainage in this area will not be required. Site arisings are proposed to be used in the landscaping proposals through more sympathetic ground reprofiling.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) sets out the planning policy context and assesses the Scheme against policy requirements, including an assessment of the overall planning balance. The Applicant considers that the benefits of the Scheme significantly outweigh any harm predicted. As required by Section 104(7) of the Planning Act 2008, the benefits of the Scheme must be weighed against any adverse impacts identified in the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) demonstrates that any unavoidable adverse environmental effects which may remain following mitigation are outweighed by the public benefit that will accrue as a result of the Scheme and the Government’s commitment to upgrading the SRN. and, for the purposes of Section 104(7) of the Planning Act 2008, that any adverse impacts would not outweigh the benefits of the Scheme. The Scheme complies with the NPS NN and accords with all other relevant and important matters which need to be taken into consideration, including the adopted development plan for the local area and the NPPF.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>The Applicant has removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of these areas has resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced potential impacts on tranquillity (both visual and acoustic intrusion) within the South Downs National Park and results in the need to affect less 'best and most versatile' (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2) provides further details of the landscape proposals for the Scheme. Where necessary appropriate mitigation has been included for land within the Application Boundary.</p>
D6. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D5 and any other views you have on our landscape proposals and what we might plant on them			
Local community	Shouldn't be dumping soil in national park land!	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>Other points raised in these responses are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p>
Local community	Not enough information currently in the public domain to be able to agree or disagree with the landscape proposals. Do not agree to the use of spoil from the scheme to be infilled on land owned by Winchester College.	Y	
Local community	Further information is needed on the final proposals for cut and fill, the areas proposed for the deposition of surplus material, and the extent and details of proposed noise and other fencing and lighting.	Y	
Local community	Concerned about the location and method of disposal of spoil and the disruption to residents in the Long Walk and Fulling Mill area that will be caused by construction traffic.	Y	
Local community	Suggestions that should the Scheme be accepted the following measures should be strengthened: Can the impact on Winnall Moors be avoided altogether ? Can we have a 'green bridge' ? Can you reduce the number of 'spoil' sites ? Please don't put a spoil site next to the South Downs Way	Y	
Local community	Cannot support the proposals as the Applicant is unable to determine the quantity of excess spoil and still investigating options as to how and where spoil will be deposited.	Y	
F2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to F1 and any other views you have on our plans for how we deal with spare soil from our works.			
Local community	Several members of the local community suggested that the plans seemed "reasonable", "sensible" and has "no issues".		<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this</p>
Local community	Unsure about where the removal of topsoil would be going.	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	The plan and consultation is irrelevant as you have not worked out how much material has to be disposed of.	Y	<p>area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>Other points raised in these responses are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p>
Local community	No soil should be moved or deposited.	Y	
Local community	Depositing the soil locally is an idea I can get behind and the areas identified aren't terrible but there is no mention of other alternatives such as whether any could be put to valid use by other bodies, whether they could be used to fill in past works or scars on the landscape or used for other works in the locality.	Y	
Local community	Do not allow any dumping of soil that affect flooding in Winchester.	Y	
Local community	Many members of the community suggested that there shouldn't be any spare soil.	Y	
Local community	There would be no need to dispose of it if you didn't create it in the first place.	Y	
Local community	These strike me as insufficiently developed at this stage. On the one hand you say that you do not yet know how much excess soil you may have to deal with but on the other talk about up to four metres of excess soil spread over the locations you have identified. Four metres would make a significant adverse impact on the visual landscape especially at the southern location but also at the northern location. For interested parties to be able to assess the potential impact you need to provide better visuals.	Y	
Local community	We do not agree to all of the spare soil from the works being deposited on to land owned by Winchester College or the land infilled. We have not yet been provided with detailed information on where all of this spare soil will go and how much there will be which will need accommodating somewhere.	Y	
Local community	Keep it local is good.	Y	
Local community	Unsure about returning extra soil to South Downs and the reasoning. Is that area already used for agriculture? Is the soil close enough to being a similar mix? Or will it be wetland soil put on chalk downs - which will have an influence???	Y	
Local community	Totally unnecessary if changes are abandoned.	Y	
Local community	Its got to go somewhere.	Y	
Local community	What are the plans for reseeded/ integrating the spare soil into its dumped location(s)?	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	I believe you will act responsibly.	Y	
Local community	Leave the soil be, its taken thousands of years to develop.	Y	
Local community	You have managed to make a mountain out of a mole hill rather than look for the elegant solution you have increased the project by enormous proportions to a monstrosity	Y	
Local community	Final details of the proposals are needed, to enable comments to be made. The current level of information is not firm or final enough for a clear position to be reached - they are still subject to change.	Y	
Local community	If the scheme goes ahead, the disruption will be huge and the soils has to go somewhere.	Y	
Local community	Can you reduce the number of 'spoil' sites? Please don't put a spoil site next to the South Downs Way - I think that's the Southern one next to Chilcomb sports ground.	Y	
Local community	Your plans are not finalised so I can't have an opinion.	Y	
Local community	It is what you have to do to achieve the scheme and involves only a temporary loss of land use.	Y	
Local community	Please do not use the location identified for the Northern spoil dump. I am concerned about the amount of construction traffic that may use the lower end of Long Walk to access Northern Spoil Dump. Long Walk is narrow and steep and unsuitable for heavy traffic. Using this route will also have an impact on Footpaths 20 and 21, and Restricted Byway 19. Preferred locations for spoil dump would be Central or Southern. Would there be scope for further infill in the field adjacent to the new path from Easton Lane to Long Walk, or an increase in the size of the bund?	Y	
F4: Please let us know the reasons for your response to question F3 and any other views about the locations we've identified			
Local community	Of the locations proposed for the spare soil, the "central" location is right next to a school. To avoid unnecessary extra disruption to the pupils, it would be better for extra soil to be dumped in the more remote locations north and south of the site.	Y	Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs
Local community	The central area feels appropriate both logistically and to minimise overall impact.	Y	
Local community	None, seems sensible.	Y	
Local community	No issues	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	It makes sense to re-use any spoil from the works locally.	Y	National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. Other points raised in these responses are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.
Local community	Not local enough to identify any preference and I don't know what these areas are used for presently.	Y	
Local community	The whole thing is not needed.	Y	
Local community	I don't have strong feelings on this subject but the northern area would appear to be the best..	Y	
Local community	Misses the point.	Y	
Local community	Totally unnecessary if changes are abandoned.	Y	
Local community	What are the plans for reseeded/ integrating the spare soil into its dumped location(s)?	Y	
Local community	I believe you will act responsibly to remove the soil, you are in the public eye.	Y	
Local community	<p>If more chalk is to be excavated during construction than can be used in embankments and other changes of level in the redesigned junction, then clearly the excess needs to be put somewhere and preferably not too far from the areas of excavation.</p> <p>Three potential sites for disposal of excess excavated materials are identified: - Northern - Central - Southern.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that attractive natural landforms created over thousands of years should be significantly remodelled just to accommodate spare chalk. That said, the Northern and Central sites ARE acceptable to me as disposal sites since they do not form areas of particular scenic value, and disposing of spare chalk in them would be unlikely to significantly alter the overall appearance of those locations.</p> <p>The proposed Southern Spare Soil Area is a very different case, and I strongly object to this area of Chilcomb being used to dispose of excess chalk. The Chilcomb valley, before being incorporated into the South Downs National Park, was previously designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and occupies a denuded anticline geological feature visible from large parts of Winchester. Chilcomb possesses significant scenic value in the context of Winchester's setting.</p> <p>The Southern site within Chilcomb occupies what is effectively a natural gully</p>	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>deepened by erosion in the ice ages. Together with the adjacent Magdalen Hill Down, this gully forms part of a locally significant scarp slope downland feature. Using this Southern area to dispose of spare excavated chalk would reduce the overall height differential between the top and bottom of the Magdalen Hill Down scarp slope, and so have a significant detrimental effect on the appearance of the local landscape.</p> <p>Magdalen Hill Down which directly overlooks the Southern site is a nature reserve crossed by well-used public rights of way and is designated as Open Access land much used by the local population and visitors. These factors mean the visual impact of altering the landscape by dumping excess chalk in the Southern site would be much greater than in the Northern and Central sites.</p> <p>This part of the Winchester landscape has already been greatly modified by major road-building schemes over the last century. Further detrimental changes to the landscape in the Southern area just to dispose of excess chalk should be avoided at all costs.</p>		
Local community	Having to move enormous amounts of soil caused by this seems ridiculous	Y	
Local community	You have yet to identify the areas except in a very loose sense.	Y	
Local community	<p>Northern Area: Very serious local concern. Central Area: Serious concern but not as strong as Northern Area. Southern Area: Outside Itchen Valley Civil Parish.</p>	Y	
Local community	I am not closely acquainted with the areas	Y	
Local community	If you can't use the chalk and spoils, it had to go somewhere.	Y	
General commentary			
Local community	<p>The plans for the improvement look better, there are a few things that could further improve it. Could the proposed walking route between Junction 9 and Kings Worthy be a mixed use path to allow access for bikes as well, there are very few cycle routes into Kings Worthy that avoid busy roads, especially for kids.</p> <p>The other would be to make beneficial user of the soil and to use this to create a mountain bike or BMX pump track in the central or Southern spoil locations. This could then be a benefit to the community after the works and would be good for encouraging kids and others to cycle the South downs way. This would be accessible from the national cycle way too.</p>	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>It isn't very clear from the plans where access to the north bound M3 from the Easton Lane is, presumably this is from the A33 route?</p>		<p>National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. Other points raised in these responses are discussed elsewhere in this Appendix.</p>
Local community	<p>The Winchester Movement strategy work suggests that improvements to the capacity of and flow through this junction will have a positive impact on the city's traffic issues, air pollution, carbon footprint etc. I remain unconvinced, because in many cases, the issues are caused by accidents on the M3 or A34 outside the proposed plan area. I do not see any data in the consultation report to show expected movements, % of non polluting vehicles by 2035, etc in the papers. This leads to build up of traffic which is avoided by going through Winchester instead. Unless these plans reduce accidents on the feeder trunk roads (the M3 and A34,) the traffic build ups will still occur, all too often as traffic levels are returning to pre pandemic levels.</p> <p>These are my specific points for your consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The layout is better for local people using the A33 who were worried about crossing heavy traffic, but it now means that all local users will have to use the new junction every time (which wasn't the case in the previous design). This may lead to congestion so it has not served our needs as well as we would hope. The north exit from the A33 on to the M3 north brings faster traffic movements closer to the communities that I represent- hence potentially noisier, which is unacceptable. • The positioning of the soil deposits has been done to suit HE/landowners. It is a missed opportunity to mitigate the noise of the road in operation all along the route from south to north. (see also point 12) Princes Mead has concerns about the setting of the listed building too. There is no assessment of flood risk when these soil heaps are in place. • The omission of the cycle route to Kings Worthy when it was so clearly described in the first proposal is a failure in this design. It is a need that is clearly described in the WCC/HCC Infrastructure Funding Statement (previously the R123 list) which I have already sent to the design/project team. I believe it is a duty to consider the needs of Non Motorised Users to be taken into account in any NSIP scheme, so this omission is disappointing. • The lack of traffic lights may be ok initially, but inevitably, there will be a need to control traffic flows in years ahead. Please include electricity schemes to enable traffic lights to be fitted later. • Failure to show signage and gantries in the scheme means that we cannot tell what views these will present to local people, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area. Already, the traffic lights of the junction can be seen from miles away in my division, both in WCC and SDNPA planning area, and 	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>cross motorway gantries can be viewed from Martyr Worthy in the national park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this country is to embrace walking and cycling for local commuting use, then the 3m wide cycle routes are inadequate to pass and should be wider. This includes actually on the roundabout where at one point, the walk/cycle way is alongside the main road. The Winnall area will continue to provide employment opportunities as well as retail etc. Other larger lorries go into the city from this junction. The paths created should not be shared for walkers and cyclists on planned bridleway that connect and to the NCN 23 where cyclists can be riding faster than is safe for walkers sharing the same surface (all should be at least to LTN1/20). • Impact on Cart and Horses junction traffic going onto the A33 from the B3047 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The design has no traffic breaks in traffic moving north on the A33 from Junction 9. Currently, there are traffic breaks (traffic lights create this) which create gaps in traffic to allow people to exit from the Cart and Horses junction, allowing it to function. This is particularly important at peak times when traffic entering and leaving Winchester is heavy on both routes. The new arrangement may create congestion, reduce safety and even more confusion at this junction. (It is also an opportunity to improve the gateway into the National Park at this point.) ○ The road layout of the A33 is changing, with one lane in each direction, and a bike lane coming into/through the junction. Currently there are sections of two lanes for filtering etc. These changes will impact on the junction itself which will need redesign to ensure it is safe, congestion doesn't occur and ideally actually improves for traffic going south (Morning Basingstoke traffic into Winchester), and Worthys /Winchester traffic going north and south at all times of day, but particularly at peak times, and traffic from the B3047 east going north. • The project statement states that one aim is to reduce Spitfire Link congestion, which severely impacts drivers there. There is no evidence in the project plan that the team have provided that shows how the new design will reduce congestion. At present, large traffic accelerates from a stop slower than smaller vehicles which results in no gaps for Spitfire Link traffic. There is no evidence provided that this will improve, because although much of the heavy traffic will be on the through road, not all of it will take that route; daytime traffic in particular, includes a considerable amount of large and small vehicles into Winnall. • The levels on the project plans are difficult to follow, and I asked HCC to seek more traffic data, and full levels plan to see the implications for views, noise, pollutants fall out. • The drive through video is poor, and difficult to follow : I requested an improved version but was told this was impossible. 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a considerable amount of biodiversity work to be considered: which includes interconnectivity between areas being 'managed' for biodiversity. I am leaving this to the experts at WCC, HCC and to SDNPA, but I do have concerns about the long term management of the water areas, set within the road system. • The DEFRA 2016 noise map showed that improvement to noise mitigation were desirable at points through Winchester and for the A34 at the Headbourne Worthy site. A noise reference along Willis Waye is included in your scheme. Anything worse, even by a slight margin would be unacceptable in planning terms 'for the enjoyment of the property' and other properties affected in this way. Since Willis Waye was built, a considerable number of properties have been built in this area, alongside the A34 margins and I am seeking noise defence for these residents. Original tree planting is unsatisfactory: acoustic fencing is necessary here to mitigate noise. • I must also express my regret that an 'open air' event wasn't organised for this consultation. With many other events taking place, this was a missed opportunity to engage the public face to face. 		
Local community	<p>We welcome the modifications to the original proposals which redesign the roads giving access to the valley to join the B3047. The creation of a new footpath between Church Lane, Easton, and Easton Lane at Junction 9 and the redesign of the national cycleway crossing there are also welcome. The cycleway is also a footpath and <u>pedestrians should have a stepped route short-cutting the graded cycling loop through the roundabout area.</u></p> <p><u>We are concerned by the proposal to export waste soil from the development area into the valley. Insufficient information has been provided at this stage about the need for this or the form it would take, the duration of soil storage, the controls intended to avoid adversely affecting local hydrology, water quality, flora and fauna. One of the proposed sites is a large area of the side of Easton Down above the Itchen. There is no indication in the consultation document of the likelihood that this site or either of the other two, or whether all three of the large areas identified will be used. That said, the side of Easton Down is not, in our view, a suitable soil storage area due to the direct impact-pathway to the River Itchen. <u>We feel there is not sufficient information for us to adequately feedback on this matter fully. We would welcome further engagement before the DCO application is submitted, in sufficient time that our views may be given regard within the scheme proposals.</u></u></p> <p>At this stage we would emphasise the sensitivity of these sites within the National Park, and their visibility from footpaths and viewing points. We question the need to export soil waste at all instead of identifying sites in the part of the valley already compromised by dense highway development. For the short term we point out that during any disposal works the noise and disruption may be</p>	Y	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>unacceptable to people living in Abbots Worthy and Easton as well as the pupils and staff at the two local schools potentially affected. <u>In particular we seek assurance that any transport of waste will take place on routes directly between the works and any disposal sites and will not use the narrow local road network.</u></p> <p>For the longer term there are indications in the consultation material that waste several metres in depth may be deposited and we object to any landscaping which detracts from the appearance of the rolling landscape or which risks depositing soil in the river Itchen and its tributaries.</p> <p>Ironically the disturbed chalkland around the M3 and Junction 9 are particularly diverse in plants and shrubs when compared to the farmed land around them and <u>we encourage you to manage the works in a way that will recreate and enhance this diversity after completion.</u> As a Society we applaud local efforts to maintain wild verges throughout the Itchen valley. Long established local programmes such as the excellent Wild Valley Verges promote the establishment of low nutrient wildflower verges through initial seeding and altered maintenance. Highways England have also taken similar approaches, for example the Weymouth Relief Road in Dorset, where established wildflower swathes reportedly require little to no maintenance cutting and provide an incredible visual display and great biodiversity net gain for pollinators and insectivores. A similar approach to the legacy landscaping around the M3 Junction 9 restoration post-construction would fit with local landscape character and be very welcome. <u>Planting around the proposed new ponds should similarly reflect their downland setting.</u></p>		
South Downs Network	<p>Objection</p> <p>The South Downs Network objects to the proposed M3 Junction 9 Development in its present form.</p> <p>Executive Summary: Move over to Sustainable Transport</p> <p>We respectfully suggest that this £180+ million road scheme should be referred back to be replaced by a sustainable transport version that will help us meet our climate change commitments, providing better bus services, bus and rail infrastructure, integrated green cycle and walking routes, safe crossing for active travel, green (car free) bridges, safer paths for access to schools and access to rail stations.</p> <p>Secretary of State for Transport guidance</p> <p>We would take this opportunity to remind Highways England of the words used by the Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps when launching the Government's 'Decarbonising Transport: Setting the Challenge,' said in the</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges South Downs Network's objection to the Scheme. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to spoil:</i></p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>foreword that: “public transport and active travel will be the natural first choice for our daily activities” and that “We will use our cars less and be able to rely on a convenient, cost-effective and coherent public transport network”.</p> <p>More roads - more traffic</p> <p>More roads equals more traffic - when a new road is built, new traffic will divert onto it. Many people may make new trips they would not otherwise make just because of new roads. This well-known and long-established effect is known as 'induced traffic'</p> <p>Increase of emissions and global warming gases</p> <p>The Highways England proposal will increase CO2 emissions by attracting more cars onto the roads! Highways England's own report admits a significant increase in carbon emissions as a result of the project - some 534,628 tonnes of CO2 for user emissions. This doesn't include the emissions from the construction which doesn't seem to be reported on.</p> <p>How are we going to meet the Government’s commitment to net zero emissions in less than 30 years with road schemes like this? Highways England say the project will be completed in 2026 so the timeline is even shorter at less than 25 years to achieve net zero! Wouldn't it be better to cancel the project and spend the £180 million on sustainable transport solutions?</p> <p>In 2020 transport accounted for 29.8% of all CO2 emissions. The majority is from road transport! How can Highways England advance a road scheme that will actively increase CO2 emissions?</p> <p>It is likely that there will still be 40 million petrol and diesel cars and vans on the roads in 2030 plus diesel HGVs!</p> <p>The UK's new climate target to cut our emissions by 78% by 2035 was passed into law in June 2021 - the Highways England plan is out of step with this. The proposal does not include a landscape strategy. Road developments are not excluded from the UK’s legally adopted climate commitment. The UK Government has a commitment to tackle climate change.</p> <p>Nature</p> <p>Overall, the current proposals are shockingly weak when it comes to mitigating and restoring the ecological damage done by this scheme.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation Design Plan</p>		<p>National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>We are concerned that this design plan consists of just one page! We are concerned that there is no landscape strategy or detailed plan. The Mitigation Design Plan contains simply focuses solely on on-site enhancements. Taking into account the historical severance of the ecological network and landscape, we urge Highways England to right the historical wrongs and make this scheme an exemplar of environmental mitigation and biodiversity net gain. As part of this, we would like to see large scale habitat creation and the restoration of woodland, trees and hedgerows in surrounding areas, helping to improve air quality. This should be both onsite and off-site to make amends for the historic damage done. The development of the M3 has led to a chain of compounding damage and development, forcing wildlife into smaller and smaller pockets. We want Highways England to look beyond mitigation, to compensate for the legacy of damage.</p> <p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</p> <p>Whilst the actual road design plan seems to be very firm there seems to be a lack of commitment by Highways England to the environment, an EIA and a landscape and biodiversity/habitats plan. Words such as 'ongoing' and "is being developed" keep cropping up. One gets the impression that the natural world is not important to Highways England.</p> <p>We are concerned that Highways England seemed to be avoiding a commitment to the production of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). In Para 1.5.4 of the PEIR Highways England says "It should be noted that at this stage the information is preliminary. An iterative process of scheme development and EIA is ongoing". Surely a draft EIA should be available for public consultation now, and not be delayed until the DCO application? Indeed there seems to be a fudging of the commitment even at that stage to the production of an EIA. Highways England says "The final EIA work will be reported in the ES."</p> <p>Indeed further fudging of commitment to environmental assessment is contained in the response to Natural England's submission of 9 November 2020. They highlighted that the impact of emissions to designated ecological sites is required. Highways England response was "Ongoing EIA work will include the assessment of the impacts of emissions from traffic on designated habitats."</p> <p>Avoiding say yes to Natural England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England said "The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies." Highways England said "ongoing EIA work is to be reported." Natural England said they would welcome the opportunity to comment on the landscape, biodiversity and access enhancement plan. Highways 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>England responded “A biodiversity and landscaping mitigation package is being developed.” But when?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England advised that “the potential impact of the proposal upon features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for habitat creation/enhancement should be included within this assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance on such matters.” Highways England responded “The Biodiversity chapter of the ES will identify all potential impacts on identified biodiversity features” Further fudging.” <p>SDNPA Nature Investment Areas</p> <p>The road site is where the South Downs National Park has identified one of its 12 nature investment areas. These nature recovery areas are part of a hub of an interconnected ‘nature network.’ The Highways England intrusion flies in the face of nature recovery and will destroy and fragment important protected habitats. This scheme affects the local nature reserve which is home to rare and notable wildlife, and a SSSI site.</p> <p>Previous environmental damage</p> <p>The creation of the M3 in the early 1990s cut through Twyford Down, creating a lasting scar on the landscape through one of the most protected habitats in Southern England. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust’s nature reserve at St Catherine’s Hill was compromised, vital wildlife corridors were severed and the construction damaged two Sites of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), two scheduled ancient monuments and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The damage has never been adequately addressed and is now at risk of being compounded since these preferred proposals for the new Junction 9 plans would see yet more important space for wildlife lost. These plans would cut through parts of the South Downs National Park and destroy irreplaceable habitats for wildlife and further degrade the wildlife corridors locally. "</p> <p>SSSI and Special Area of Conservation</p> <p>In addition, the plans to potentially compulsory purchase a strip of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, a Site of Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), are completely inappropriate. Winnall Moors is a vital wildlife-rich sanctuary for wildlife in the heart of Winchester city. The current proposals would cut connectivity between the nature reserve and the wider ecological network.</p> <p>Government Environmental Policy</p> <p>Highways England need to take on board Government policy on the environment:</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government's Final Report of the Independent Review on the Economics of Biodiversity led by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta. Amongst other things he says “Human demands on nature must be curbed • We say - road building and development cannot come at the expense of the value and importance of our natural world. As the seminal government ‘Dasgupta Review’ says, ‘Nature is therefore an asset, just as produced capital (roads, buildings and factories).’ We should no longer tolerate the severed eco-system at Junction 9, preventing wildlife from growing, moving, and adapting to urbanisation pressures. • Also please bear in mind the Environment Bill is to be amended to extend the requirements of biodiversity net gain to include Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as this scheme. <p>Green Bridge</p> <p>We support the Hampshire and IoW Wildlife Trust’s proposal for a green bridge to the National Park which would reunite wildlife habitats that became disconnected by the 1990s M3 construction.</p> <p>We want to see a green bridge installed across the M3, reconnecting the people and wildlife of Winchester to the South Downs National Park and standing as a clear commitment to nature’s recovery despite modern transport development.</p> <p>Spoil</p> <p>The Highways England report says “We have not yet completed our junction design, so we do not know exactly how much material may need to be placed in these areas, or whether we will need all three areas”. Surely after at least two and a half years of preparation such civil engineering detail should be known? The amount of spoil will affect the landscape design. This should be known now; before Highways England applies for a Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>2019 consultation</p> <p>We have serious concerns about the previous stages of public consultations.</p> <p>Highways England says “There was a high level of support for the Proposed Scheme”. “We received 526 responses to our consultation”. Other than a few meaningless and valueless paragraphs the Public Consultation Summary Report does not provide any substantive information on exactly what those 526 respondents said. What organisations responded and what did they say? How many of the 526 comments were from individual members of the public. How</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>many were car, commercial and HGV vehicle owners/drivers? Did horse riding, walking and cycling groups respond? Indeed were they invited to respond?</p> <p>References are made to 'stakeholders.' It is understood they were invited to workshops to give their input. Exactly who were they? and how were they selected? We hope it wasn't a question of selecting the appropriate stakeholders so that it assisted in giving the right answer to suit Highways England.</p> <p>Walking and Cycling Proposals Plan</p> <p>We are concerned that there is little substance to walking and cycling provision. The plan just consists of one page. There seems to be very little reference to provision for horse riders.</p> <p>Walkers, cyclists and horse riders to be put in a 'subway'! Underground? Highways England say "On both sides of the motorway, the existing walking and cycling route links both parts of Easton Lane, which would descend to a subway route provided beneath the gyratory roundabout. Existing provision for horse-riders will be improved with a widened 3m route, which includes mounting blocks provided either side of the eastern subway..."</p> <p>This is unacceptable. This proposal is fraught with all sorts of problems. Who is going to police the subway to ensure the safety of users? Who will maintain it and how will it be lit? Will there be security cameras? Will there be traffic separation to ensure safety of different users such as horse riders and cyclists?</p> <p>Instead of hiding these active travel users away below ground highways England should provide a green bridge out in the fresh air above the pollution from the motorway style road.</p> <p>In any event Highways England should ensure that cycle provision is compliant with Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20 Published last year by the Government.</p> <p>Highways England must take account of latest Government policy</p> <p>The business case for this project should be rewritten taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Gov policy paper - A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment (pub Jan 2018) • DfT's policy paper - Decarbonising transport: setting the challenge (pub March 2020) • UK Gov policy paper: Gear change: a bold vision for cycling and walking • UK Gov policy paper: Bus Back Better: national bus strategy for England 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Upper Itchen Valley Society	<p>We welcome the modifications to the original proposals which redesign the roads giving access to the valley to join the B3047. The creation of a new footpath between Church Lane, Easton, and Easton Lane at Junction 9 and the redesign of the national cycleway crossing there are also welcome. The cycleway is also a footpath and <u>pedestrians should have a stepped route short-cutting the graded cycling loop through the roundabout area.</u></p> <p>We are concerned by the proposal to export waste soil from the development area into the valley. Insufficient information has been provided at this stage about the need for this or the form it would take, the duration of soil storage, the controls intended to avoid adversely affecting local hydrology, water quality, flora and fauna. One of the proposed sites is a large area of the side of Easton Down above the Itchen. There is no indication in the consultation document of the likelihood that this site or either of the other two, or whether all three of the large areas identified will be used. That said, the side of Easton Down is not, in our view, a suitable soil storage area due to the direct impact-pathway to the River Itchen. <u>We feel there is not sufficient information for us to adequately feedback on this matter fully. We would welcome further engagement before the DCO application is submitted, in sufficient time that our views may be given regard within the scheme proposals.</u></p> <p>At this stage we would emphasise the sensitivity of these sites within the National Park, and their visibility from footpaths and viewing points. We question the need to export soil waste at all instead of identifying sites in the part of the valley already compromised by dense highway development. For the short term we point out that during any disposal works the noise and disruption may be unacceptable to people living in Abbots Worthy and Easton as well as the pupils and staff at the two local schools potentially affected. <u>In particular we seek assurance that any transport of waste will take place on routes directly between the works and any disposal sites and will not use the narrow local road network.</u></p> <p>For the longer term there are indications in the consultation material that waste several metres in depth may be deposited and we object to any landscaping which detracts from the appearance of the rolling landscape or which risks depositing soil in the river Itchen and its tributaries.</p> <p><u>Ironically the disturbed chalkland around the M3 and Junction 9 are particularly diverse in plants and shrubs when compared to the farmed land around them and we encourage you to manage the works in a way that will recreate and enhance this diversity after completion.</u> As a Society we applaud local efforts to</p>	Y	<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>maintain wild verges throughout the Itchen valley. Long established local programmes such as the excellent Wild Valley Verges promote the establishment of low nutrient wildflower verges through initial seeding and altered maintenance. Highways England have also taken similar approaches, for example the Weymouth Relief Road in Dorset, where established wildflower swathes reportedly require little to no maintenance cutting and provide an incredible visual display and great biodiversity net gain for pollinators and insectivores. A similar approach to the legacy landscaping around the M3 Junction 9 restoration post-construction would fit with local landscape character and be very welcome. <u>Planting around the proposed new ponds should similarly reflect their downland setting.</u></p>		
Local community	<p>Letter setting out basis of the representation:</p> <p>These representations are submitted in specific response to one element of the proposed works at Junction 9 of the M3, notably the proposed areas of land identified as potential deposition sites for surplus soil from the works.</p> <p>The OBJECTION in the strongest terms is submitted on four principal grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Process and Procedure b) Landscape Impact c) Heritage Impact d) Access Implications <p>The order of the objections should not be regarded as conveying any order of significance to the objections being raised.</p> <p>a) Process and Procedure</p> <p>Despite the stated intention by Highways England that this is the final round of consultation prior to the submission of the formal application to government, it is our understanding that this is the first consultation that any consideration has been given to the important issue of how to deal with surplus soil generated from the works. This is clearly a critical matter that should have been addressed much earlier in the development of the scheme.</p> <p>Even at this stage, the proposals for the deposition of surplus soil are extremely vague and lacking in any detail. All that can be gleaned from the available consultation material is that three potential sites have been identified and that the land levels may be increased by 4m at two of them, with no detail of intent for the third northern site. However, if the 4m increase represents the envisaged level of excess soil requiring deposition, it would seem plausible that a similar amount of deposition may be envisaged for the northern site, potentially leading to an infilling of the natural valley. It is also not yet known whether 1, 2 or 3 of these sites might be required; the actual landfill requirements; the proposed profiles of the land after deposition and future uses apart from a vague indication of returning to agriculture.</p>	Y	<p>The objection to the principle of the Scheme is noted. Please refer to the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1) and National Networks National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2) which set out the need case for the Scheme and how the Scheme complies with national and local policy.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to deposition areas:</i></p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, all three deposition areas have been removed for the Scheme. In re-profiling the landform between Easton Lane and Long Walk, in response to South Downs National Park Authority and Natural England’s comments, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition. The removal of these areas resulted in a reduction to the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park and the need to affect a smaller area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p>As a highly sensitive building the potential impacts upon Princes Mead School have been fully considered within Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). No significant impacts have been identified. A programme of archaeological investigation to inform the baseline consisting of geophysical surveys and trial trenching was carried out to inform the assessment and no remains associated with the Morn Hill camp have been identified within the Application Boundary.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to walkers, cyclists and horse-riders:</i></p> <p>The effects on existing PRoWs during construction are outlined in Chapter 12 (Population and Human health) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The impacts of the construction of the Scheme on these routes are considered.</p> <p>The Applicant has also submitted an outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) as part of its DCO application. The Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) provides details of how the construction works will be phased and how the proposed temporary traffic management measure, including closures and diversions, will be implemented for each phase. The traffic impacts of</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>There is therefore no basis upon which the impact can be properly assessed and therefore a considered response made and submitted.</p> <p>There is also no understanding of how these sites have been selected; this should be compared with the earlier consultation versions on alternative options for the junction works themselves. It is assumed, but it is not clear, that a range of potential sites have been considered and analysed. It is also hoped that discussions have been held with local authorities and organisations who have a detailed knowledge of the local area and would most probably be able to identify potential sites for soil deposition and subsequent enhancement works.</p> <p>Whilst we understand that the process can be ongoing from now onwards, up to and during the application process, there is limited opportunity for individual landowners, local residents and organisations to be directly involved, notwithstanding that they will be directly affected by the proposals.</p> <p>An OBJECTION must therefore be raised to the unfair and unsound process and it is requested that the opportunity be provided for a further round of consultation when the proposals for the deposition of surplus soil have been properly addressed and refined, taking into account the representations received from this stage of consultation.</p> <p>The following objections are therefore necessarily based on the limited information available and apply directly to the proposed northern area identified as a potential site for soil deposition. This site actually has the most limited information available; the flythrough of the scheme touches upon the central and southern sites but does not even refer to the northern site. The potential for the northern site is really only picked up from the site plans showing areas of land, which appear largely unrelated to the actual existing landforms.</p> <p>b) Landscape Impact</p> <p>Please refer to the attached assessment undertaken by the terra firma Consultancy Ltd. Terra firma are a well-respected firm of landscape architects advising on a local and national basis and who have advised the Trust on a number of projects over many years.</p> <p>The report concludes that there is the potential for significant harm on landscape character of and visual amenity within the SDNP, as well as on the setting of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>c) Heritage Impact</p> <p>Please refer to attached Heritage Impact Assessment from LJE Planning Ltd. This concludes the potential for significant harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* designated heritage asset of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>d) Access Considerations</p>		<p>the Construction Traffic Management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.13).</p> <p>Due to the removal of the deposition areas, the existing walking, cycling and horse-riding routes within the vicinity of the Scheme would not be affected.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to cultural heritage:</i></p> <p>Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (comprising archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). The assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies outlined within the DMRB LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (National Highways, 2020) and the DMRB LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (National Highways, 2020) and agreed with key heritage stakeholders.</p> <p>It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to Worthy Park House:</i></p> <p>Worthy Park House is recognised as a designated built heritage asset in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). An assessment of the impact on this receptor is provided in the chapter. It has been shown in Chapter 6 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment from the construction or operation of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures, such as the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy. An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy has been prepared as part of the DCO application documents and is contained within Appendix 6.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3). The final mitigation strategy would be secured as requirements of the DCO.</p> <p>Specifically, a very small part of the area between the A34 and M3 is visible in long distance views from the listed building and overall, it is considered that construction activities are unlikely to be visually or audibly noticeable from the listed building and the current character experienced from the listed building would be retained. Therefore, the impact of magnitude would be negligible to Worthy Park House, resulting in a temporary slight adverse effect which is not significant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the LVIA concludes that the construction phase will have a slight effect that is also not significant on Worthy Park House during construction. By summer year 15, there will be no change of effect on Worthy Park House. See Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) for further details.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The northernmost site is within an existing agricultural field with very limited access. Existing access to the site is via narrow country lanes, most of which have to go through the very attractive and historic village of Easton. These existing routes cannot be contemplated as any means of access to the northern site.</p> <p>Looking at the plans that have been submitted it can only be deduced that the intention would be to create a new haul route parallel to the south side of the M3. This is not shown on any of the plans; only the final environmental improvements along this land. Its potential use as a haul route would need its own environmental assessment given the proximity to the River Itchen SSSI and there is no indication that such work has been undertaken. Noise, contamination and air quality issues in such a sensitive environment must also be considered.</p> <p>On the basis of the access limitations and considerations which would apply to the introduction of a new haul route, the access to this northern identified site would seem unrealistic and impractical.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>Significant OBJECTION must necessarily be raised to the proposals in so far as they relate to the deposition of excess soil as a result of the J9 changes. There is just insufficient information available to enable a proper assessment to be made of potential impacts, which is a major objection in itself to the process and procedures.</p> <p>However, and even on the limited information available, there would be significant landscape, heritage and access impact issues arising from the proposed use of the northern site. These are sufficient that this site should not be progressed any further as a potential soil deposition site. The site would be returned to agricultural use but leaving an irreversible impact on landscape and heritage which could and would not be mitigated by environmental measures.</p> <p>The enhancements along the line of the haul road, if indeed this is the intended means of access cannot be construed to be enhancements as they would appear to being promoted generally as part of the overall enhancement works and not specific to the deposition of soil at the northern site.</p> <p>There may be other sites (and not necessarily the other two identified sites) which would be much better suited with less adverse impacts and where there could be environmental benefits to be secured. It is understood that other objectors, including the South Downs National Park Authority have recommended other sites for consideration, where tangible and long lasting enhancements can be achieved.</p> <p>It is very much hoped that the next stages of the process will not only take account of these objections but also find a way to involve all those parties, including individual residents and landowners who will be directly impacted by these proposals.</p>		<p><i>Response in relation to landscape and visual:</i></p> <p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) considers the potential impacts during the construction and operation of the Scheme on landscape and visual amenity and likely significant effects following implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>At the foremost the Scheme proposals look to avoid impacts and the Scheme retains as much existing vegetation as possible, with landscape mitigation measures including extensive areas of native woodland planting, linear planting, roadside tree planting, species rich grass verges, and areas of chalk grasslands creation (which all complement biodiversity and respond to the key characteristics of the landscape in which the Scheme is located). There is substantial green infrastructure proposed within the Scheme, as shown on Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2), which would create multi-functional habitat corridors across the Scheme and would link to the wider landscape.</p> <p>The Scheme also includes re-profiling of existing landform to create sympathetic features and reinforce existing characteristics and aid visual screening together with improving the network of public rights of way and new walking, cycling and horse-riding routes). These mitigation measures are presented in detail in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) (see Appendix 7.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)) has been included as part of the application to deliver any mitigation required. This describes the proposed outline management and monitoring of the landscape and ecological mitigation elements with detail of the objectives, and success criteria for the establishment to achieve its environmental function. This would be updated into a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) during detail design and would include further detail on the long-term management.</p> <p><i>Response in relation Landscape Character Areas:</i></p> <p>Landscape Character Areas considered in the study area for the Scheme are outlined in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1). The Scheme and study area lies within three of the landscape character areas (LCAs) identified in the <i>South Downs Landscape Character Assessment (South Downs National Park Authority, 2020)</i>. These are LCA A5, LCA F5, LCA G5. The study area, as described in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1), extends up to 3km from the Application Boundary, has been informed through consultation with stakeholders, visibility analysis and site survey. The published national, county and local character areas within the study area are shown on Figure 7.3.1 (Landscape Character Areas) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p><i>Response in relation to viewpoints:</i></p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Summary of report on Landscape Impact:</p> <p>The element of the proposals that is covered by this report is the deposition of spoil, in particular to the potential northern site as identified on the extract below from the 'Indicative Land Uses' plan. The PEIR states at section 7.7.2 that 'The landscape of the areas of search for potential excess spoil management is defined by undulating arable farmland bounded by hedgerows and hedgerow trees. These areas of search for potential excess spoil management lie within the boundary of the SDNP' and at 7.7.6 that 'post construction the 'landscape east of the M3 within the SDNP would continue to exist as arable farmland with associated crop and land management changes.'</p> <p>PEIR states at 2.4.42 that 'The construction process would re-use excavated materials as fill (where possible) to reduce the number of construction vehicles travelling on the network.'</p> <p>There are three areas being considered for spoil deposition from the construction works. Our response concerns the northern area.</p> <p>The potential extent of the northern spoil deposition site is included within the Indicative Application Boundary on the proposals plans. However there is limited further information; on viewing the flythrough of the scheme it is clear that, whilst this covers the central and southern spoil deposition sites and a raising of levels by approximately 4m to accommodate spoil, it does not refer to the northern site.</p> <p>The northern boundary line of the site runs immediately adjacent to the bridleway that links the western edges of Easton village with the subway below the M3 linking through to the Itchen Way and the Itchen Valley to the west of the M3.</p> <p>The site lies across a dry valley on the side of the downland, with the northern extent set at between approx. 50m AOD at the north-west corner rising to approx. 60m AOD at the north-east corner. The southern boundary at set at approx. 70m AOD at the south-west corner, dropping down to approx 66m AOD before rising up again to 80m to the south-east boundary.</p> <p>Worthy Park House is listed Grade II* and its Coach House separately listed Grade II; its grounds are listed on the Hampshire Register of Gardens Parks and Landscapes of Historic Interest.</p> <p>The site is located to the east of Abbots Worthy between the A33 and the M3 road corridors. The buildings, which include Worthy Park House, are set to the north of the B3047 beyond intervening agricultural land and school playing fields. Vehicular access is from a private drive that runs from the B3047 I and also serves adjacent residential properties to the east of the site. To the west and north of the site lie areas of deciduous woodland, with the northern woodland within the ownership of our client. Sports pitches and courts are situated to the south and southwest of the school buildings.</p>		<p>View Locations are shown on Figure 7.4 (View Locations) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2). Baseline photographs (winter and summer) are presented on photo sheets at Figure 7.12 (Photosheets (Daytime Winter and Summer)) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>In Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) view location 23 is recorded to have a negligible adverse magnitude of effect during construction. This is due to the fact that the deposition areas have been removed from the Scheme and the Application Boundary has been revised to reflect this change.</p> <p><i>Points in relation to South Downs National Park and its special qualities:</i></p> <p>The overall design of the Scheme has been developed with the presence of the South Downs National Park and its setting in mind. The design has been developed in consultation with South Downs National Park Authority and seeks to avoid impacts through minimising the footprint and potential for direct impacts within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The Scheme design avoids introduction of tall bridge structures or elevated embankments and instead the Scheme is positioned within cutting with structures and associated headwalls set within the landform at as low an elevation as possible. Views of the Scheme from the designated landscape have been considered with the aim where possible to minimise any adverse effects.</p> <p>The proposed landscape strategy aims to reinforce and enhance (where appropriate) existing defined key characteristics of the receiving South Downs National Park landscape and its setting with reference to the defined Landscape Character Areas. The landscape proposals for the Scheme are presented in Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The earthworks strategy has evolved to minimise impacts on topography, positively respond to the characteristics of the landscape (including landscape pattern, features and perceived tranquillity) whilst providing a balance to material cut and fill. Sympathetically designed earthwork which reflect the existing landform provide opportunity to utilise site gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland a priority habitat which positively responds to the characteristics of the national designation.</p> <p>The creation of new scrub/woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment / cutting slopes aids visual screening of the Scheme. This approach strengthens the perception of the large open skies and distant panoramic views focusing views to the open rolling downland landscape of the South Downs National Park and away from the highway network.</p> <p>Further details of how the Scheme design responds to the special qualities of the South Downs National Park is presented in the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9).</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The site lies on ground falling towards the southern boundary with the B3047 on the north side of the River Itchen valley floor. The building is set at approximately 64m AOD, with the road set at approx 51m AOD. On a direct line between the House and the northern deposition site the Itchen Valley falls to a low point of approx 42m AOD.</p> <p>With reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011), the northern spoil deposition site lies in the Landscape Character Area (LCA) A5 East Winchester Open Downs.</p> <p>Relevant key characteristics of this character zone include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the open character of the East Winchester Open Downs, there are expansive views over Winchester and the Itchen Valley. • Open rolling upland chalk landscape of rolling Downs reaching 176m at Cheesefoot Head. • Dominated by large 18th and 19th century fields of arable and pasture, bounded by sparse thorn hedgerows creating a very open landscape supporting a range of farmland birds. • Large open skies ensure that weather conditions are a dominant influence creating a dynamic, moody landscape, particularly on higher ground e.g. at Cheesefoot Head. • A strong sense of remoteness and tranquillity away from the major transport routes (M3, A31, A272) which cross the landscape. • Other characteristics to note are: • Transport routes carve up the area – the M3 runs along the western boundary and the A31/A272 cut across the character area in an east-west direction. The sense of tranquillity and remoteness of this character area is diminished in the vicinity of these major transport routes. Also associated with the major transport routes out of Winchester is ribbon development, as seen along the B3404. • Of particular sensitivity is the remote and tranquil character of the East Winchester Open Downland which is threatened by its proximity to Winchester and numerous transport routes. • Given the proximity to, and views over, Winchester, this area is also sensitive to changes in the urban area and on the urban fringe beyond the South Downs study area. Also of particular sensitivity are the prominent scarps and open undeveloped skylines. • Observable changes in the past have included the introduction and upgrading of major roads, including the M3, A272, and A31 which have severed the landscape and created some incongruous cuttings and bridges. <p>Development considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent further fragmentation of the East Winchester Downs by roads and development. 		<p><i>Response in relation to public consultation:</i></p> <p>As part of the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant presented a variety of plans and figures (including; the Indicative Application Boundary, a General Arrangements plan and environmental baseline figures). A 'red line' was included on all figures to illustrate the proposed site boundary of the DCO application.</p> <p>The 2021 PEIR and supporting figures were a preliminary document and reflected the Scheme proposals at the time. A complete Environmental Impact Assessment has now been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the information presented in 2021 PEIR and supporting figures aligns with advice provided in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements and the Infrastructure EIA Regulations 2017.</p> <p><i>Response in relation to construction:</i></p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which accompanies the DCO application. The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects. Specifically, Chapter 5 (Air Quality), Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) and Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) present assessments in relation to air quality, contamination and noise, respectively.</p> <p>As part of the DCO Application, Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES Figures (Document Reference 6.2) has been produced to show the haul roads and temporary construction compounds.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek opportunities to reduce the visual impact of existing visually intrusive elements such as the infrastructure and traffic associated with the M3, A272, and A31, and prominent built elements on the edge of Winchester. • Maintain the open and undeveloped scarps and skylines – avoid siting of buildings, telecommunication masts, power lines and wind turbines on the sensitive skyline. • With reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011), Worthy Park House lies in the adjacent LCA E4 Itchen Valley. Characteristic points to note include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This character area includes the rural part of the valley of the River Itchen in two locations north east and south of Winchester. The boundaries are strongly defined by the topography and are drawn along the apparent skyline of the valley sides as seen from the valley floor. ○ Crossed by the M3 and A roads which interrupt the otherwise tranquil landscape. A sequence of settlements occur along the lower valley sides. ○ Although the valley has an overall tranquil quality this is disrupted in place by the audible ‘hum’ of traffic. <p>Key landscape sensitivities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The smooth form of the intact valley sides which reveal dramatic chalk landforms. • The setting of, and uninterrupted views to churches tower/spires, which are often seen against the rising downland backdrop of the valley sides are also important. • Designed landscapes which provide evidence of gentry houses and landscape parks of the wealthy population of the past. • The woodlands and • hedgerows generally limit visual sensitivity of these valley landscapes. However, the visibility of the chalk valleys from the adjacent downs increases their visual sensitivity. From within the valleys, the valley crests are seen against an open sky and are particularly visually sensitive. <p>Landscape management considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve the intact smooth form of the valley and its dramatic chalk landforms. • Conserve historic designed landscapes, and their settings, which provide evidence of gentry houses and landscape parks of the wealthy population of the past. <p>Development management considerations are specific to this character area include the need to:</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the effects of incremental change to buildings and land, and minimise such change by providing design guidance and encouraging applicants to enter into discussions at an early stage in the preparation of their proposals. • Conserve the open skylines of the valley crests which are particular sensitive in views from the valleys. Consider views from the adjacent downs in relation to any change in the chalk river valleys. <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House are on the southern facade, with all the rooms, including the key internal spaces, looking out over the landscape to the south across the top of the lower level Itchen Valley, much of which is hidden in the intervening woodland on the valley floor, along with the M3 corridor. The eye is drawn beyond to the open arable downland above the valley floor where the rolling nature is clearly visible in the views from Worthy Park House, accentuated by the presence of the characteristic valley, central to views, which give rises to a distinctive contouring of the landform. The presence of the valley is also accentuated by the patterns of the arable farming landscape with straight lines seemingly folding and curving around the contours of the landform.</p> <p>The PEIR Heritage Chapter includes at section 6.8.13 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) states ‘Worthy Park House is located to the north of the IAB. Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape including south across land within the IAB. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding landscape, which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped retaining part of the views described in the nineteenth century and contributes towards the historic interest of the listed building. The construction of the Proposed Scheme, particularly areas of search for potential excess spoil management, potential construction compound areas and areas proposed for environmental mitigation on the eastern side of the M3 are likely to be prominent in views from the listed building introducing construction traffic and further eroding the character of the surrounding landscape which are part of the wider setting of the listed building. As part of the wider setting that has already been extensively altered the construction of the Proposed Scheme is likely to result in an impact of minor magnitude and a temporary slight or moderate adverse effect. This assessment will be reviewed in ongoing EIA work and reported in the ES following the decision on which areas of search for potential excess storage will be included and once further details about construction activities in this area are available.’</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Section 7.4.4. sets out the relevant landscape character areas, stating these cover all the relevant areas - but there is no mention of the LCA to the north that Worthy Park House lies within: SDLICA LCA E4 Itchen Valley.</p> <p>Topography is described as ‘a key characteristic of the undulating hills in the nationally designated SDNP. It is also important to the wider distinctive landscape of the River Itchen valley’ and is ‘therefore considered to be of medium to high value (sensitivity) depending on location relative to the SDNP and its setting’. Effects on topography are stated to be as follows: ‘Construction: Temporary adverse landscape effects are anticipated for the topography within the IAB as a result of construction activities and land reprofiling’ and ‘Operation: Adverse effects on topography are anticipated to remain during operation as result of the earthworks required to enable the Proposed Scheme. However, earthworks have been designed to sympathetically tie into existing levels and surrounding landform within the SDNP.’</p> <p>Vegetation is described as ‘The surrounding landscape contains numerous copses, blocks of trees, hedgerow trees and hedgerows alongside lanes, tracks and field boundaries. The area of the IAB contains fields of both arable and pastoral farmland, typically bounded by hedgerows’ and ‘is a key characteristic of the nationally designated SDNP and is fundamental to the distinctive landscape of the River Itchen valley. It is an important part of the green infrastructure of the area and it is therefore considered to be of high value (sensitivity).’ No effects on vegetation are noted as being relevant to the northern spoil deposition site.</p> <p>Whilst Registered Parks and Gardens are assessed in this section, Heritage Statutory designations are not assessed as part of the landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>Landscape Statutory Designations include ‘The SDNP covers around 117ha of the area of the IAB, principally around its northern and eastern lengths (see Figure 7.1, Appendix 7.1). The SDNP incorporates the more intimate local landscape of the River Itchen to the north-west, the north-east of the area of the IAB and also covers the downland to the east. Consideration will be given to both the direct and indirect effects upon this designated landscape, including effects upon its special qualities and representative views. Special qualities of the SDNP are defined by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA); those special qualities which have the potential to be affected by the Proposed Scheme are as follows: Diverse, inspirational landscapes and breath-taking views. This is in part a function of the downland topography, and tranquil; and unspoilt places.’ and is stated to be ‘a nationally designated landscape resource of very high value (sensitivity).</p> <p>Points on perceptual aspects include ‘Noise, lighting, vehicle movement and the presence of infrastructure, all associated with the urban fringe of Winchester and the transport routes including the M3, A34/Winchester bypass</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>and A272/Spitfire Link all erode tranquillity in the area’ and that ‘Built development and transport corridors have also affected the pattern and texture of the landscape over time’ and that tranquillity ‘is a perceptual quality of the landscape, and is influenced by things that people can both see and hear in the landscape around them’ and that ‘Tranquillity and a sense of remoteness are important aspects of the nationally designated SDNP and the River Itchen valley and are of high value (sensitivity).’</p> <p>The PEIR states that relevant landscape character assessments will also be examined and used to inform the landscape assessment.</p> <p>The assessment methodology states that the assessment of the magnitude of impacts on landscape receptors, the evaluation of the significance of landscape effects and the reporting of residual landscape effects for each landscape receptor are all to be reported in ES.</p> <p>Table 7-11 sets out the 24 viewpoints selected and the potential visual effects. There are two that are likely to include views of the northern spoil deposition site: 23 and 24, both from public rights of way. No photographs are available at this stage for review.</p> <p>There are no views from Worthy Park House included.</p> <p>The assessment methodology states that assessment of the magnitude of visual impacts, evaluation of the significance of visual effects and reporting of residual visual effects are all to be reported in ES.</p> <p>Effects during operation for Viewpoint 23 area noted ‘Adverse effects would reduce over time as the landscape mitigation takes effect. Longer term beneficial effects are expected as a result of the landscape mitigation.’</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Mitigation Design Plan makes no reference to mitigation proposals for the northern spoil deposition site .</p> <p>The section states that ‘Anticipated further assessment relevant to landscape and visual matters, which will be submitted with the ES to accompany the Development Consent Order (DCO) process is as follows: A full assessment of landscape and visual effects on receptors and reporting of significance will be undertaken as part of the ES’ alongside continuing design work.</p> <p>The public consultation is being held with a considerable lack of information for review; proposals are diagrammatic, indicative and in some aspects simply not available. This gives very little scope for a full understanding of the nature of the proposals by the public. This information provided is not a full landscape and visual impact assessment and is subject to design development. Therefore the full proposals cannot be properly reviewed and commented on.</p> <p>The figures included in the information include a red line that covers the entirety of the proposals for the construction and operational stages. This gives rise to difficulties in reviewing specific areas of the proposals and their effects.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>The statement that the ‘earthworks have been designed to sympathetically tie into existing levels and surrounding landform within the SDNP’ is not backed up by any proposals available for review. The information on the spoil deposition sites is very limited. The amount of spoil being relocated to the northern spoil deposition site will determine the final ground levels, however this is not known at this stage and therefore the form of the proposals cannot be determined. It should be noted that the central and southern spoil deposition sites are far more level in nature than the northern site which dips considerably in the middle and the blanket spreading of a 4m layer of spoil may give rise to significant adverse effects in a valley situation. Indeed, without clarity on the proposals for the northern spoil deposition site, if there is considerable spoil to be deposited on the northern site then this may in effect be used to ‘fill’ the valley, giving rise to significant adverse effects on one of the main key characteristics of the landscape identified in the SDILCA.</p> <p>The PEIR notes that, as mitigation, the adverse effects on Viewpoint 23 will reduce over time, however the raising of levels and changes to topography are permanent and will remain constant over the long term. With the key landscape characteristics for the spoil deposition site noted as the ‘open rolling chalk’ downland with ‘sparse hedgerows, the nature of the landscape character gives little opportunity for mitigation or enhancement.</p> <p>Any change in levels will affect the nature of the view from Worthy Park House. Regarding Worthy Park House, the PEIR Heritage section states that ‘Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape including south across land within the IAB. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding landscape, which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped retaining part of the views described in the nineteenth century and contributes towards the historic interest of the listed building.’</p> <p>It is exactly these views that have been identified as contributing to the historic interest of the House that will be affected by potentially significant adverse effects to the landscape character of the SDNP, identified by the PEIR as very highly sensitive.</p> <p>On the basis of the points raised above, this report concludes that there is the potential for significant harm on landscape character and visual amenity within the SDNP, as well as on the setting of Worthy Park House.</p> <p>Report on Heritage Impact:</p> <p>LJE Planning Ltd was instructed to consider the impact of the Scheme on the significance of the designated heritage asset, Worthy Park House (Grade II*) with particular regard to the impact on its setting. The assessment is undertaken with particular regard to the inclusion of proposals for identified sites for the deposition of excess spoil, one of which would be on the south</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>side of the Itchen Valley, directly ‘opposite’ Worthy Park House and its grounds.</p> <p>There is regrettably very limited information available about the precise details of the proposed scheme for this potential deposition site. All that can be gleaned from the available consultation material is that three potential sites have been identified and that the land levels may be increased by 4m at two of them, with no detail of intent for the third northern site. However, if the 4m increase represents the envisaged level of excess soil requiring deposition, it would seem plausible that a similar amount of deposition may be envisaged for the northern site, potentially leading to an infilling of the natural valley.</p> <p>In the absence of any more precise details and analysis of the proposals, this assessment has necessarily had to be made on the basis of this extremely limited information; namely the location of the site as identified by the overall extent of the application site for the proposed works including the deposition sites, the suggestion in the consultation material that land levels may be raised or changed by 4m and that the land would revert to agricultural use in the longer term.</p> <p>Client’s land occupies a 5.68 hectare site on the northern side of the B3047 approximately 1km to the east of the junction with the A33 and within the countryside and South Downs National Park. The main building is Worthy Park House, a Grade II* listed, former residential house within a parkland setting, designed by Sir Robert Smirke and dating from the 1820s. The School has recently been successfully extended to the side facing the Coach House, but this extension is not generally visible from the southern side of the building.</p> <p>There are a small number of other buildings within the site, including the Coach House, which is separately listed Grade II to the immediate north-east of the house, and thought also to be by Smirke, as well as the much more recently built sports hall to the west. There is a hard surfaced play area / netball court to the immediate west of the main house and the main grassed playing fields, hard surfaced tennis courts/netball courts and play areas lie to the south.</p> <p>The grounds are also included on the Hampshire County Council’s register of Historic Parks and Gardens (No 1550).</p> <p>There is a Scheduled Monument (Saxon Cemetery) in the woodland area to the west of the Site.</p> <p>In the 18th century, Worthy Park belonged to William Evelyn who constructed a mansion in 1722. The Worthy Park estate passed to Kingston’s second wife Isabella, whose son by a previous marriage, Sir Chaloner Ogle, inherited in 1761.</p> <p>Sir Charles Ogle, grandson of Sir Chaloner Ogle constructed the present Worthy Park House in 1820 to a neo-classical design by Sir Robert Smirke. The layout of the property plot was redeveloped at this time. The west wing of</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>the existing 1722 mansion was demolished and the new house built over its foundations (Butchart 1989). The existing rectangular plan building was retained and incorporated into 1820 house as the east wing and used as a service range. The stable block and stable yard wall were constructed at this time, also believed to be by Smirke.</p> <p>Ogle sold the Worthy Park Estate to Samuel Wall in 1825; it remained with his descendants (the Rivers, Fryer and Butchart families) until the late 1950s. During WWII it was used as the southern command headquarters for the Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers and accommodation for the Auxiliary Territorial Service.</p> <p>Following WWII, Worthy Park House was still owned by the Butchart family, although they did not live there. In the late 1950s it was sold to Currys Ltd and became their regional office and staff training centre. Currys left the property in 1985 and the house stood vacant for four years until T. S. Frobisher Ltd. bought it to use as a business centre. Prince's Mead School took over the Site in 1999 and continue to occupy the site.</p> <p>There is a statutory duty to have regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any special architectural or historic features that they possess.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) defines the setting of a heritage asset as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral. <p>Worthy Park House is listed Grade II* and its significance relates to both features of special architectural interest as well as historic interest relating to the design by Sir Robert Smirke. In addition, and of particular relevance to this issue under consideration, the setting adds to the overall significance of the listed building.</p> <p>Country houses defined their owners' relative social standing and the setting of a country house, in the landscape, was of considerable consequence. The site for an nineteenth century house was most particularly chosen for its potential views across parkland and where there might be some view of water or a water feature created.</p> <p>With respect to Worthy Park House, commentary in "Selected Illustrations of Hampshire" published in 1834 describes the importance of the southerly view from the house. 'Below the south front of the mansion winds the river Itchen, on the opposite banks of which rise beautiful eminences, partly covered with wood, beyond, are the more romantic downs.' The historical relationship between the house and the landscape should therefore not be underestimated.</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>Worthy Park House, in its elevated position on the north side of the Itchen Valley gives it a commanding location over the valley. This relationship has not largely changed in character and appearance since the house was first built despite the changes to the use of the building and intervening development. The setting of Worthy Park House and its relationship to the landscape remains an essential part of the significance of the designated heritage asset.</p> <p>The setting of Worthy Park House, both in terms of views out from the house and its south facing grounds as well as views of the house from the surrounding area largely comprise the rolling downlands of the River Itchen valley.</p> <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House and the landscape setting for the Grade II* listed building are described more fully at paragraph 6.2 of the report by the terra firma Consultancy on the landscape and visual effects of the M3 J9 proposals:</p> <p>The key views out from Worthy Park House are on the southern facade, with all the rooms, including the key internal spaces, looking out over the landscape to the south across the top of the lower level Itchen Valley, much of which is hidden in the intervening woodland on the valley floor, along with the M3 corridor. The eye is drawn beyond to the open arable downland above the valley floor where the rolling nature is clearly visible in the views from Worthy Park House, accentuated by the presence of the characteristic valley, central to views, which give rises to a distinctive contouring of the landform. The presence of the valley is also accentuated by the patterns of the arable farming landscape with straight lines seemingly folding and curving around the contours of the landform.</p> <p>Despite the paucity of available information on the details of what is proposed for the possible northern deposition site, it is clear that the use of this site for the deposition of excess spoil would result in changes to this existing landscape, including potentially through the artificial infilling of a natural valley. This would seriously detract from the setting which has been present since the house was built in the early nineteenth century. The rolling downlands are an integral part of the landscape character of this local area and the proposed infilling of the valley and raising of the land would be an artificial intrusion in that natural landscape.</p> <p>The proposed northern site for deposition of soils would be directly visible from the main building as well as from the grounds to the south of the building and the interrelationship of the building with its natural setting would therefore be harmed.</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (May 2021) (PEIR) produced by Highways England recognises at Table 6-5 that Worthy Park</p>		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>House, as a Grade II* listed building has ‘high’ sensitivity in relation to the proposals, and this is agreed.</p> <p>However, the Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline report undertaken by Highways England suggests at paragraph 5.2.17 and repeated in the PEIR at paragraph 6.8.13 that the existing setting has already been compromised by the construction of the M3 and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. It is contended that the effects of these later developments are overstated. The dominance of the house within the Itchen Valley and the relationship between the house and its setting is very largely unaltered since the time it was built and commented upon by the first owner, Sir Charles Ogle.</p> <p>Although it has been necessary to make certain assumptions about the extent of changes arising were the northern deposition site to be progressed, the conclusion is reached that there would be material impact to and therefore potentially significant harm to the setting of Worthy Park House. Such harm therefore would require to be offset by public benefits, which it is argued should be considered in the context of public benefits arising from the proposed northern deposition site. However, given that the proposal would appear to result in an artificial raising of the land and / or filling in of a natural valley, and its return to agricultural use, it is difficult to envisage any potential opportunities for landscape and / or environmental enhancements.</p> <p>This is of even more concern, given that it is noted that other parties submitting representations to this consultation exercise have raised the possibility of other areas of land for the deposition of excess soil, where there would be significant opportunities for landscape and environmental improvements.</p> <p>This report seeks to assess the potential impact of the works associated with the proposed northern site for the deposition of excess soils arising from the proposed works to J9 of the M3 on the setting and significance of Worthy Park House, a Grade II* listed building. Despite the serious shortcomings in the information available upon which the assessment necessarily has to be made, this report concludes that, on the understanding of the works envisaged, there would be significant harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* designated heritage asset of Worthy Park House.</p>		

K.2.Z Construction – compound locations

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
C1. As we develop our plans for construction, is there anything specific you think we should consider?			
Local community	<p>Sustainable practices are important and suggest renewable energies should power the project.</p> <p>Local community concerned about increased traffic through Winchester as people would exit M3 northbound at junction 11 or junction 10 to avoid roadworks and wanting to understand what measures will be in place.</p> <p>Concerned about the location of construction compounds and deposition areas being on national park land and suggested that any scheme using them as ‘dumping grounds during construction’ should be rejected.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the location of the construction compounds during the refinement of the current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been studied by the Applicant and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has reduced the impact of the central construction compound (presented as construction compound 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation) by reducing its footprint and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant has reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area of the tree line.</p>
Local community	<p>Agree that spreading the construction units across different compounds is a good idea. I'm not sure what the Christmas Hill compound adds to the mix – the other 3 proposed compounds appear to be located more closely to where the works will be carried out.</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment.</p> <p>The northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 in the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals.</p>
Local community	<p>Please cease all construction - in particular the compound at Oliver's Battery should cease immediately.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment and can confirm that the compound at Oliver's Battery is not part of the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme.</p>
D2. Please let us know the reasons for your response to D1 and any other views you have on the environmental impacts set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report or our public consultation brochure			
Local community	<p>Since the decision about where spoil is to be put and where the construction compounds are to be is not made I am not sure what my opinion is. Constructions compounds 3 and 4 seem particularly unsuitable.</p>	Y	<p>The construction of the Scheme would require the following construction compounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A central temporary construction compound (presented as number 1 in the 2021 statutory consultation) located to the immediate east of Junction 9. Activities within this compound would include plant storage, car parking, fuel and water storage, ‘skills school’, staff welfare facilities, waste segregation areas and a wheel wash. The area would also be used for material storage, a tree and hedging nursery area and material processing (earthworks and pavements) and storage of topsoil.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two smaller areas within the footprint of the Junction 9 gyratory roundabout (presented as number 2 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to facilitate construction of the new gyratory bridge. A small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities. <p>The northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 in the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals and will therefore not be required.</p>
F.4: Please let us know the reasons for your response to question F3 and any other views about the locations we've identified			
Local community	No areas should be 'temporary' compounds as they'll never go back to being safe sites. Better to use sites which were already developed. If you don't know what size compounds are needed how can you consult on this?	N	This comment has been noted. Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides further details about the temporary construction compounds.
G.2: Please let us know the reasons for your response to G1 and any other views about our locations for possible construction compounds			
Local community	The northern construction compound on Christmas Hill does seem a bit distant from the works, and I am a bit concerned it might bring noise/dust/congestion into that area.	Y	The northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 in the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals and will therefore not be required.
Local community	They are temporary, no issue	N	The Applicant has noted this comment. Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides a description of the construction compound locations.
Local community	Really not concerned - this will be a temporary set-up so doesn't matter where to me.	N	
Local community	Not knowledgeable to answer, but within existing junction 9 perhaps has least impact?	N	
Local community	Totally unnecessary if changes are abandoned.	N	
Local community	You are in the public eye and I believe you will do the right thing.	N	
Local community	I've no problems with any of them -- you have to put your machinery etc somewhere and I have no vested interested in any particular site.	N	
Local community	These all make sense to me.	N	

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Using sites within the existing area of the roundabout/junctions seem a reasonable use of space available but I would be less certain about the impact of the northern site. It is assumed that all sites would be returned to their pre-existing state.	Y	The Applicant has noted this comment. The northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 in the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals and will therefore not be required.
Local community	3 and 4 are already damaged, so better to use them than new areas.	Y	<p>The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the location of the construction compounds during the refinement of the current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been studied by the Applicant and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, further work was undertaken by the Applicant to consider the potential impacts of the two options for the main construction compound. As a result of this, the northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals.</p> <p>In order to facilitate construction of the Scheme, a number of temporary construction compounds would be required as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A central temporary construction compound (presented as construction compound number 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation), located to the immediate east of Junction 9. • Two smaller areas within the footprint of the Junction 9 gyratory roundabout (presented as construction compound number 2 at the 2021 statutory consultation) • A small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as construction compound number 3 at the 2021 statutory consultation).
Local community	It makes sense to put the compounds as close to the work sites as possible. This is not to pretend that they can be wholly integrated, but just hope that the disruption would be limited and they are, after all, a temporary.	Y	<p>This comment has been noted.</p> <p>The northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 in the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals as a result of distance from the works.</p>
Local community	No comment so long as they don't become permanent as they have done off Spitfire Link.	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	I do not agree with the plan at all	N	This comment has been noted.

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
Local community	Compound 1 is the best size and location. Compound 2 looks like it would create traffic problems on the roundabout with vehicles entering/exiting and the impact on site lines. Similarly with number 3, access to or from the compound could present safety issues. Compound 4 looks ok but is a bit far away.	Y	<p>The Applicant has noted this comment and confirms that the following temporary construction compounds would be required to facilitate the construction of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A central temporary construction compound (presented as number 1 in the 2021 statutory consultation) located to the immediate east of Junction 9. Activities within this compound would include plant storage, car parking, fuel and water storage, 'skills school', staff welfare facilities, waste segregation areas and a wheel wash. The area would also be used for material storage, a tree and hedging nursery area and material processing (earthworks and pavements) and storage of topsoil. • Two smaller areas within the footprint of the Junction 9 gyratory roundabout (presented as number 2 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to facilitate construction of the new gyratory bridge. • A small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities. <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) sets out the proposed temporary traffic management measures during the construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>Following the review of the Scheme proposals by the newly appointed contractor, the Applicant decided to remove the northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 in the 2021 statutory consultation) from the Scheme proposals.</p>
Local community	We are not aware of the time frame for the use of the proposed compounds, as well as the intended use for each.	N	<p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) sets out the Applicant's approach to construction, including phasing details and temporary construction compounds. The construction phase of the Scheme is estimated to commence in early 2024. It is currently envisaged that the construction phase would be spilt into four main phases (0 to 3), with compound establishment being within Phase 0 (site set up and construction prep).</p> <p>In order to facilitate the construction of the Scheme, the following construction compounds would be required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A central temporary construction compound (presented as number 1 in the 2021 statutory consultation) located to the immediate east of Junction 9. Activities within this compound would include plant storage, car parking, fuel and water storage, 'skills school', staff welfare facilities, waste segregation areas and a wheel wash. The area would also be used for material storage, a tree and hedging

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>nursery area and material processing (earthworks and pavements) and storage of topsoil.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two smaller areas within the footprint of the Junction 9 gyratory roundabout (presented as number 2 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to facilitate construction of the new gyratory bridge. A small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities.
Local community	Impact on 3 Maids is unfair	Y	The northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals.
Local community	<p>Central compound I have no view on. Junction 9 compound I wholeheartedly agree with the location. A33/A34 compound appears to be in an area where drainage occurs as well as wildlife habitats though I may be wrong about its actual location. Northern compound is not marked on the plans so I'm going with strongly disagree until you point it out.</p>	Y	<p><i>Response to point 1:</i></p> <p>The Applicant notes this comment. It is proposed that the main construction area is to be located to the immediate east of Junction 9 (presented as number 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation). Activities within this compound would include plant storage, car parking, fuel and water storage, 'skills school', staff welfare facilities, waste segregation areas and a wheel wash. The area would also be used for material storage, a tree and hedging nursery area and material processing (earthworks and pavements) and storage of topsoil.</p> <p><i>Response to point 2:</i></p> <p>The Applicant notes this comment. It is proposed that the two smaller areas within the footprint of the Junction 9 gyratory roundabout (presented as number 2 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would be used to facilitate construction of the new gyratory bridge.</p> <p><i>Response to point 3:</i></p> <p>The small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (presented as number 3 in the 2021 statutory consultation) is also required to help construct the Scheme. This compound location would be used to for car parking and storage, as well as staff welfare facilities.</p> <p>A range of measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to avoid and reduce potential effects. Essential mitigation measures are outlined in the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3). As the design develops towards construction phase, mitigation would be refined and included within the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (siEMP), which would be secured through a DCO requirement. The EMPs would be drafted in consultation with statutory bodies, and regular contact</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>would be had with these parties through the subsequent detailed design and delivery (construction) phases.</p> <p>A comprehensive package of pollution prevention measures would be provided to avoid accidental pollution events during construction, with particular regard to the River Itchen. Measures would include source control, settlement tanks, silt fencing, and dust suppression. Furthermore, the Applicant will aim to locate construction compounds outside areas at risk of flooding where possible.</p> <p>Fencing of adjacent designated areas and retained important habitat to protect the area/habitat would be installed to avoid accidental damage and avoid incidental species mortality. Easton Down SINC is located within the Application Boundary but would be fenced and protected throughout the construction phase. Measures would also be provided to avoid entrapment of animals during construction, such as covering excavations at night or where this is not feasible providing escape ramps.</p> <p>An Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) would be present on site during key periods of the construction phase. The ECoW would be required to make certain that all committed mitigation measures are adhered to.</p> <p><i>Response to point 4:</i></p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, further work was undertaken by the Applicant to consider the potential impacts of the locations of the construction compounds in relation to carbon emissions. The assessment predicted 135 tonnes of CO₂ emissions over the construction period associated with travelling to the site from the northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation) in comparison to 0.6 tonnes of CO₂ emissions over the construction period associated with travelling to the site from the central construction compound (presented as number 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation). The lesser distance also reduces congestion on the surrounding local road network and the local communities. As a result, the northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides further details.</p>
Local community	Times change but given this is only temporary during the construction period, I would have been more interested in best locations for site operation than what the locals thought!	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	They have to go somewhere so on the basis all will be returned to pre-construction condition it is what it is	N	This comment has been noted.
Local community	Compound Number 1 is on arable/pasture land within the South Downs National Park. An alternative location should be found.	Y	The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the location of the construction compounds during the refinement of the current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been studied by the Applicant and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.</p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has reduced the impact of the central construction compound (presented as number 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation) by reducing its footprint and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant has also reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area of the tree line.</p> <p>The Applicant has discussed these changes with South Downs National Park Authority.</p>
Local community	Concerns regarding light, noise and security with the location of Compound Number 1. Could the compound be hidden within the valley and behind the existing tree line? The plan looks as though it could extend outside of this in a northerly direction in which case it will be seen from properties along Easton Lane and it also looks as though existing trees may be removed which would seem unnecessary.	Y	<p>The main construction compound would be to the immediate east of Junction 9 (presented as number 1 in the 2021 statutory consultation). Activities within this compound would include plant storage, car parking, fuel and water storage, 'skills school', staff welfare facilities, waste segregation areas and a wheel wash. The area would also be used for material storage, a tree and hedging nursery area and material processing (earthworks and pavements) and storage of topsoil. Details of the other construction compounds required to construct the Scheme can be found Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The Applicant has reduced the impact of the central construction compound by reducing its footprint and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant has reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area of the tree line.</p> <p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) provide details on the proposed construction working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme.</p> <p>Working hours would be restricted to the following core hours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07.00 to 19.00 Monday to Friday • 07.00 to 13.30 Saturday • No Sunday working

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
			<p>Works outside of the core working hours are likely to be required in certain circumstances and would be carried out following consultation with Winchester City Council.</p> <p>It is anticipated that standard temporary fencing for the main construction compound would be used to screen and secure compound locations. This would reduce visual intrusion, assist in noise attenuation and ensure public safety.</p> <p>The temporary compounds would also be subject to surface water drainage measures to avoid significant environmental effects. Such measures would include (refer to the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) for further details):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the amount of topsoil stripping where possible and soil stockpiles would be located as far from watercourses as practicable • Use of silt fences • Plant and wheel washing and haul road damping in designated areas • Plant to be re-fuelled in designated locations at a safe distance from water courses and good practise to be in place with relation to pollution prevention (adequate bunding, storage etc) • Spill kits are to be positioned at strategic locations on site and thorough training provided for staff to ensure a rapid and effective response to any pollution incidents that occur on site • Use of an Ecological Clerk of Works / Environmental Manager, along with toolbox talks and training to promote contractor awareness of pollution risks <p>The need for temporary construction lighting would be limited. Works would largely be undertaken during daylight hours. Where operations are needed to be undertaken overnight, such as resurfacing works and traffic management switches, temporary lighting would be needed for safety reasons and would be directional to minimise light spill. Temporary lighting would also be needed at the site compound again for safety reasons in mornings and evenings, this would also be directional and minimise light spill.</p>
Local community	<p>From the published diagrams and maps it is difficult to precisely identify where some of the proposed temporary construction compounds will sit in the existing landscape or, at least, where their boundaries will lie. It would have been helpful if these plans were shown overlaid on a satellite view of the area to assist visualising how the proposed works would sit in the landscape.</p> <p>Nevertheless, examination of the diagram showing the construction compounds reveals that Temporary Construction Compound Number 1 will</p>	Y	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments raised in this response.</p> <p>The main construction compound would be to the immediate east of Junction 9 (presented as number 1 in the 2021 statutory consultation). Activities within this compound would include plant storage, car parking, fuel and water storage, 'skills school', staff welfare facilities, waste segregation areas and a wheel wash. The area would also be used for material storage, a tree and hedging nursery area and material processing (earthworks and pavements) and storage of topsoil. Details of</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>cover a large area of land east of the J9 roundabout and, in part, bordering the A272 Spitfire Link. Most of this land is currently arable - and I do not object to the temporary use of arable land for a construction compound.</p> <p>However - the plan also shows that Compound No. 1 will have an extension on its northern side, roughly rectangular in shape, stretching up towards Easton Lane. The plan shows this northern extension of Compound No. 1 as occupying an area of land simply shown as plain white - suggesting it is nothing more than arable land. This is incorrect.</p> <p>A walk around the proposed site of Compound No. 1, or even just a glance at a satellite view of the area (Google Maps), clearly shows that this northern extension of Compound No. 1 would cover and destroy the western end of a belt of young trees and natural grassland.</p> <p>Incidentally, while the published plan showing the temporary construction compounds does show the belt of young trees in question, the plan incorrectly shows the tree belt as stopping some distance to the east of the northern extension of Compound No. 1. This belt of trees and natural grassland in fact extends the whole way to the boundary of the existing Junction 9 roundabout, and does not end in the middle of a field as is wrongly shown on the plan.</p> <p>Why is an inaccurate and misleading plan being used?</p> <p>Is it really essential that Temporary Construction Compound No. 1 should extend over this northern area and so destroy a valuable natural resource of young trees and natural grassland?</p> <p>I support the need for Junction 9 to be improved and accept this will inevitably involve the loss of some valuable natural habitat, but it is not obvious that this particular piece of environmental destruction - just to provide space for the northern extension of Temporary Construction Compound No. 1 is either essential or inevitable.</p> <p>Could the plans for Compound No. 1 be reviewed so as to dispense with, or at least reduce, the northern extension and so preserve the tree and grass belt?</p>		<p>the other construction compounds required to construct the Scheme can be found Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2).</p> <p>The Applicant has reduced the impact of the central construction compound by reducing its footprint and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant has reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area of the tree line.</p>
General commentary			
Local community	<p>In general we are in favour of improving the junction configuration to create free-flow traffic from the A34 to the M3 and vice versa. More importantly, we support the separation of local traffic and the strategic road network around the junction with the creation of a separate link road. This will make driving to Winnall from Itchen Abbas a safer and more accessible journey.</p>		<p>The Applicant has noted this comment and provides a response to points 1 to 3 below and points 4 to 8 elsewhere in this Appendix.</p> <p>Response to point 1:</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>However, there are areas of the proposals we have specific concerns about. Our feedback is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction compound Number 4 would inevitably add construction traffic to the likely traffic management routes through the construction site, namely down the A34. There are no other sensible options to build either off highway haul roads or use local lanes to avoid the A34 with this construction traffic (narrow railway underbridge on Down Farm Lane, local villages not appropriate for HGVs and LGVs). This location seems unnecessary given the scale of other potential construction compounds in the vicinity. We recommend this compound Number 4 is dropped from the plans. If it is retained, we would expect to see in the DCO application/examination a detailed assessment and findings based upon how this site had been selected. This should include detailed traffic modelling results for the construction period to demonstrate minimal ill-effect from other traffic to local surrounding roads from the addition of construction vehicles leading to and from compound Number 4 and the Junction 9 site. Adding construction vehicles from this remote location up the A34, which is highly likely to be congested during extended periods of the construction phase, would compound delays on this already busy section of A34 and risk sending traffic heading south along the A34 on rat-runs using either the city of Winchester or local village roads in the Itchen Valley. This is avoidable with better choice of onsite or existing compound choice. • Construction compound Number 3 is a poor choice of construction compound given the immediate proximity to the sensitive River Itchen. This ground form slopes towards the river giving direct pathway from a proposed construction compound to the internationally designated river. This would likely be a very challenging location to confirm through the DCO application/examination on Habitat Regulations Assessment grounds alone. This site should be dropped from the plans and all efforts be made to distance the construction sites from River Itchen wherever practicable. • We are surprised there is no mention of using the existing R&W materials compound site situated right next to Junction 9 between the M3 SB Onslip and the Spitfire spur road. This site is run by an established Highways England contractor; it is full of potential 		<p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, further work was undertaken by the Applicant to consider the potential impacts of the options for the main construction compound, of which one of the options was the northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation). This further work was predominately in relation to carbon emissions given the heightened focus on climate change. The assessment predicted CO₂ emissions over the construction period associated with travelling to the site from the main construction compound locations of 0.6 tonnes with the central construction compound (presented as number 1 at the 2021 statutory consultation) compared with 135 tonnes of CO₂ with the northern construction compound. The lesser distance also reduces congestion on the surrounding local road network and the local communities. As a result, northern construction compound at Christmas Hill (presented as number 4 at the 2021 statutory consultation) has been removed from the Scheme proposals. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) provides further details.</p> <p>Response to point 2:</p> <p>This comment has been noted. The Applicant has prepared a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Document Reference 7.5), which explains that potential adverse effects arising as a result of the construction phase will be avoided through the implantation of an agreed Environmental Management Plan (see fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) for further details). As such, there will be no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Itchen SAC as a result of construction phase disturbance to or killing or injury of qualifying species. The HRA concludes that once standard avoidance and mitigation measures are applied there would be no significant effect that would affect the integrity of the River Itchen SAC.</p> <p>Response to point 3:</p> <p>This comment has been acknowledged. The Applicant has carefully considered alternatives to the location of the construction compounds during the refinement of the current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) provides a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been studied by the Applicant and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects.</p>

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<p>engineering fill material that will have come from elsewhere on the strategic road network over recent years; and, now that very ‘recycled’ fill material is piled to its current height the plant, other machinery and lighting used in that compound is a visual eyesore on the edge of the South Downs National Park. It would be bordering on disingenuous for Highways England not to look at the opportunities this compound offers both in terms of construction compound site location (instead of compound Number 3 or 4) and the reuse of fill material borne from years of ‘recycling’ from other Highways England schemes. Again, as in my point 1/ I would expect to see full assessment and reasoned findings in the DCO application, as to what the selection criteria against using this location with the potential use of the engineering fill material within, all of which is quite literally already on site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the constrained location of the proposed development site between the historic city of Winchester and the South Downs National Park and over the River Itchen, construction mitigation would have to be extremely well planned out, with best practice mitigation strategies and pollution prevention controls in place. This scrutiny over the construction phase should extend to design and logistics and include maximising off-site prefabrication of as much infrastructure as possible, delivering to site for installation in a quick and controlled manner. For example, the deck for the new footbridge over the River Itchen should be prefabricated offsite and dropped into place overnight from the adjacent A34 NB carriageway once pier footings have been installed. The underpass taking the A34 SB under the M3 could be built in square shape box sections and slid into place on rails. New junction infrastructure on Junction 9 itself ought to be prefabricated as far as possible and the onsite build be on as accelerated a timeline as possible to improve potential impacts on traffic movements during the construction phase. Prefabrication offsite would enable greater control of materials transfer and storage (reducing the potential for pollution incident) in the constrained development location between Winchester and the South Downs National Park, while having the potential to improve construction times for the overall project. With the construction site being on two significant highway routes (being the A34 and M3), there is ideal opportunity to bring in large elements of prefabricated infrastructure onsite, using appropriate abnormal indivisible load protocols, without need to go through local towns and villages. 		

Consultee	Matters raised in response to 2021 statutory consultation	Change (Y/N)	Regard had to response (s49)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re. landscaping, topsoil ought not be used where swathes of chalk grassland are intended. It should be made clear to landscaping contractors through means of detailed soil management plans, environmental masterplans and landscape design secured through the DCO that chalk grassland requires in part denudated substrate free of nutrients. Good case study here is the Weymouth Relief Road in Dorset where swathes of wildflowers complement the highway inclusion in the local landscape and has resulted in greatly reduced maintenance regimes according to Highways England's own LinkedIn posts (ref. Ben Hewlett's posts). There is plenty of local expertise in this area with Butterfly Conservation (who manage the excellent Magdalen Hill Down butterfly reserve in line of sight of the M3 Junction 9 proposals), Hampshire and IOW Wildlife Trust, the Bumblebee Conservation Trust and the very local Wild Valley Verges group all in the county and who can advise appropriate design and management. Topsoil is a precious commercial resource nowadays and could be used agriculturally in the vicinity. • With Biodiversity net gain for DCO consented schemes now in proposed amendments to the Environment Bill, all proposed biodiversity habitats created towards the end of construction should be maintained in line with an appropriate Handover Environmental Management Plan in perpetuity, if not by Highways England then by a suitable local agent who could acquire the areas in concern. This would secure real environmental legacy for the area. • I could not find any detail about operational lighting proposals in the consultation material. I would expect highway lighting to be minimal unless absolutely required for safety. This view is to contribute to the dark night skies over South Downs National Park. • It is not easy to see from the indicative general arrangement plans whether the proposed M3 Junction 9 improvements scheme goes as far north up the A33 as the 'Cart and Horses junction'. There is a most fantastic opportunity here for collaboration between Hampshire County Council, Winchester City Council and Highways England to incorporate the long needed upgrade of this awful staggered junction between the B3047 and A33 (which has seen so many road traffic accidents over many years) into the wider proposals, while Tier 1 contractors are on site. More detail on this would be welcome if it is being considered – from a local's perspective it certainly should be. 		

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

M3 Junction 9 Development Consent Order 202[x]

5.1 TARGETED CONSULTATION COMMENT AND APPLICANT'S RESPONSE (NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 2021)

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR010055
Application Document Reference:	5.1
BIM Document Reference:	HE551511-VFK-LSI-X_XXXX_XX- RP-LE-0004
Author:	M3 Junction 9 Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	April 2022	DCO submission

Contents

Appendix K.3 Targeted consultation comments and the Applicant’s response (November 2021 – December 2021)..... 786

K.3.A: SGN 786

K.3.B: PIL ID 256..... 787

K.3.C: Royal Mail..... 788

K.3.D: SSE 789

K.3.E: PIL ID 219..... 790

K.3.F: PIL ID 240 791

K.3.G: Southern Water 794

K.3.H: PIL ID 288..... 795

Appendix K.3 Targeted consultation comments and the Applicant’s response (November 2021 – December 2021)

K.3.A: SGN

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 targeted consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
17 November 2021	22 December 2021	Assets	Concerned that works related to the scheme may adversely affect the apparatus within and in the vicinity of the entire scheme boundary. SGN have a medium pressure gas main within this parcel of land which has the benefit of a Deed of Grant dated 9 November 1995.	N	The Applicant has reviewed the information provided and it is not envisaged that there would be a requirement for diversionary or protection works to the medium pressure main within this parcel of land. Discussions between SGN and the Applicant, in relation to any apparatus that could be affected by the Scheme proposals, is ongoing.

K.3.B: PIL ID 256

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 targeted consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
17 November 2021	22 December 2021	Land ownership, traffic and transport.	<p>The Plot referred to is Title No 390. The information provided states that this area includes an access road, gas pipeline and underground electricity cable. However, it is unclear as to what works are proposed and why Title No 390 is required.</p> <p>The shared access road provides means of access for commercial businesses. Any proposed works that could impact on trading position or operations could have severe implications for the future viability of the business.</p> <p>Unable to determine whether to object to the changes and thus the upcoming DCO application in the absence of any clear indication as to what is precisely proposed on Title No. 390. The 'General Arrangement' plan appears to show a new public footpath and verges in this location, but there is no indication as to whether the works will also include the diversion of existing utilities.</p> <p>The letter refers to the possibility that the land within the red line could be compulsorily purchased, either as its required to deliver the scheme or is required temporarily to undertake the works or I assume divert existing utilities. However, it is again unclear as to what is proposed in this context in relation to Title No.390.</p>	N	<p>A meeting was held between the Applicant and PIL ID 256 on 15 February 2022 to discuss the matters raised and provide an overview of the Scheme and explain the land requirements from PIL ID 256. The title is required temporarily for temporary traffic management. At the meeting, the Applicant noted that access to the commercial business would remain open throughout the Scheme works but detailed discussions will be held with PIL ID 256 closer to construction to gain an understanding of the frequency and size of deliveries and the nature of the access so this can be incorporated into the Traffic Management Plan. An Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) has been submitted as part of the DCO application.</p>

K.3.C: Royal Mail

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 targeted consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
17 November 2021	22 December 2021	Traffic and transport	<p>Junction 9 of the M3, as the intersection between the M3 and the A34, is a critical junction used by both Royal Mail's national operation and its local collection, distribution and delivery operation. Nationally, on any given day, this junction will potentially see 85 national services carry mail to and from Dorset and Southampton Mail Centres. Vehicles operate over a 24 hour period with the majority passing through this junction between 19:00 and 05:00 daily and across 7 days a week. The M3 /A34 junction is used by services to and from the South West Distribution Centre (SWDC) in Bristol and the National Distribution Centre (NDC) in Northampton. The ES should acknowledge the requirement to ensure that major road users are not disrupted though full advance consultation at the appropriate stages in the DCO and development processes. The ES should acknowledge the need for this consultation with Royal Mail and other relevant major road users.</p>	N	<p>This DCO application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1) which has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 ('the Infrastructure EIA Regulations'). The ES identifies and assesses the likely significant effects on the environment resulting from the construction and operation of the Scheme and recommends appropriate mitigation to reduce effects.</p> <p>The DCO application is also accompanied by an Outline Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8) that provides details of how the traffic management will be undertaken during the construction works. This document will remain live during construction and will be subject to regular updates through engagement with stakeholders, including Royal Mail.</p>

K.3.D: SSE

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 targeted consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
17 November 2021	22 December 2021	Assets	Confirm if a quotation has been obtained and have accepted the costs associated with these works.	N	The Applicant has engaged in discussions with SSE that will continue during the examination process.

K.3.E: PIL ID 219

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 targeted consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
17 November 2021	22 December 2021	Land ownership, Construction - general	<p>No objections to raise against the rest of the scheme or the rest of the land affected by this scheme. However, we take this opportunity to suggest one change to the red line boundary of the scheme.</p> <p>We would prefer to see the northern extents of Plot 180 and Plot 225 removed from the Scheme or, if not possible, reduced as much as possible. Given the majority of the land is for temporary use then it appears this may very well be possible especially if we can provide other temporary land.</p> <p>Our reasons for our response to this consultation are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current proximity of the scheme to the farm buildings will cause major disturbance to the operations undertaken at the farm buildings and will affect the business run from this site. • To ensure operations at the farm buildings can continue as normal and not be adversely affected we have suggested a buffer between the buildings and the scheme area. • There is a concern over health and safety of the site with the planned scheme being located so close. • There is a concern over access and the farm yard being used without the landowner's consent to access the scheme area if it is to be located so close to the farm buildings. • To protect my client's interest in the farm buildings. 	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments received however it is not possible to modify the Application Boundary as suggested. This is because the land is required for both temporary and permanent works. However, the Applicant has added two additional commitments into the REAC (see fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3)), to mitigate any potential impacts and protect this landowner's interests as expressed. The additional commitments are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the construction works will not be permitted through the agricultural enterprise on Fulling Mill Lane without consultation with the landowner; and • Discussions will be held with the owners of the agricultural enterprise on Fulling Mill Lane during detailed design regarding Plot 5/1c (as shown on the Land Plans (Document Reference 2.2)) about maintaining a buffer between the enterprise and the construction works. <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with PIL ID 219 throughout the examination process.</p>

K.3.F: PIL ID 240

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 targeted consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
17 November 2021	22 December 2021	Land ownership, Construction – deposition areas, construction – compound locations, traffic and transport, safety.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We were advised at a site meeting that no landfill or land disposition will take place on land owned by my client in relation to this scheme. The land area identified for temporary rights is required as a compound area to be used as staff offices, welfare units and to park staff vehicles. The land area identified with permanent rights we understand is required for landscaping mitigation works, bunding, tree planting, and a cycle path through the top section. My client would prefer to retain full ownership of all of their land and grant use of this land through a lease arrangement, rather to sell any land to the scheme. My client would like to retain ownership of all land. Any land sales and consequently values have to be entirely justifiable and supportable. If environmental mitigation or greater BNG requirements are required in respect of the scheme, this may be a service that my client would be willing and could provide National Highways. My client is happy to enter into further discussions surrounding this and any environmental covenant / lease arrangement. The land shown as being permanently required stretches along the west boundary of the field and adjacent to A272 and accordingly includes the only access into the field. This access is used regularly by very large farm vehicles to include tractors and combine harvesters and access to and from the field must be maintained at all times. There is also emergency access granted across the land and via this entrance out on to the A272 from the industrial buildings which are located at Winnall Down Farm to the west of the site. Consequently this reserved right must be retained and the access kept open at all times, both during construction and on completion of the scheme, as well as being suitable for 40 tonne artic lorries. My client would prefer to retain ownership of the access directly on to the public highway. Currently access in and out of the site, as well as the recycling plant opposite is very dangerous when turning across the busy and fast A272. A request was made as to whether a 'breather / turning' lane could be configured in the middle of the road to give the opportunity for larger vehicles to stop before turning across the traffic. 	Y	<p>A meeting between the Applicant and PIL ID 240 was held on 14 December 2021 to discuss the Scheme proposals. Discussions between the Applicant and PIL ID 240 regarding land acquisition and other matters raised in this response are ongoing.</p> <p><i>In response to point 1:</i></p> <p>Following the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant revisited and redesigned the earthworks between Easton Lane and Long Walk to create a more sympathetic feature and reinforce the existing characteristics of the South Downs National Park whilst balancing visual screening requirements. In re-profiling the landform in this area, it was calculated that the excess spoil predicted to be raised during the construction phase would be sufficient to construct the new earthworks. This, in turn, prevented the need for the areas of search for excess spoil deposition and as a result the Applicant removed all three spoil deposition areas from its proposals. Therefore, the spoil deposition will not take place on land owned by PIL ID 240. The removal of all three deposition areas from the Scheme resulted in a reduction in the Application Boundary, reduced visual and acoustic intrusion into the South Downs National Park as well as the need to affect less best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p> <p><i>In response to point 2:</i></p> <p>As set out in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) the activities within this compound (presented as number 1 in the 2021 statutory consultation) would include plant storage, car parking, fuel and water storage, 'skills school', staff welfare facilities, waste segregation areas and a wheel wash. The area would also be used for material storage, a tree and hedging nursery area and material processing (earthworks and pavements) and storage of topsoil. The Applicant confirmed in the meeting that the land area identified for the compound area is for temporary rights.</p> <p>Since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has reduced the impact of the compound by reducing its footprint and selecting a location within the defined area that would maximise visual screening and would be viewed in context of / absorbed into the wider construction works. The Applicant has reduced the impact on the newly planted tree line by moving and reducing the main compound and routed the haul road to the main compound through a small area</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 targeted consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					<p>of the tree line. Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (Document Reference 6.1) and the fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3) provide details on the proposed construction working hours, lighting and mitigation measures for the Scheme.</p> <p><i>In response to point 3:</i></p> <p>Discussions between the Applicant PIL ID 240 in regards to land ownership are ongoing.</p> <p><i>In response to point 4:</i></p> <p>Discussions between the Applicant PIL ID 240 in regards to land ownership are ongoing.</p> <p><i>In response to point 5:</i></p> <p>Discussions between the Applicant PIL ID 240 in regards to land ownership are ongoing.</p> <p><i>In response to point 6:</i></p> <p>The existing access is to remain open at all times during and after construction. This access is proposed to be temporarily amended during the construction works to enable access to the construction compound.</p> <p><i>In response to point 7:</i></p> <p>This comment has been noted. PIL ID 240's ownership of access directly on to the public highway would be retained.</p> <p><i>In response to point 8:</i></p> <p>The Applicant has noted this comment. In the existing junction layout, all traffic travelling northbound on the M3 wishing to join the A34 northbound, must exit the motorway and use the main Junction 9 gyratory. This is the same for traffic travelling southbound via the A34 wishing to travel south via the M3. These flows of traffic currently lead to congestion on the M3 Junction 9 gyratory and all approaches (including Spitfire Link). With the proposed Scheme layout, these traffic movements are separated away from the gyratory roundabout by the introduction of a dedicated lane drop/lane gain arrangement (M3 to A34 and A34 to M3). This enables a smaller M3 Junction 9 (unsignalised) gyratory to be constructed. The revised layout has</p>

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 targeted consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
					been assessed using transport modelling, which predicts that queuing on the Spitfire Link will reduce. Therefore, a filter lane is not justified.

K.3.G: Southern Water

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 targeted consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
17 November 2021	22 December 2021	Consultation	Local planning and property team are reviewing the letter and associated plans provided.	N	The response is noted. The Applicant has engaged with Southern Water within the pre-application process (including meetings and a site walkover). The Applicant has received Southern Water's detailed diversion estimate and will continue to engage with Southern Water throughout the Examination and detailed design.

K.3.H: PIL ID 288

Date Consulted	Response Deadline	Consultation Topic	Matters raised in response to 2021 targeted consultation	Change Y/N?	Regard to response (s49)
17 November 2021	22 December 2021	Land ownership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The private access to PIL ID 288's property is a single track and the only means of access to the property There is a water meter within Plot Number 181 that supplies PIL ID 288's property and water pipes running up the side of the field toward Easton. 	N	The Applicant responded to the matters raised by PIL ID 288 in writing on 26 January 2022. The Applicant confirmed that works will be undertaken within the field adjoining PIL ID 288's property for the diversion of overhead power cables. The access track to PIL ID 288's property will not be used for the Scheme works. The Applicant has offered to arrange a site meeting with PIL ID 288 closer to the start of works.