

## **VolkerFitzpatrick\_OFH1\_17\_May\_2023\_PT1**

File Name: VolkerFitzpatrick\_OFH1\_17\_May\_2023\_PT1.mp3

File Length: 01:35:47

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:03:10 - 00:00:34:03

Morning, everyone. It is now time for me to open this hearing. Welcome to this open floor hearing which is held being held in connection with an application made by national Highways for an order for development consent for the M3 Junction nine Improvement Project. Before I go further, can I first check that everyone can hear me clearly? Thank you. Can also confirm with the case team manager, Mrs.

00:00:34:05 - 00:00:40:02

Norris that the recording and live streaming of this event has begun. Thank you.

00:00:41:24 - 00:01:04:08

My name is Wendy McCarthy. I'm a bachelor of law non-practicing solicitor, and I've been appointed by the secretary of state to be lead member of the panel that will examine, report and make a recommendation on the application to the to the secretary of State. And I'm now going to ask the other panel member to introduce himself.

00:01:05:14 - 00:01:14:27

Good morning. My name is Matthew Simms. I'm a chartered civil engineer and I've also been appointed by the secretary of state as a member of the panel, which will examine this application.

00:01:16:12 - 00:01:46:13

Thank you. Now, together, we constitute the examiners authority for this application. I'll just explain a few housekeeping arrangements for the benefit of those attending the hearing in person. Could I first ask everyone to please turn off or set all your devices and phones to silent so as not to disrupt the proceedings? The toilets are situated opposite the reception at the staircase.

00:01:47:13 - 00:02:15:00

Now, there is no fire alarm testing scheduled during the meeting today. Therefore, if the fire alarm does sound, please leave the building by the nearest clear exit and do not re-enter the building until instructed to do so by staff. The assembly point is the front car park. We're taking a short mid-morning break around 1130 if the proceedings are not concluded by then.

00:02:17:19 - 00:02:58:20

Now we will be following the Indicative Agenda, which is published on the Planning Inspectorate website on the 15th of May. The order in which you will be invited to speak will follow the list set out in Annex A to that agenda. However, please note that this annex includes parties who have indicated that there will be attending but not speaking. So not all of those listed will be speaking. Today's hearing is being undertaken in a hybrid way, meaning that some of you are joining us at the hearing venue and some of you will be joining us virtually using Microsoft teams.

00:02:59:13 - 00:03:06:19

We will make sure that however you decide to attend today, you will be given a fair opportunity to participate.

00:03:08:13 - 00:03:43:28

A recording of today's hearing will be made available on the M3 Junction Improvement page of the National Infrastructure Planning website as soon as practicable after the hearing is finished. With this in mind, please ensure that you speak clearly into a microphone stating your name and who you represent each time before you speak. If you are not at a table with a microphone, then we will ask you to come forward to the empty table, which has a microphone for you to use.

00:03:45:09 - 00:04:18:10

A link to the planning. Inspectorate's Privacy Notice was provided in the notification to this hearing. We assume that everybody here today is now familiar with this document which establishes how the personal data of those concerned is handled in accordance with data protection laws. Please speak to Mrs. Norris if you have any questions about this. I'll now ask my colleague, Mr. Sims, to explain the purpose of the open floor hearing.

00:04:20:04 - 00:04:54:07

Many thanks. So I'll briefly explain the purpose of this open floor hearing. The purpose is to hear the representations of interested parties who have registered to make oral representations. The open floor hearing provides an opportunity for interested parties to make their oral submissions to us as the panel. It also gives the panel an opportunity to ask speakers questions about their evidence that they've presented. Oral submissions should be based on the representations previously made in writing by the participants.

00:04:54:15 - 00:05:27:07

However, we have already read those written submissions and they will be afforded the same weight as those made orally. Therefore, what we're really looking for is not for those written submissions to be repeated, but instead this should be an opportunity to provide further detail and explanation to help us fully understand and appreciate the case you are seeking to make. The procedure that will follow today is to hear first from the interested parties who have notified us in advance of the meeting that they wish to speak.

00:05:27:22 - 00:05:59:02

We do not intend to make a strict time limit, as indicated on the agenda to make, but to make efficient use of the hearing. We would ask that your submissions are concise and to the point and to be concluded within about ten minutes for individuals and for those representing a group. We're going to be allowing about 15 minutes. I will give an indication at the end of that ten and 15 minutes if we're still there. Once you've spoken to the panel, the panel may wish to ask you questions.

00:05:59:15 - 00:06:33:03

And finally, the applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to any matters raised by each speaker. Once all speakers have been heard and that either be orally or in writing by the deadline one on the 6th of June 2023. So would ask for those presents not to interrupt whilst another person is given evidence. Even though you may disagree strongly with what is being said, it's important that everybody has a fair opportunity to put their case without interruption or other distraction.

00:06:34:09 - 00:07:11:28

The guidance for the examination of applications for development consent explains that the examining authority may refuse to hear evidence, which is, in its view, irrelevant, vexatious or frivolous, or relates to the merits of a national policy statement repeats other representations already made or relates to compensation for compulsory acquisition of land or an interest in or over land. Additionally, the examining authority may request any person behaving in a disruptive manner to leave the hearing or to remain only if that person complies with specific conditions.

00:07:13:01 - 00:07:27:21

So if there are no questions relating to the purpose of the open floor hearing. Your opportunity to ask questions now. Thank you very much. Ms.. McCoy will now continue with the introductions.

00:07:30:00 - 00:07:36:21

Thank you, Mr. Sims. Before I hear from the speakers, can I ask who will be representing the applicant today?

00:07:45:09 - 00:07:52:08

Can you hear me? There we go. Catherine Treacy from director Directorate Burgess Salmon on behalf of the applicant.

00:07:55:23 - 00:07:56:16

Thank you.

00:08:02:25 - 00:08:43:05

Now. Now invite representations from those interested parties who gave the requested notice to us of their intention to speak. I have a list of those who have indicated that there will be attending today, and this is set out at annexed to the agenda. However, as I've mentioned, not all of those persons listed intend to speak. The parties who have indicated that they will be speaking will be heard in the order set out in Annex A to the agenda For the avoidance of doubt, the parties that I have listed as speaking are Denise Elizabeth Rosewell.

00:08:44:12 - 00:09:05:05

Richard Doughty of Itch and Valley Parish Council. Rob Jordan, Andy Kee of Cycle Winchester, Christopher Gillam, Winchester, Friends of the Earth, Phil Winchester Action on the Climate Crisis and Jacky Porter Parish Councillor.

00:09:06:08 - 00:09:08:03

That correct?

00:09:10:29 - 00:09:13:16

And the County councillor, but I'll address that. Apologies.

00:09:15:02 - 00:09:19:16

Apologies. We have. We have you listed incorrectly. Thank you.

00:09:23:20 - 00:09:29:15

I was also hoping to speak. My name is Hannah Greenberg. I represent twenty's plenty Hampshire.

00:09:29:22 - 00:09:32:20

Sorry. Apologies had you down as not.

00:09:32:22 - 00:09:33:08

Speaking, but.

00:09:33:10 - 00:09:35:07

I'll include you. Hannah Green.

00:09:52:27 - 00:09:53:13

Right.

00:09:54:00 - 00:10:11:14

If there is anyone else in attendance who wishes to make submissions that have not already been made, then we do have discretion to hear any relevant submissions from those should time permit. Can I ask if there's anyone here today who wishes to speak who is not previously given notice?

00:10:16:12 - 00:10:22:12

Right. Could I therefore ask the first speaker, Mrs. Rosewall, to begin her oral submissions?

00:10:24:03 - 00:10:26:00

And as was the case.

00:10:26:02 - 00:10:29:12

Yesterday, if you could state who you are and who and.

00:10:29:29 - 00:10:31:27

Who you are representing. Okay.

00:10:31:29 - 00:11:12:03

Good morning. My name is Denise Rosewell. I am a resident along Eastern Lane, which is very close to the proposed works on the Junction. Um, so I'm representing myself and my family, but also other residents along Eastern Lane and also a long, long walk. Um, so there are approximately 10 to 12 properties, um, whose basically back gardens back onto the red line as the, the perimeter of the, of the works.

00:11:12:18 - 00:11:47:20

Um, so. Although there are wider issues. My sort of main focus is really on how how the works may affect or will affect, um, those residents really. Um. So there is it's proposed that there will be an infiltration basin, um, near to White Hill Cottage, which is also within sort of 50 to 100m of the borehole that provides our drinking water to our property.

00:11:47:22 - 00:12:21:10

So we have concerns that that will that that may well affect our drinking water. Um, so would probably be looking um, to recite the borehole I would think. Um, and I'm aware that there are at least two more boreholes at the other properties in close proximity. Um, the compound, um, is again sited very close to our property and other other properties.

00:12:21:19 - 00:13:00:21

Um, and as far as I can understand, they will be um, accessing the works across what is currently Sustrans 23 linking into Bridleway 520 and 502. Um, so this is um, pedestrian and cycle access to Winnow and Winchester, um, for Eastern Village residents. Um, so if that access isn't, isn't maintained during the works, it really does cut us off, um, and puts us in a position of needing to get into the car every time we go anywhere.

00:13:01:25 - 00:13:10:19

Um, it may also affect access to, um, Whitehill Cottage and also our own property. Um.

00:13:13:14 - 00:13:28:03

Um, another point of concern is, um. Long walk where understand they will be accessing or using footpaths 2021.

00:13:29:23 - 00:14:00:18

Part of 22 and axing accessing a long walk using the bridge M3 bridge at the bottom of long walk. So depending on the volume of traffic using that, that's got to have a massive effect on filling mill and Fulling mill cottage. So two properties at the bottom of that road. Um. In addition, that's a sort of, um.

00:14:02:24 - 00:14:12:01

Point like a spaghetti junction of bridleways and restricted byway 19 which head straight into eastern

00:14:13:17 - 00:14:31:27

footpath 52 and 49 that of all access into Winchester from the village. So it would be looking. To see sort of those those routes maintained really through. Through the works. Um.

00:14:34:14 - 00:14:35:04

Thank you.

00:14:53:12 - 00:15:07:21

Thank you very much, Mr. Rosewell. That's really kind of you. Can I just ask one short question about the borehole? Have you had any conversations with the applicant about the exact location of that borehole previous to your submission to us?

00:15:08:12 - 00:15:34:18

Yes. Um, and we were told that it would be for runoff from the footpath, the proposed new bridleway. Um, but we're not clear what the surface of that bridleway would be. Um, I believe that other properties might have been told that it would be runoff from the road, so we're really not clear. Okay.

00:15:34:20 - 00:15:39:28

Sorry. My, my, um. My confusion was asking about the location of your boar.

00:15:40:00 - 00:15:44:10

The location? Yes. Yes, we did have a site visit. So? So? And they have a location.

00:15:44:12 - 00:16:10:05

That's been highlighted. That's really kind of that's very useful that they know. And. Sorry. And you answered the second question about your your actual concern about the basin. And so we've we've seen your concern in the in your representation, which is which is really useful. So, um, I think that that fully explains your, your concern that you have. Um, so thank you for that. Okay.

00:16:12:08 - 00:16:17:00

Could you perhaps tell me a little bit more about the use of Sustrans.

00:16:17:14 - 00:16:31:09

Route 23 and other public rights of way linking your village and the dwellings within the vicinity to Winchester? As you say, without having to use the car.

00:16:32:00 - 00:17:11:29

Okay, so Sustrans, 23, runs from Winchester and directly to Easton and beyond. But um, you know, as a resident of Easton, I'm concerned mostly about residents in Eastern and the Itchen Valley. Um, and so, yes, it is a sort of it's a super highway. It's very, it's very well used by cyclists going directly into, into Winchester and out. Um, it gives us as residents, we can walk very easily to winnow and everything that, that provides that can get to Tesco nicely on foot.

00:17:12:01 - 00:17:57:13

Um, to drive is a sort of 4 or 5 mile drive round or it's less than a mile walk for, for myself and other residents and that, that location. Um, so the loss of that even for a short, even sporadic loss for a short period, it would have quite a big effect. Um, I think we accept that the, that the end goal will, will be an improvement on what we have there at the moment and that, that improved footpath bridleway

access, um, is welcomed and certainly the new post new footpath which I understand is to be a bridleway cycleway.

00:17:57:23 - 00:18:29:12

Um, you know, for everybody would be welcomed as far as I'm concerned. Um, but consideration should be given to the surface most definitely. And its rural location. I would hate, personally I'd hate to see it tarmacked. Um, it does that that proposed path would link the existing bridleway that goes through that junction, um, to restricted Byway 19, which continues on to Easton which again outside of the red line.

00:18:29:27 - 00:19:00:05

Um, so I would like to see that considered. And you know, if there is going to be increased use of the new path, how does that affect restricted Byway 19? I think it's right that that should have increased use, but it needs to also be considered. Is it up to the job? Um. And the other paths down there near to Fulling mill. 52 is a route from eastern to kings worthy.

00:19:00:23 - 00:19:32:05

Um 21 um, turns into 49 again that that goes down to winnow. Um, so that could probably be better used than it is at the moment, but it is there wouldn't like to see it disappear. Um, and think it could be the link between the, the new kings worthy path could be explored. How does that link into that footpath.

00:19:32:07 - 00:19:46:20

49 Because I think it appears that they'd be on different levels. Um, so can they be linked and has that been that, has that been sort of can it be accommodated really properly? Not not people scabbling up and down banks

00:19:48:13 - 00:19:50:12

I hope that's helpful.

00:19:50:14 - 00:20:01:00

That is. And if you could include all those points in your written summary of the oral submissions, that would be very helpful. That's deadline one, which I believe is the 6th of June.

00:20:01:02 - 00:20:01:21

Yeah, will do.

00:20:02:06 - 00:20:04:10

And then I just had a final question.

00:20:04:12 - 00:20:20:19

You did mention the proximity of the compound. Do you have any other concerns regarding that? You mentioned the contamination of all, but I'm just asking you as a resident whether you have any other concerns.

00:20:20:21 - 00:20:54:07

Yes. Um, yeah. Access, as I say, along that Sustrans 23, they are, I believe, planning to be well, this is what I've been told. So more than believe. Suppose, um, that they will be crossing that sustrans 23 um, to access well the site where the where the infiltration basin is and the, the new path and the, the construction works and the other side so definitely access during that works.

00:20:54:09 - 00:20:54:24

Um.

00:20:56:09 - 00:21:26:22

At air quality. I know that neighbors have particular concerns, particularly if they've got children with, you know, um, respiratory conditions. Um, and light. What times of the day and night will they be working? At the moment we have a beautiful view where we count the deer in the field. Imagine we're going to be counting diggers. So it's it's going to affect us.

00:21:26:24 - 00:21:29:18

There's no way, no way around that. Um.

00:21:31:07 - 00:21:36:12

So, yes, it's I'd like to see all of those things addressed and reduced as much as possible.

00:21:39:19 - 00:21:46:13

No, thank you. And I must say, we did spot deer when we were on our unaccompanied site visit. It's very.

00:21:46:15 - 00:21:47:00

Beautiful.

00:21:51:00 - 00:22:00:18

Right. Thank you very much indeed. Um, that's very helpful. So if I could now hear from Richard Doughty, Itchen Valley Parish Council.

00:22:06:19 - 00:22:07:12

Uh, good morning.

00:22:07:21 - 00:22:08:06

Right.

00:22:09:04 - 00:22:11:16

Richard Kitchen, Valley Parish Council.

00:22:11:25 - 00:22:12:14

Thank you.

00:22:13:11 - 00:22:49:00

Um, I'm going to speak on points for the council. Uh, significant, significant area of the development consent order boundary is in our parish. The parish is interested in various aspects of the project, including but not limited to accessible routes, footpaths, cycling and bridleways. The impact on the river Itchen. The impact of construction diversions and noise and the quality of landscaping. We believe the initial assessment of principal issues and the statements of common ground cover many of these interests.

00:22:51:00 - 00:23:22:22

That said, we have one outstanding interest that we wish further consideration. The development consent order boundary runs north east along the A33. It stops at the junction of the A33 and the B3. 473047. Known as the Cartoon Horse Junction. The junction is of significant concern as it is considered unsafe. We seek short and long term resolution to this. In the project documents.

00:23:22:24 - 00:24:00:23

2.5 General Arrangement plans Sheet three. They state that the existing cart and horses junction configuration is to remain. The unaccompanied unaccompanied sight inspection. One shows that the

examining authority have visited the site. Hampshire County Council has stated on their web page Cartoon Horse Junction Improvements. Winchester. That in light of the proposed highway changes by national highways to M3 Junction nine and a strong local desire to see the junction redesigned to better accommodate vehicular movements, the County Council will develop proposals to improve the junction.

00:24:01:28 - 00:24:24:16

Further, they state no funding has been identified to deliver a scheme, so the county will work with national highways to develop a delivery and funding plan. We would like to see the rationale for the decision in the project to leave the configuration the same assessed. We would like to see the long term improvement of the junction included in the project.

00:24:31:26 - 00:24:33:18

Thank you, Mr. Doughty.

00:24:40:00 - 00:24:42:21

Thank you. Mean as we're aware.

00:24:42:23 - 00:24:44:09

Of those concerns and.

00:24:44:11 - 00:24:55:03

Thank you for your contribution today. And as you know, we have already had a look there and I'm sure it will figure further in the examination. But thank you for your contribution today.

00:24:55:12 - 00:24:56:09

Thank you very much.

00:25:06:25 - 00:25:08:04

Right. So the next people.

00:25:08:06 - 00:25:13:07

I'd like to hear from, I have two people full cycle. Winchester. I'm not sure.

00:25:13:09 - 00:25:17:02

In which order or if both are speaking. That's Rob Jordan.

00:25:17:04 - 00:25:18:06

And Andy Key.

00:25:25:29 - 00:25:44:03

Good morning. I'm Rob Jordan of Cycle Winchester and I registered to speak. We didn't think Andy was able to attend at the time. He's actually got the greatest background in this, so I'll defer to him for questions, but I'll deliver the oral representation in the first instance, if that's okay.

00:25:46:19 - 00:26:18:13

So cycle Winchester We campaign to improve cycle infrastructure in Winchester. We argue that improved cycle infrastructure will result in a shift from car journeys to active modes of travel, leading to benefits such as reduce carbon emissions, reduce congestion and improved health. And in relation to this examination, our supporters and members will have a variety of views for and against the improvement scheme as a whole. But as an organisation we have two main concerns in relation to the examination.



00:26:18:16 - 00:26:50:24

The first is to ensure that the scheme, if it goes ahead, provides improved cycle infrastructure. And the second is that cycle routes should not be unreasonably disrupted during the construction period. So I'll address those two points in relation to improving cycle infrastructure at the end of the project. And the scheme has proposed provides an important new cycle link from King's Worthy to Wintle, which will support active modes of travel between a major residential area and a main shopping and industrial location.

00:26:50:26 - 00:26:59:21

And we believe that this cycleway will allow residents to switch from car journeys to bike with benefits to climate congestion, health that I've already mentioned.

00:27:01:09 - 00:27:14:24

And the scheme also provides improved commuting and leisure cycle routes between Winchester and Easton and onward into the Ancient Valley via 23. As Mrs. Rosewell has mentioned.

00:27:16:17 - 00:27:50:06

And we are aware that cycling issues can seem insignificant in the context of such a large road project. And that was illustrated earlier in the project when the Kings worthy to win or cycleway was at one stage removed from the scope of the project due to budgetary pressures. And over the past months and years cycle, Winchester has engaged vigorously with the applicant with the help and support of South Downs National Park Authority, the British Horse Society and the Ramblers to reinstate this cycle link.

00:27:50:08 - 00:28:22:08

And we're pleased to see that it now forms part of the proposed scheme. Nonetheless, we'll continue to lobby to ensure that these cycle infrastructure improvements remain in scope as the project progresses. And we note in the papers from yesterday's meeting that both the South Downs National Park Authority and Hampshire County Council are responsible in the statements of Common Ground to take into account and quote effects on the public rights of way and on cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders.

00:28:24:21 - 00:28:56:01

And during our engagement with the applicant, it appears that they've been so far reluctant to discuss the legal statuses of the proposed new routes with us. And in the past, a lack of clarity over the legal status, particularly of the crossing of the M3 eventually resulted in the anomalous situation where one half of the current path across junction nine is legally a bridleway while the other half isn't. And the plans as presented actually reproduced that situation without any attempt to resolve it.

00:28:57:10 - 00:29:05:16

So we'd request to be included in consultations between these statutory bodies and the applicants in relation to these statements of common ground.

00:29:07:18 - 00:29:57:18

So I'll move now on to disruption during the construction period. Our second concern and our view is that the diversion route for cyclists during the construction is not fit for purpose. Prior to submission, the applicant assured us that no decisions had been taken on no non-motorized diversions and that we would be consulted before any were proposed. We were therefore surprised to find that the applicant's submission included a detailed diversion route for cyclists and horse riders during construction, and the proposed diversion is both illegal for cyclists and physically impossible for cyclists and pedestrian equestrians to use, including, as it does two public footpaths, two stiles and a bridge with clearance so low that even pedestrians have to duck when using it.

00:29:58:03 - 00:30:30:18

And bear in mind, as Mrs. Rosewell has said, this is a diversion for a well-used national cycle network route. So we're very concerned about this as it suggests that despite all the good work so far, the applicant is still not taking the requirements of Non-motorised users seriously. And we would like to see the applicant work with its walking cycling and horse riding advisory group to identify a satisfactory diversion route. In the absence of that, and again, I echo Mrs.

00:30:30:20 - 00:30:48:07

Russo's comments, an important national cycle network route, which is well used by commuters and leisure cyclists, will become impassable for an extended period, causing a reduction in cycling, which is the exact opposite of the goal for which we campaign. Thank you. That's my statement.

00:30:49:06 - 00:30:49:27

Thank you.

00:30:52:20 - 00:31:14:10

Thank you very much. The only question I've got is you mentioned the consultative group, just for our clarity, who was within that consultative group and broadly, are you as one in terms of your responses? I'm just trying to understand how your response may differ to other parts of the consultative group.

00:31:15:03 - 00:31:45:29

Um, yeah, that's me. Um, myself and one other member of the Cycle Winchester team are members of that consultative group together with, as Rob said, um, representatives from the Ramblers, British Society and South Wales National Park Authority. Um, I think I can say with confidence that we are pretty much of one mind on what should be produced out of this project in terms of walking, cycling and horse riding facilities.

00:31:46:01 - 00:32:11:06

I'm very pleased to say that when that King's worthy route was taken out of the plan at one point, we had a lot of support from those other representatives stepping forward and saying, This is ridiculous. Of course there should be a cycle route there. So yeah, I think we have worked together and come up with a common point of view which we have put to the applicant in meetings.

00:32:11:08 - 00:32:16:13

Sorry, Just as a follow up for clarity, were Hampshire County Council involved with that consultative group as well?

00:32:16:15 - 00:32:24:12

They weren't there, invited in originally, but declined to take part. Okay. Um, I would add the.

00:32:26:22 - 00:33:00:14

Yeah. So just one related thing is one thing that we haven't had the chance to discuss is the motor vehicle diversion routes during construction, not just the cycle routes. It's not just about where the cyclists and horse riders go. It's about what effect it's going to have on surrounding roads in the area, some of which are well used by cyclists. For instance, the B 347, quite aside from the cart and horses junction is a very popular recreational cycle route, major access point to the national park and to the villages.

00:33:01:03 - 00:33:08:19

And so far we haven't been able to have a serious conversation with the applicant about that. Along with those other things that Rob mentioned.

00:33:09:25 - 00:33:24:29

Okay. Thank you very much. I think the points that you've made for me are really quite clear in your your submissions. So I've got no further questions of clarification on those points because they're very clear. And thank you for making them clear.

00:33:30:09 - 00:33:52:05

Could I just ask in terms of the proposed diversion, which you say is impractical? Um, how could you just outline for the purposes of today how you consider that would be best resolved? Is there a reasonably practicable alternative solution that you've been putting forward?

00:33:54:18 - 00:34:26:21

And we haven't yet. But again, again, that's partly because we want we would like to do that in terms in the context of a conversation about where the vehicle diversion routes are going to be. It's a difficult one. We don't deny that. It's a very difficult diversion to achieve, but nonetheless, that's a conversation we need to have. The obvious ways to go in terms of cycling are up to the 347 or down to the B three 404. I think it is the Oxford Road, both of which are accessible via country lanes from Eastern Village. Basically, we're looking at something that links Eastern Village through to Windsor.

00:34:27:26 - 00:35:01:01

So both of those might be possible. And yeah, that's something we would like to discuss with the applicant. We asked to discuss it before they submitted the plans to yourselves, but that didn't happen. We were assured that those plans would be discussed later on and nothing had yet been decided. So it's quite a difficult one. But yeah, those are the two options basically along the lanes to the north or to the south to the the nearest roads that do cross over the existing motorway.

00:35:02:28 - 00:35:11:06

Right. Thank you. And again, if you could include those all those points in your written summary. Thank you very much.

00:35:19:03 - 00:35:21:18

Mayor now hear from Hannah Greenberg.

00:35:24:08 - 00:36:03:05

Hello, I'm Dr. Hannah Greenberg. For clarity, I'm a medical doctor, and I'm also the county lead for 2020 for Hampshire. And I represent residents throughout Hampshire who want slower speeds where traffic and people mix and feel that their lives are already blighted by excess traffic, which is travelling too fast through their homes. I'm also a district councillor for Twyford and called In Common and I also run a weekly cycle bus along the B3 335, which is code and common to Twyford, to Winchester, which is a secondary school cycle bus, which is tricky to do along that road as things stand.

00:36:03:07 - 00:37:03:12

Um, so as said, we already feel in Twyford and Colgan Common that our lives are quite blighted by the high volume of heavy traffic which has been caused by the traffic by the Twyford down construction, M3, M3 construction and the road layout, particularly in Twyford, isn't suitable for the heavy traffic that we have at the moment and we're worried about the induced traffic that this may cause. Um, I'm worried about the environmental, human health and mental distress impacts as well as the prohibitive effects this might have on cycling and walking in the wider network, but also in Twyford and Colden Common at the moment in Twyford and Cold and Common, we are dominated and divided by a road that if you have any mobility issues at all, is impossible to cross because we don't have any well, we don't have adequate light controlled crossings for pedestrians and we don't have any cycling facilities.

00:37:04:03 - 00:37:40:05

Um, during the construction and diversion phase, there's also an unsafe crossing at Junction 11 near the Hockley Golf course. Um. The B three, three, five. So that is that is not the junction 11 itself. That is the crossing for pedestrians which goes across the B3 three five south of the motorway there. There is no light phasing there for pedestrians and you can't see what the lights are for the traffic coming off the motorway or coming from.

00:37:40:07 - 00:38:16:24

Hockley Link The problem, that's a problem as it is anyway. It's dangerous as it is, but my concern is when you are diverting traffic, the northbound traffic on the motorway and when you're using junction 11 to divert the traffic and then turn it around again at junction 11, the pressure on that junction, first of all, to use that junction as a pedestrian or as a cyclist is going to be unbearably dangerous. And also with the heavily increased volume of traffic that will back up into Twyford.

00:38:16:26 - 00:38:48:11

So I think we will need some proper light controlled crossings there for pedestrians and cyclists and a sorting out of that junction, looking at it properly as part of mitigating, but also a consideration of what the effects on the wider network in terms of induced traffic and induced congestion is going to be. So that backing up into Twyford and Cold and Common and the concomitant pollution noise effects on health distress and the prohibition of safe, active travel is a big concern for us.

00:38:49:09 - 00:39:20:18

It will also be the case not just during construction, but due to the increased demand of use of the road long term, especially now. And I don't make a judgment about it, but that we won't have the smart motorways. There isn't the increased capacity south of Junction 11 potentially. And so there's. The concern is that there will be increased motivation to use the B3 three five for heavy traffic.

00:39:20:20 - 00:39:53:21

And as I said, that is an unsuitable road as it stands. So I'd like consideration of mitigating measures along the B3 three five. At the moment we have. I think it's five changes of speed limits within three miles and some standardization of those speed limits and reduction of those speed limits would be a really good idea. I think in terms of mitigation measures, in terms of pedestrian and cyclist safety, in terms of noise and emission reduction.

00:39:54:21 - 00:40:23:18

There's also one very short section which currently is 60 miles an hour. And and with the current level of traffic, it's impossible to use unless you are a very, very experienced cyclist. We have to take a group of children with adults protecting them on the outside. That's the only way that we can normalize cycling for children is by physically protecting them with adults along that route at the moment. And.

00:40:26:13 - 00:41:06:27

One. I've got. I've got myself lost. Um. So, um, I also. So I organized my notes based on the lists in Annex C, so I'll just move on to the next one, which is the noise and vibration under the, under that you had said whether the proposed development would. Contribute to health and quality of life. And I would like it to be considered whether or not this proposed development will negatively contribute to the health and quality of life of the population around the wider network, especially as surrounding communities and dwellings are impacted by the increased traffic.

00:41:08:25 - 00:41:09:10

Um.

00:41:12:00 - 00:41:13:16

I just checked. Close.

00:41:17:21 - 00:41:57:11

Did you? And I suppose my other question is this, that really when you look at the alternatives that have been suggested, the only alternatives that have been mentioned are alternative routes and not the alternatives to this construction in its entirety. And as demonstrated yesterday in Winchester, where there was a closure of the M3 and the entire network came to a gridlock. We don't have the capacity to have the amount of traffic that we have as it is on our roads and inducing more traffic is going to be a problem.

00:41:57:13 - 00:42:11:21

So I think looking into the alternatives to remove some of that traffic from our network would improve safety, improve air quality and should be done as a first phase.

00:42:13:18 - 00:42:14:20

Thank you so much.

00:42:21:16 - 00:42:40:04

No, thank you very much. And can I just clarify the mitigation you were seeking for the B3? Three five. Um, that I my understanding you said that your concerns related to operation as well as construction. So you're seeking mitigation for both periods?

00:42:41:09 - 00:43:14:03

Absolutely. I don't know if you did a site visit to the B3 three five, but at the moment it's a small village road that goes through Twyford and we have high volumes of HGVs on it as it is. So the mitigating measures that I think should be considered there are the standardization and reduction of speed limits along there. At the moment it goes 60, 40, 30, 50, 30 and then and that's confusing. And each of those speed limits is only for a short while.

00:43:14:05 - 00:43:47:14

So reduction of them and standardization of them and also. Light controlled crossings, adequate light and controlled crossings at the junction at the Junction 11 junction, and also through Twyford, and called in common for the backed up traffic. I would like consideration of a weight restriction along that road because at the moment the volume of HGVs is very heavy and unsuitable and I'm concerned that that will only grow with increased use.

00:43:50:02 - 00:44:25:24

Ideally, I'd like a cycle lane. Really? That would be fantastic. I should probably have spoken to Cycle Winchester about that beforehand, but but reduction of speeds would allow for better cycling and actually that is also an access to the South Downs be 335 and it is also a route to reduce traffic coming into Winchester. That's why we've set up the cycle bus is to reduce the traffic coming into Winchester. And if we can do whatever we can to improve access for people to active travel, if that could be part of the mitigation, that would help.

00:44:26:15 - 00:44:27:06

Thank you.

00:44:28:03 - 00:44:28:25

Thank you.

00:44:30:16 - 00:45:03:27

Yeah. Just to clarify, on the a company site visit, we did note your suggestion for a company site visit along the that road. So that will be on our list that we're suggesting so that will be done. And can I just

clarify just for for for my knowledge, you're you're representing a group called 2020s for Hampshire. And your relevant rep talks a lot about a one specific road and and junction 11 and south but doesn't doesn't go into. Oh sorry about that doesn't go into other parts of of Winchester itself.

00:45:03:29 - 00:45:13:29

I was just wondering if there's a boundary in terms of who the group represents or whether that's just your your concern is particularly those things.

00:45:15:13 - 00:45:48:08

So yeah, I wear a few hats. So in terms of 2020, Hampshire am aware of a wide spread throughout Hampshire, concern about the burden of traffic and the limitations that places on people's lives at the moment, particularly in terms of cycling, walking and accessing the their lives around them. Specifically for this, I was representing Twyford and called and Common as the district councillor for Twyford and Colden Common, which is why I've focused on that and also the cycle bus that comes through there.

00:45:48:10 - 00:46:02:02

But any increase in traffic volume is going to have a negative impact on lots of populations. Lots of residents who have spoken to me about this. Thank you. Not just in that area. Okay, it's.

00:46:02:04 - 00:46:03:21

Really helpful for clarification. Thank you.

00:46:09:27 - 00:46:11:17

Right. Thank you. Can I now hear.

00:46:11:19 - 00:46:12:19

From Christopher.

00:46:12:21 - 00:46:14:15

Gillam? Winchester, Friends of the Earth.

00:46:15:09 - 00:46:17:15

Thank you. Thank you, ma'am. Um.

00:46:19:05 - 00:46:54:09

I intend to speak to many of the issues hearings on particular particular matters. But perhaps I should briefly say my, my, my history, the Winchester Friends of the Earth history in respect of the M3, it goes right back to 1975 where where Winchester Friends of the Earth was involved in the action against the first M3 scheme, which went straight down the Itchen Valley.

00:46:54:18 - 00:47:28:00

Um, personally, I've been involved since the 1976 inquiry. The three more inquiries into the M3 followed that, um, particularly ending up in with the Twyford Down scheme. In between there was another inquiry which people have probably forgotten about, which was to another scheme which was from the M3 junction nine into the heart of Winchester called the Eastern Lane Link Road. Fortunately, we managed to defeat that.

00:47:28:16 - 00:47:56:00

That was um that, that that area is now the the the nature reserve that of wind or moors. So we only have that because we stopped one of these road schemes that seemed necessary at the time. Um, our, our objection is sort of manifold really. It's mainly to, to this particular scheme, um,

00:47:57:24 - 00:48:07:12

its capacity increase the, the direct environmental damage that results from that. Um, but um.

00:48:08:29 - 00:48:40:27

Also to a transport policy which is not integrated, as Dr. Greenberg has suggested there's no consideration of. Proper transport alternatives to what is being proposed. Um, the our objection will be to the sort of that it's fundamentally misconceived that one of its major objectives, the removal of congestion, is illusory. In fact it's illusory to the point of dishonesty.

00:48:40:29 - 00:49:10:13

Road building has never resulted in reduction of congestion on national network, and it will not because it induces traffic. And we knew that. We've known that since 1994. Think with the bit later, perhaps with the Sakura report. Um, we're concerned with the effect of induced traffic, as Dr. Greenberg had suggested on the, on the local network. Um,

00:49:12:08 - 00:49:12:28

we

00:49:14:25 - 00:49:27:25

a concern with an economic analysis which we the we think is is also misconceived. Um. On congestion relief.

00:49:29:24 - 00:50:00:09

Noting that the the the previous inquiries into the Twyford down scheme and the scheme before all of this was supposed to relieve congestion. And now even within the lifetime of that scheme, the scheme lifetime, they are now demanding more congestion relief. And so it goes on and it goes on and it will have effects well beyond this scheme in particular. Um. The.

00:50:01:09 - 00:50:28:27

There is a threat to Twyford down the Twyford down scheme now Twyford down is. You must know by now that it was regarded as extremely important in this area in terms of its landscape importance. It's the, the, the salient of the national park. It's got this horrible cutting through it. And if we increase capacity at M3 Junction nine, the induced traffic makes the cutting erm

00:50:31:06 - 00:51:16:01

probably reduces the will, make the capacity of the cutting unsuitable for the level of traffic it will induce. So there will be um, there will be demands by, by by the agency to, to widen Twyford down. They already have a plan for that. They had a plan which they kept secret from the, from the public which is only revealed by a leaking process is all described in Barbara Bryant's book on the Twyford down um last year um a plan to widen Twyford down and they've kept that very secret but it will it will loom

00:51:18:04 - 00:51:45:17

to increase traffic through this junction and there will be capacity capacity increased demands for M3 south now that the smart motorway concept has been, um, been removed and they have to go back to the to do all three operation and there will be further demands for capacity increase on the a34. This thing just goes on and on and we're

00:51:47:12 - 00:52:12:25

very, very concerned about it. In particular, we're concerned about the the national policy now understand the the instruction that we can't really contest national policy, but national policy has to be has to be logical, has to be consistent, has to be, um

00:52:15:16 - 00:52:16:01  
and

00:52:18:26 - 00:52:50:12  
can't be, um, in defiance of, of of, of, of physics, if you like, the, the, you might be in the situation, the sort of famous situation of the Indiana legislature which decided that the mathematical pi should take the value three and that was a policy. Um the the the national the national policy with all the ends in it can't remember it.

00:52:50:14 - 00:53:22:07  
National networks, national policy national policy statement that that that was written before the net zero commitment of of of the government. It's there is a draft revision of of this which has only come about because there have been legal pressures put on the Department for Transport to change this policy. And finally they put up this policy for consultation.

00:53:22:23 - 00:54:01:08  
That consultation is going to take place during this, um, during the period of this inquiry. But the central principle of the national highways in respect of climate emissions is the principle that the total amount of carbon emissions that the the scheme represents are small compared with the total carbon emissions of the nation as a whole. Now that absurd position is, is is promoted across the country for every scheme that National Highways is promoting.

00:54:01:15 - 00:54:40:25  
And so they say they can't add up all these individual carbon sums into the one big sum that threatens that threatens the carbon, the government's net zero objective. And one of the things we're really concerned with is an inquiry like this should consider the in combination effects of all the schemes in the the the programme, the major road network, all the £100 billion of of road networks that are in the current government programme.

00:54:41:26 - 00:54:42:12  
Um.

00:54:49:06 - 00:54:49:22  
Uh.

00:54:50:09 - 00:55:24:09  
I think most of the other stuff I have, I have sort of already indicated in written stuff. Um, I think that the other matters of policy or deemed to be policy that I wonder about things like air quality thresholds where we know that the legal thresholds by which local authorities and and governments are supposedly bound, that legal thresholds have almost nothing

00:55:26:00 - 00:56:04:29  
useful to say about the health consequences of air pollution. We know that the current legal thresholds are well, well above what they should be. If we were concerned about the health consequences, particularly for particularly for particulates and the the there is there is some there are indications that the government is thinking about reducing these thresholds. There is a local indication that the local authority may reduce its its thresholds.

00:56:05:01 - 00:56:25:19  
So. I'm concerned that the air quality predictions of this of this scheme are measured against what is likely to be the health consequence of air pollution. Not that the existing legal threshold measure.

00:56:28:10 - 00:56:29:15



And, uh.

00:56:30:10 - 00:56:30:25

Uh.

00:56:31:12 - 00:57:01:14

Yes. And to to to echo Dr. Greenberg. Think the the perhaps the most important thing I'd like to hear from the inquiry is that the possibility of investigating alternative, alternative ways of reducing congestion if congestion is the problem, and those alternatives should or ought sensibly to include non road alternatives. The.

00:57:02:18 - 00:57:11:03

The standing of the High Court decision on Stonehenge, which I'm sure you're aware of,

00:57:13:17 - 00:57:14:06

was.

00:57:20:00 - 00:57:51:14

Statement was that the government should have considered alternatives. Think it's not yet clear whether the judge was saying you should consider all alternatives or other road alternatives. But that's a that's perhaps a moot point. I just feel that an inquiry of this nature ought really to consider. If the problem is congestion, what is the best way of solving it? And if the best way of solving it might might well be in the direction of non road alternatives.

00:57:52:03 - 00:57:52:22

Thank you.

00:57:55:09 - 00:57:57:08

No, thank. Thank you very much.

00:58:05:05 - 00:58:09:29

You've made your key points quite clearly. I've no questions

00:58:11:21 - 00:58:12:06

from you.

00:58:12:08 - 00:58:19:25

No. Similarly, I think the key points and your submission is very comprehensive of where we are now. So thank you. I have no further questions either.

00:58:25:15 - 00:58:26:21

Hear from Phil.

00:58:27:06 - 00:58:28:20

Winchester action on.

00:58:28:27 - 00:58:30:22

The climate crisis.

00:58:32:14 - 00:59:01:29

Thank you, ma'am. Um, as the name implies, we're very concerned about how this project will increase carbon emissions and how the applicant has analyzed the ways in which it will minimize that extent, the extent to which the project will have an impact on.

00:59:03:19 - 00:59:34:06

This greenhouse gas emissions were deeply worried that the quality of the analysis misses the point and misses a number of government policies. The first specific point I made in my initial submission and want to say a bit more about now is the consideration of alternatives. This follows up on one of the points that Mr. Gillam was making.

00:59:35:14 - 01:00:19:23

We are worried that the NPS and N guidance on consideration of alternatives has not been taken far enough. We feel their vision is focused, understandably, given the applicant's name on highways. But actually the problem is congestion. M3 Junction nine And if there are ways that the congestion can be reduced for less money, less disruption and with a better carbon footprint, they should be appraised in some detail.

01:00:20:03 - 01:00:53:26

We do not see any appraisal in the application papers that look at the possibility of developing the proportion of freight that goes by train instead of going along the a34. It could go along the railway line from Southampton docks to the north west, North East Midlands and East Midlands. And indeed, it's not my idea this.

01:00:54:09 - 01:01:43:22

It is an idea behind a joint national highways. The applicant and network Rail's study to explore the possibility of putting more of the docks freight on the railway line. And we are shocked really, that they that national highways have failed to follow up that possibility as the NPS and and says if we can find ways of encouraging a modal shift from rail to road, there will be 70% less greenhouse gas emissions, 1/15 of the NOx emissions and 90% less of the PM 2.5 emissions.

01:01:44:09 - 01:02:24:22

The people who run Southampton docks have expressed the desire, a very strong desire to transfer a third. Well, sorry, let's get this right. To increase the proportion of rail transit from the docks by 30%. So it seems that all the flags are pointing the right way that docks traffic could be transferred to the railway line, and the rail freight group are extremely keen to electrify the whole of the route in order to facilitate that and reduce emissions.

01:02:24:24 - 01:03:13:20

But there are other non roadway ways of relieving the congestion congestion as well. The other big element I think in the congestion that everyone's trying to solve around M3 Junction nine is commuter traffic from Winchester and Basingstoke to Southampton. And actually there is a very poor commuter train service and I think it would be a considerably lower carbon footprint to increase the frequency of all stations, trains from Winchester to Southampton and thereby remove quite a lot of the incoming traffic to Winchester in the morning and outgoing traffic to Southampton in the evening.

01:03:14:10 - 01:04:03:02

But I'm not saying the problem is solved, but I am saying it was probably a big omission not to appraise these ways of reducing emissions. I have included other examples of how those emissions can be included, but I'll submit that in writing. Although it is worth also mentioning the possibility of following up bus back better and funding nationally a much better, more frequent district bus service which will also remove particularly traffic coming into Winchester from the north, which is a major problem at the moment on the A34 just.

01:04:03:07 - 01:04:34:09

Suppose we were to reduce the demand for driving and freight traffic along that junction. Then there would be no need for this disruption. There would be no need for the current day price. £160 million contribute a proposal. Um, the second point I would like to I hope you will be able to explore is the traffic flow predictions.

01:04:35:00 - 01:05:12:05

There are there is an extensive paper of traffic flow predictions and that paper looks at, I think, 2037, 2047 traffic flow figures. What it doesn't do, although it has prepared the model, it tells us it's prepared the model. It doesn't tell us what the traffic flow in 2017 is. And without that baseline, it's extremely difficult for people like us or indeed people like you to look at the movement of the pattern.

01:05:12:07 - 01:06:01:23

So I would put in a plea that we do ask for, um, baseline data on traffic flow. What we do have though, is the comparison between what's called do nothing and do something, which seems to be a comparison between what will happen in certain years if the project goes ahead compared with if the project doesn't go ahead. And we have figures produced by the traffic modelling saying if the project goes ahead, all that money is spent or that carbon's caused by construction, um, there will be a 4% increase in traffic on the strategic roads, in other words, the A34 and the M3.

01:06:02:10 - 01:06:35:28

That doesn't seem very much to me. And also it will help traffic across Winchester. There will be a 3% reduction in traffic across Winchester. The traffic flow modelling also looks at how long journeys take. So that's another angle on this. And by 2047 we are told just get the right figure. The average time saving on the journeys that have been explored.

01:06:36:00 - 01:07:12:16

So that's just averaging the journeys. It's not weighted according to number of vehicles, but the average time saving on journeys, um, in 2047 will be 56 seconds on journeys that go across Winchester. That's less than 10% of the time it takes vehicles to go across Winchester. So this is. An amazingly underwhelming project in terms of the benefits it will create by 2047.

01:07:13:08 - 01:08:02:21

Um, so I don't know and I hope we can explore this, whether that indicates that, um, it's all right. There won't be much of a problem because of this project, therefore it should go ahead. Or is it really worth spending money on saving 56 seconds? Or um, are perhaps the forecasts measured so that it looks like the project will be relatively innocuous and then someone will be shrugging their shoulders in 2047 when there is again congestion, when they type of traffic attraction, that doubling the width of the junction produces produces congestion again on the motorway.

01:08:03:02 - 01:08:33:03

Um, or, or does it mean that some of the alternative strategies I just mentioned might be more effective in terms of speeding up journeys etcetera? The other another theme I hope you'll be able to explore is, um, and indeed it has been raised in the scoping paper is PM 2.5 pollution.

01:08:34:05 - 01:09:09:28

This isn't seriously mentioned. When asked to have a think about it, the applicant said, All right, I'll publish some tables. There is no significant discussion about an increasingly recognized major problem. The maps in the preliminary environmental papers show that there will be between 10 and 12 micro grams of PM, 2.5 per whatever.

01:09:10:09 - 01:09:10:24

Um.

01:09:12:10 - 01:09:12:25

Uh.

01:09:13:24 - 01:09:56:08

The currently is all around junction nine, so any increase in traffic will probably make that worse. But I think roadside emissions are pretty serious and bad for the people in Will. But that even more serious for everyone using the motorway. There will be a terrible outbreak of symptoms relating to travelling along the motorway and I think it is probably irresponsible not to start addressing it because the government is proposing standards that this that Junction nine will not be compliant with on PM 2.5.

01:09:56:29 - 01:10:30:12

And I'm really worried about that in terms of the health effects it will have. Uh, another theme I hope you will be able to explore is how the calculations have been done on the likely, uh, greenhouse gas emissions. And I'm really worried at the methodology here, and I think this is not something that is a pedantic little footnote in our lives.

01:10:30:19 - 01:11:03:20

It's something that will affect all of us and will affect our whole civilization if we don't get a handle on it. And there is an extraordinary quote in paragraph 14, 538 of Chapter 14. It is noted that the 2008 does not impose a legal duty to set carbon budgets at a smaller scale than national. Um, therefore we're not going to bother about it.

01:11:03:22 - 01:11:35:06

And that's effectively what it goes on to say. That feels to me really worrying. It's a bit like saying, well, um, I agree. There's a 70 mile an hour national speed limit, but there's no local speed limit, so you can go any speed you like. It does seem to be a fundamental misunderstanding of the relationship between law nationally, targets nationally and what happens locally.

01:11:35:12 - 01:11:49:18

And I suggest that we should be respecting the national targets and apportioning them to what happens locally. So the baseline for carbon

01:11:51:04 - 01:12:26:20

measurement should really be there some relationship to the data issued by the government. It used to be called bays, but now it's called business. Um, the, the data issued by the government for Winchester district. So in this paper we've calculated what we think is a rough estimate of how much data would be, um, commensurate with what happens across the district.

01:12:26:22 - 01:13:05:03

But I think if there is a transport model, it is extraordinary that there isn't a carbon baseline that's based on the transport model that was done in 2017 that can say what the current um, carbon level of the roads concerned in the traffic model which covers Winchester and the main roads, Winchester Town and the main roads. So there's a very, very clear model area and the guidance does say you will create a carbon baseline in relationship to your traffic modelling area.

01:13:05:05 - 01:13:38:25

That seems to have been ignored. But instead of that apportioning of traffic in the modelling area, we are given a baseline figure for all transport emissions in the whole of south eastern England. That seems to me. Very negligent. So, of course, any savings identified will be seen as minimal. Um, because you've got such a big base, i.e.

01:13:38:27 - 01:14:21:28

transport emissions in the whole of Southeast and England compared with likely emissions in a very, very small area. So I'm really worried that this logic, some might call it sophistry, has produced a conclusion that there isn't any CO2 emissions or greenhouse gas emissions to worry about. So I am worried about them. And our amateurish calculations suggest that the level of baseline emission is a very, very tiny fraction.

01:14:22:01 - 01:15:01:24

I can't see the number here because my eyesight's not good, but it's a very, very tiny fraction of the baseline figure that is quoted in the paperwork. That then means that that um, the calculated increase we're given an appendix which shows how the increase in greenhouse gas emissions will result as a result of will come about as a result of this project. And there's a whole appendix that just has two figures no workings, no rationale, no set of assumptions.

01:15:01:28 - 01:15:26:29

And so I think we are actually being denied the workings that lead to the overall conclusion on climate emissions. So I'm really hope that time can be set aside to look at the workings of the climate case in this project, because I can make no sense of it at all.

01:15:27:26 - 01:15:43:18

Mr.. Just say that you've reached your 15 minutes that we. Yeah, it's gone very quickly. Um, so more heading then one more head in it. But if you could wrap that up quite succinctly, if that's okay, because we do have your, your submissions and there's an opportunity to to continue to respond.

01:15:43:24 - 01:15:45:07

Time goes through quite quickly.

01:15:45:09 - 01:15:48:08

So thank you very much. If you could do that, that'd be very so.

01:15:49:05 - 01:15:53:16

And, and I will submit the detail of this, um,

01:15:56:07 - 01:15:58:18

rushing on and.

01:16:01:26 - 01:16:32:18

Effectively our calculations show that the base. Yes, I think there's one final point, which is about the government's pathway to net zero. The paperwork refers. Very. Almost. I'll pass on to climate. Climate budgets. But actually, there is a very precise government pathway to net zero, and there is a spreadsheet that shows that we should all be aiming to have.

01:16:32:20 - 01:17:10:28

So a percentage decrease annually until 2050. That should be factored in to the baseline or the do nothing the do minimum climate data that appears in the comparisons that will then that then means that by 2047 the predicted level of climate emissions for this project or for the area in this project will be way above what would be proportionate to the net zero pathway.

01:17:11:00 - 01:17:15:06

Thank you. And I'm sorry to over wrapping up quickly.

01:17:15:08 - 01:17:17:04

That's very funny. Talk.

01:17:20:05 - 01:17:21:11

Thank you. Um,

01:17:23:05 - 01:17:27:25

I don't have any. I mean, your points were very clearly made, and I don't have any questions. Um.

01:17:28:07 - 01:17:31:12

No, I don't. I don't have any questions. Thank you very much.

01:17:34:01 - 01:17:34:21

Could I hear.

01:17:34:23 - 01:17:35:18

Now from.

01:17:35:20 - 01:17:38:16

Jackie Porter, County Councillor.

01:17:38:18 - 01:18:10:21

Thank you very much indeed. There is a parish called Itchen Valley and Richard Doughty has just spoken on their behalf. It's one of the parishes that I represent within the county division of the same name. It causes confusion quite frequently, so please don't worry about it. It covers approximately 8000 households, and I've been representing it since 2005. The division comprises over 30 communities from a market town and hamlets of a few homes. It covers also a small section of Windle industrial estate, which you have seen as well as areas to the north east, west of the junction.

01:18:10:23 - 01:18:48:13

And basically it's edged by the A33, the A31, the 272 and reaches the 303 to the north. And the reason I wanted to make an open floor hearing statement today is that I actually have two local authority roles. One is the county councillor for that division and one is a Cabinet member for planning in place at Winchester City Council. And I'm addressing you today as the County councillor representing residents in my county division. To put this in context, I discussed this problem with the County Highways Department as early as 2009, describing the conflict between local traffic and the motorway traffic and its impact on residents in my division.

01:18:48:17 - 01:19:29:05

The smooth running of this junction will be improved if the need to use the junction between the M3 to reach the a34 is eliminated. I the principal aim of this junction, but my understanding and concern is that the capacity will be increased too. I fully understand that National Highways has the role to get national traffic moving and in particular freight. Local traffic is not in their KPI, but it's the impact of this plan on local traffic in the division that I'd like to address first, in my submission, at the northern end of the red line, the National Highways Plan makes the County Council managed highway at the staggered junction of the 347 and the A33.

01:19:29:08 - 01:20:03:18

And I know this has been raised before, but I make no apologies for doing it because it is such a key part. In fact, it's right the key junction in my division locally, this is called the Carter Horse Junction. There have been many accidents at the junction, lots of police, lots of air ambulances, lots of ambulances. And unfortunately, an accident resulting in a fatality in the autumn 2022. Turning right from the side roads feels dangerous and the opportunity to use the gaps in the a33 traffic is created by traffic lights that would be lost if the lights are removed from junction nine.

01:20:03:20 - 01:20:39:06

I'm not suggesting that that is a reason to put them back, but it's a consideration of the issue at that junction at peak times, the junction is very busy with built up local queues and at other times quiet. But it has been informally agreed between the county and national highways in the statement of Common Ground that this junction could be addressed within the plans for Junction nine. I'd like this proposal to be explored in this inquiry, as you have already said that you will, which is encouraging, but I'd like a specific outcome to be finalised so that changes that cartoon Horse Junction will be constructed and funded as part of the scheme in front of us today.

01:20:39:22 - 01:21:19:15

The proposal by national highways to include an improved cycle and footpath and footway system from junction nine to this junction is welcome and frankly, applicants should be addressing this in any inset proposal. But the plan drawings do not specify exactly how this section meets with the current a33 pavement, the road, pavement and footway. This also needs to be confirmed and I know I'm very pleased to hear the cycle. Winchester have also raised this, and yet, apart from the drive through film, which is very quick and difficult to see, local public traffic engineers Hampshire County Council or I, none of us have seen a 3D view of this new junction covering the whole area within the red line and outside it.

01:21:19:17 - 01:22:04:04

We've only seen flat 2D views. We have never seen the 3D view and so we would like this to be made available so that we can judge the impact on the landscape and our lived environment and the gradients of minor roads and non-motorized paths, a gradient of a minor road and non-motorized path. The cycle path, for instance, is very important to its usability and at the moment we have no real idea of how that will feel. The cartoon Horse Junction is the northern way out of Winchester, avoiding Junction nine, which it means that as drivers learn faster way through the preferred diversions during construction, it will be well used during that M3 junction, construction only changes to the cart and horse junction will be essential to address safety and city centre congestion during that construction.

01:22:04:15 - 01:22:42:20

Now returning to the M3 junction itself, almost all of the construction takes place within my division. Local roads travel under the a34. The contour of those roads, their height and speed affects residents. Right across my division. The sound of traffic rumbling is heard all over the western half of the division. The roads spread, noise and pollution. It's obvious to us when the traffic on the trunk roads network stops moving. I have to admit it's almost a relief to many of us that it's stationary or moving. Slowly. Again, I'd like more information about the levels in this proposal, because this will help us to understand the impact of noise and of pollution, which Mr.

01:22:42:22 - 01:23:12:29

Gaga has gone into in great detail. So I won't go again. A substantial part of my division also sits in the South Downs National Park. Gantries were inserted onto the M3 just north of Easton a few years ago and they can be seen easily within the national park. And if that one was lowered and changed slightly, the impact of the motorway is all around us. The 3 or 4 seven crosses it and we all learn to look to see if the traffic has stopped to determine our onward route. We know which way we're going to turn, if that that looks full.

01:23:13:01 - 01:23:45:01

It's important that the overhead gantries don't impact the landscape of the national park. The national park makes it very clear that the quality of the landscape extends right to the very edges of it. And this is part of that edge. Views of Junction nine are seen from several points in the division. The South and South Downs Way crosses it in my division and traffic ensures long queues queues of up to a kilometre from the A31 onto the Spitfire link. I'd like to ensure that this plan addresses those Spitfire violent queues which also are very long.

01:23:45:15 - 01:24:18:26

The non vehicle paths travel under the current junction onto Bridleways and the in the national park and I'm really pleased that that's been gone into more depth by Winchester and by Mrs. Rosewell. We'd like clarification of how these routes will be surfaced not only within the red line, but how that will extend outside the red line too. That's a very important part of the usability of Non-motorised users users. You'll have heard from Mrs. Rosewell, a local resident, and she's given a very good response and I won't go into the detail in mind as a result of that.

01:24:19:05 - 01:24:53:28

And yesterday you will be aware that a dreadful accident occurred on the M3 between junctions nine and 11. The motorway was closed for the day and formal diversions were proposed online and on screens. It not only brought Winchester to a halt, but the worthies, Eastern Horsford, Common, Twyford and Wickham to a complete halt. The motorway in the 1834 carries a lot of traffic. Local roads can't take that traffic in addition to the local traffic. If the capacity of the motorway and the a34 network is even greater, it's made even greater and this will increase the impact even more.

01:24:54:00 - 01:25:24:24

Something that we're very, very concerned about. So smooth running of the a34 and the M3 is fine, but increasing the capacity is not acceptable. So this brings two questions. If the capacity of this road is increased as a result of this DCO, where will all this traffic go? If there is a motorway closure, it brings enormous economic and personal cost when lorries can't get to the ports on time, commuters and key workers can't get to work. And we've had problems with even bin lorries not being able to collect bins.

01:25:24:26 - 01:26:00:12

Patients missed hospital appointments, ambulances have to reach accidents and illness. Local buses cannot run on time. I'd like consideration to be given to improving the rail freight rail freight network rather than increasing the capacity of the road network. Again, you've just made that point in full and I won't go on more about it. And number two, how does this application actually reduce the frequency and severity of accidents north of Junction nine? There are not so many accidents, but they do occur. But accidents occur frequently between Bollington Cross on the A34 and Junction 13 of the M3.

01:26:00:14 - 01:26:38:23

The speed limit here is 70 miles an hour in an early, earlier iteration of this plan. And I've been watching it, as you can imagine, for some time. A consultant working for national Highways suggests that a 50 mile an hour limit permanently could reduce accidents. And the impact of noise on this section of the motorway between Junction 13 on the eighth on the M3 and the Bollington Cross Junction on the A34. On behalf of my residents, I'd like that to be an outcome of this application. Last but not least, the carbon footprint of this proposal is far greater and your last two speakers have been far more eloquent and I can in the detail.

01:26:39:08 - 01:27:14:16

But the carbon footprint of this proposal is in the order of ten times even that of works at the M25 junction with the A3. Why is this there so huge and the light of our Hampshire County Council commitment to net zero a target to which we county accounts as a committed cross-party? How can we accept this huge carbon load to be acceptable without substantial mitigation? A new junction and section of highway brings great opportunities for solar and wind generation electric charging banks. ET cetera. But none of this is currently included, and I know that others have raised this today, and these benefits could bring new skills to our community, too.

01:27:14:27 - 01:27:23:14

Others have spoken on this already, and I just think this is something that we we have also raised in so many ways that we'd like this to be addressed in the process. Okay.



01:27:26:14 - 01:27:27:03

Thank you.

01:27:29:16 - 01:27:35:17

No questions. Could I just ask you did mention a 3D view you were seeking.

01:27:35:19 - 01:27:40:21

Could you just clarify me exactly what you wanted that to encompass and why?

01:27:40:23 - 01:28:13:06

Um, the, the whole plan does include cycles and footways improved improvements. Um, the point was made about under the motorway at the moment. Currently we have a route that is cyclical, but it's not to the standards it should be. Um, we also have all of those other routes where they look great on paper on 2D but have no idea whether they go up or down, whether they're actually cyclical by most of the population or whether they're only cyclical, where somebody who's a very, very frequent and confident cyclist.

01:28:13:15 - 01:28:46:24

Um, at the junction of, um, the road that the actual junction that goes into Eastern Lane. Um, the road, the footways and cycleways come on to one side of the road, but actually you're likely to use them if you're on both sides of the road. So how do you get from side to side? Um, but also the, there are underpasses for the minor roads that go to the worthies and there's no real description of the heights or what that will look like on the overall landscape.

01:28:46:26 - 01:29:22:20

It's right on the national side of the national park. So how does it sit with the national park on that landscape? Um, the roads below the ground certainly improve the landscape, but we can't see from these plans exactly how it will sit. Um, so that those aspects of it about the usability of those footways and cycleways and also the usability and the impact on the national park and on the local community currently mean even coming here this morning I drove under a road which is the A34, which has got stationary traffic on it.

01:29:22:22 - 01:29:34:06

The the congestion also creates pollution which is falling back down onto people. We need to know what the impact of that is as well. But it's a it's about landscape usability and

01:29:36:01 - 01:29:40:25

impact on the the quality of lives of people that live there.

01:29:42:23 - 01:29:58:02

Thank you very much. Um, and then just one other question. You mentioned concerns about aspects such as gantries and impact on landscape. Um, I know there's a lot of material, a lot of plans being put forward.

01:29:58:04 - 01:29:59:13

But are there any.

01:29:59:16 - 01:30:02:06

Specific aspects of.

01:30:02:10 - 01:30:03:18

Design.

01:30:04:00 - 01:30:07:00

That you would seek improvements on? Um.

01:30:07:16 - 01:30:37:27

Yes, I've mentioned actually about the potential for, um, for ways in which we could use the sides of the motorways to perhaps generate energy, um, which would be useful. But I think from the design, nobody really thought the last time round when all the gantries were put up, it was just about the efficiency of the gantries rather than the efficiency of the of the, the outcome for local residents.

01:30:38:11 - 01:31:09:23

Um, and I thought that was very important. Um, we still aren't sure from this that we will have. Something that does not impact the national park. Um, the national park. Think are listening today. Don't know if they're listening today. Certainly, but yesterday. But I do feel I need to stand up for that section of the national park that sits closely with the M3. It already has lights going along.

01:31:09:25 - 01:31:26:00

It's very but it's set down. But it does rise towards the junction of the the roundabout. And I can see that from miles away. And those that impact on the national park, I think shouldn't be underestimated.

01:31:27:18 - 01:31:32:07

Yeah. Thank you very much indeed. I did. That brings me.

01:31:32:09 - 01:31:33:00

To the end of.

01:31:33:02 - 01:31:35:18

My list of speakers. I did ask.

01:31:36:00 - 01:31:50:17

The start of this hearing if there was anyone either in the room or attending virtually, who would now change their minds and wish to speak and just confirm. There's nobody that I've missed.

01:31:53:08 - 01:31:57:14

And no hands up on the virtual Microsoft teams.

01:31:58:19 - 01:31:59:14

Thank you.

01:32:01:27 - 01:32:04:05

Right. If there are no other matters.

01:32:06:19 - 01:32:25:24

Sorry, Chris. Chris Killen Winchester, Friends of the Earth haven't understood where. We have made submissions on what we feel should be within the issues examinations. When do we know whether there are answers to those? What matters should be considered and so on.

01:32:26:25 - 01:32:29:00

Well, I think, as.

01:32:29:02 - 01:32:29:28

Mr. Simms.

01:32:30:00 - 01:32:34:13

Explained, we're not reissuing our that initial.

01:32:34:15 - 01:32:37:28

Assessment, but we'll take into account.

01:32:38:00 - 01:32:41:02

What you've said yesterday.

01:32:41:04 - 01:32:44:20

And today, and we'll consider what issues we believe.

01:32:44:22 - 01:32:57:06

Should be examined. And we're also considering, for example, what issues specific hearings are pertinent. Um, but in the meantime, you know, you'll be putting in your oral.

01:32:57:08 - 01:32:57:23

Summary of.

01:32:57:25 - 01:33:07:27

Today. There's a lot of material for us to consider and the examination progresses as from today, which is the start date.

01:33:16:07 - 01:33:29:00

All right. If there are no other matters that anyone wishes to raise. I will now close the hearing. Thank you all very much indeed for your attendance and participation in this.

01:33:31:24 - 01:33:41:22

Right. So sorry the the applicant didn't come to you because I understood that you weren't responding today and that you would be responding in writing. Is that correct?

01:33:43:12 - 01:34:16:13

That is correct. Apart from a couple of quick requests for clarification, when the. All right. That's. Come in, please. Thank you. So, Catherine Tracy, on behalf of national highways, and it's just as we've gone through that, Mrs. Rosewall, you mentioned you were representing others along Eastern Lane, Long walk. If you could detail who those people are, it would be helpful to us to know exactly who it is you are representing, if that's acceptable. Um, and then in response to Cycle Winchester, Mr.

01:34:16:15 - 01:34:33:24

Jordan and Andy. So I didn't catch your surname. Um, if you want to enter into a separate statement of common ground with the applicant, we'd be more than happy to engage in that dialogue. But it's not really appropriate to add them to the Winchester and Hampshire statements of common ground, which are much, much broader. Um.

01:34:34:09 - 01:34:36:08

Say that we would welcome that.

01:34:36:17 - 01:35:08:00

Yeah. So we'll take your contact details and if you could speak to one of my colleagues and then they'll, we'll make arrangements to speak to you. Um, and I think just you've got sight of the draft statements of common ground. Um, but the position isn't quite as, um, Councillor Jackie Porter mentioned in respect of the discussions that are ongoing between National Highways and Hampshire

County Council and the car and Horse Junction. But that will be. We'll respond to that in, in written statement. That's why I raised it there.

01:35:11:03 - 01:35:13:22

But thank you very much for those contributions.

01:35:17:12 - 01:35:28:15

And my understanding is that you were going to be responding fully to all the oral representations made today in writing. Thank you.

01:35:32:01 - 01:35:35:22

Right then if there are no other matters anyone wants to raise.

01:35:38:03 - 01:35:43:23

I will close the hearing. Thank you all very much for your attendance and participation today.