

M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme

Scheme Number: TR010055

Applicant Responses to Relevant Representations

APFP Regulations 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

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

Volume 8

06 June 2023

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

M3 Junction 9 Improvement
Development Consent Order 202[x]

8.2 Applicant Responses to Relevant Representations

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR010055
Application Document Reference:	8.2
BIM Document Reference:	HE551511-VFK-HGN-XXXX_XX-RP-IM-40001
Author:	M3 Junction 9 Improvement Project Team, National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	06 June 2023	Deadline 1 Submission

Contents

- 1 Introduction 1**
- 2. Multiple common relevant representations 2**
 - 2.1 Introduction..... 2
 - 2.2 Common response A: Climate..... 2
 - 2.3 Common response B: Noise and vibration 3
 - 2.4 Common response C: Need for the Scheme 4
 - 2.5 Common response D: Potholes and local roads 7
 - 2.6 Common response E: Air quality 8
 - 2.7 Common response F: Traffic assessment..... 8
- 3 Responses to relevant representations 10**
 - 3.1 RR-001 20s plenty for Hampshire 10
 - 3.2 RR-002 Action on Carbon in Twyford 10
 - 3.3 RR-003 Ahmad Tauqir..... 10
 - 3.4 RR-004 Alison Moore 11
 - 3.5 RR-005 Amy Battersby Harford 11
 - 3.6 RR-006 Anne Robinson..... 11
 - 3.7 RR-007 Brian Walter Langer 12
 - 3.8 RR-008 British Horse Society..... 12
 - 3.9 RR-009 Catherine Goldring 12
 - 3.10 RR-010 Catherine Tuffrey 13
 - 3.11 RR-011 Charlotte Bailey..... 13
 - 3.12 RR-012 Charlotte Coleman 13
 - 3.13 RR-013 Chris Hobson 14
 - 3.14 RR-014 Chris Todd..... 14
 - 3.15 RR-015 Christine Holloway 14
 - 3.16 RR-016 Claire Jones 15
 - 3.17 RR-017 Clare Reynolds..... 15
 - 3.18 RR-018 Climate Emergency Planning and Policy (Dr Andrew Boswell)
..... 15
 - 3.19 RR-019 Cllr Paula Ferguson 18
 - 3.20 RR-020 Cycle Winchester 18
 - 3.21 RR-021 Daniel Chapman 20
 - 3.22 RR-022 Daniel Lee..... 20
 - 3.23 RR-023 Deirdre Hartz..... 21

3.24	RR-024 Duncan Melling	21
3.25	RR-025 Eastleigh Borough Council	21
3.26	RR-026 Elizabeth Braakenburg Dyce.....	22
3.27	RR-027 Environment Agency	22
3.28	RR-028 Esther Dovey.....	26
3.29	RR-029 Extinction Rebellion Winchester	27
3.30	RR-030 Geoffrey Michael Fairris	28
3.31	RR-031 Giles Gooding	28
3.32	RR-032 Grace Brennan.....	29
3.33	RR-033 Graham Wren.....	29
3.34	RR-034 Hampshire Chamber of Commerce.....	29
3.35	RR-035 Hampshire Countryside Access Forum.....	29
3.36	RR-036 Hampshire County Council.....	30
3.37	RR-037 Hazel Agombar	32
3.38	RR-038 Headbourne Worthy Parish Council	32
3.39	RR-039 Helen Feeney.....	32
3.40	RR-040 Helen Gabriel	32
3.41	RR-041 Historic England	32
3.42	RR-042 Ian James Douglass.....	33
3.43	RR-043 Ilina Todorovska.....	34
3.44	RR-044 Itchen Valley Parish Council.....	34
3.45	RR-045 Jacqueline Porter	35
3.46	RR-046 James Batho	36
3.47	RR-047 James Brett.....	36
3.48	RR-048 James Miller	36
3.49	RR-049 Jane Rutter.....	36
3.50	RR-050 Jemma Giles	37
3.51	RR-051 Jennifer Muriel Stables.....	37
3.52	RR-052 John Moore	37
3.53	RR-053 Jonathan William Muir.....	38
3.54	RR-054 Judith Lowndes	39
3.55	RR-055 Kate Needham	39
3.56	RR-056 Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy Parish Council	40
3.57	RR-057 Kristeen Ruffell.....	40
3.58	RR-058 Laura Blake	40
3.59	RR-059 Lewis Troke.....	41
3.60	RR-060 Linda Diane Groves	41

3.61	RR-061 Louise Conroy	42
3.62	RR-062 Lucinda Graham.....	42
3.63	RR-063 Mark Paul Reach.....	42
3.64	RR-064 Michael Hart.....	42
3.65	RR-065 Michael Nell.....	43
3.66	RR-066 Michael Robinson.....	43
3.67	RR-067 Michel Anthony Slinn.....	43
3.68	RR-068 Mitchell Bridges Ltd.....	44
3.69	RR-069 Naomi Bryer	44
3.70	RR-070 National Air Traffic Services Ltd	44
3.71	RR-071 New Forest District Council	44
3.72	RR-072 Phillipa May Wood	44
3.73	RR-073 Polly Perry.....	45
3.74	RR-074 Ramblers Association - Winchester Group	45
3.75	RR-075 Richard Cannon	47
3.76	RR-076 Richard Dilwyn Hawker	48
3.77	RR-077 Richard Needham	48
3.78	RR-078 RJM Land Investments Ltd.....	49
3.79	RR-079 Robert Michael Jordan	49
3.80	RR-080 Robert Parker.....	49
3.81	RR-081 Roberta Brockman	50
3.82	RR-082 Roger Lunn	50
3.83	RR-083 BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Royal Mail.....	51
3.84	RR-084 Rupert Cyril Pitt.....	52
3.85	RR-085 Sarah Gooding	53
3.86	RR-086 Simon Burgess.....	53
3.87	RR-087 Simon Mole	53
3.88	RR-088 South Downs National Park Authority	54
3.89	RR-089 Southampton City Council.....	56
3.90	RR-090 Addleshaw Goddard LLP on behalf of Southern Gas Networks Plc	57
3.91	RR-091 Southern Water	58
3.92	RR-092 Susan Bacchus	59
3.93	RR-093 Susan Jayne Cook	59
3.94	RR-094 Suzanne White.....	60
3.95	RR-095 Thomas Rogers.....	61
3.96	RR-096 Transport Action Network.....	62

3.97 RR-097 Transport for the South East 65

3.98 RR-098 Twyford Parish Council 67

3.99 RR-099 UK Health Security Agency 67

3.100 RR-100 Ward Councillor for Badger Farm and Oliver's Battery..... 68

3.101 RR-101 Winchester Action on the Climate Crisis 68

3.102 RR-102 Winchester City Council 69

3.103 R-103 Winchester City Council..... 75

3.104 RR-104 Winchester City Council 75

3.105 RR-105 Winchester Friends of the Earth..... 76

3.106 RR-106 Winchester Green Party 76

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 The purpose of this document is to set out the Applicant's response to the Relevant Representations received from interested parties. The Relevant Representations were published on the Planning Inspectorate website on 28 March 2023.
- 1.1.2 A total of 106 responses were received during the Relevant Representation period. The Applicant's response to the Relevant Representations can be found in Chapter 3 of this report.
- 1.1.3 Where applicable the Applicant has broken down the submitted Relevant Representation into sub parts in accordance with the topics covered in that sub part. This breakdown of the Relevant Representation makes it easier to respond directly to the points raised by interested parties. The Applicant's responses are customised to each Relevant Representation as far as possible but where a recurring topic or question has arisen, a standard response was adopted. These responses can be found in Chapter 2.
- 1.1.4 For defined terms and abbreviations, please refer to **Section 12** of the **Introduction to the Application (1.3, Rev 1)**.

2. Multiple common relevant representations

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 This chapter provides the Applicant's response to the key themes that were commonly raised in the Relevant Representations.

2.2 Common response A: Climate

2.2.1 The Climate Change Act 2008 sets a legally binding Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction target for 2050. The 2050 target, and interim five-yearly carbon budgets set to date are, according to the Climate Change Committee (CCC), compatible with the required magnitude and rate of GHG emissions reductions required in the UK to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement, with the intention of limiting severe adverse effects. In March 2023, the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero published the Carbon Budget Delivery Plan which sets out how Government policy will enable the carbon budgets to be met. The plan utilises Energy and Emission Projections (EEP 2021-2040) which make assumptions for future economic growth that allow for investment in, and the build out of, new infrastructure to come forward while still enabling the required trajectory toward net zero.

2.2.2 As summarised in **Paragraph 14.10.16 of Chapter 14 (Climate)** of the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1)**, when operational the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK's 4th carbon budget, 0.001% of the 5th carbon budget and 0.002% of the 6th carbon budget. This is considered to be a small increase in the magnitude of emissions due to the Scheme. It is therefore unlikely that this Scheme would materially affect the UK's ability to meet its carbon budgets. Consequently, the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate, in line with the position set out within Section 5.18 of the *National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)* and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 114 Climate (Highways England, June 2021)

2.2.3 National Highways has set a programme for and net zero targets within their Net zero highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan (National Highways, 2021). The targets within this plan align with the UK Carbon Budget trajectory to net zero by 2050. These targets include net zero maintenance and construction activities by 2040 with an interim target of 10% reduction compared to 2020 by 2025. Mitigation measures with the aim to reduce the Scheme's emissions in line with the Net Zero Highways plan are reported in **Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate)** of the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1)**.

- 2.2.4 Mitigation has been secured through incorporating the measures within the design of the Scheme and the application drawings submitted with the DCO application, which will be secured in the **first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1)**. Measures include retaining existing roads where possible, reducing the volume of material required to construct the Scheme and using alternative materials that are less carbon intensive. For the operational stage of the Scheme, mitigation includes the provision of high-quality accessible pedestrian and cyclist routes which will encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.
- 2.2.5 Further work will be undertaken including the development of an internal Carbon Management Plan and Carbon Opportunities Tracker for the Scheme. This will enable mitigation to continue to evolve during detailed design of the Scheme (and will be secured by inclusion in the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (siEMP)) in order to align it with the targets within the Net Zero Highways Plan.

2.3 Common response B: Noise and vibration

- 2.3.1 Noise and vibration have been assessed and impacts reported in **Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration)** of the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-052)**. These assessments have been made using the UK-Wide industry standard methodology set out within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111 Noise and vibration (Highways England, May 2020).
- 2.3.2 Mitigation measures proposed to reduce potential impacts as a result of the Scheme are outlined in the **first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1)**, and are derived from **Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration)** of the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-052)**. These mitigation measures will be secured via requirements within the Development Consent Order (DCO).
- 2.3.3 Residual effects (effects after mitigation measures have been implemented) from construction noise and vibration and from operational traffic noise were assessed and reported in **Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration)** of the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-052)**. In summary, no significant impacts relating to construction noise and construction traffic have been identified.
- 2.3.4 The assessment of significance during operation in the short-term (year of opening) and long-term (15 years after opening) is based on consideration of the short-term and long-term impacts, absolute sound levels and other contextual factors noted within DMRB LA 111 Noise and vibration (Highways England, May 2020).

- 2.3.5 During operation, short-term significant beneficial effects are anticipated at two residential dwellings due to reduced traffic flows along the B3047 and at 44 other properties during the daytime due to the conversion of the slip road from the A34 to the A33 into a public footpath. During operation, short-term significant adverse effects are anticipated at 20 residential properties during the daytime, due to an increase in traffic flows on the surrounding road network, as a result of the Scheme. In the long term (15 years after opening), modelling demonstrates that the effects reduce in magnitude and significance.
- 2.3.6 In the long-term (15 years after opening), significant adverse effects are not anticipated at any residential properties. However, eight commercial properties will experience a significant long-term beneficial effect with a reduction in noise, due to the re-routing of traffic along the A34, which with the Scheme would be repositioned towards the east.

2.4 Common response C: Need for the Scheme

- 2.4.1 The need for the Scheme is set out in the **Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1)**.
- 2.4.2 The Department for Transport's *Road Investment Strategy 2015/16 – 2019/20 (RIS 1)* identified improvements to M3 Junction 9 as one of the key investments in the strategic road network for the London and South East region and *Road Investment Strategy 2 2020 – 2025 (RIS 2)* continues to support the upgrade of M3 Junction 9 to allow free movements from the A34 to the M3.
- 2.4.3 Upgrades to the M3 Junction 9 to address congestion are identified within The Hampshire Local Transport Plan (2011).
- 2.4.4 The M3 Junction 9 is a key transport interchange which connects South Hampshire's vital deep water ports of Southampton and Portsmouth and the wider region, facilitating intensive movements of freight cargo and important tourism traffic. It is a crucial confluence between the region and London via the M3 and the Midlands/North via the A34 (which also links to the principal east–west A303 corridor) and is a primary access point to the city of Winchester.
- 2.4.5 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.

- 2.4.6 Projected development of the region's ports is anticipated to increase heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements and as demand for freight grows, existing congestion on the M3 and A34 is likely to worsen. Safety on the existing route is also currently an issue with a high accident rate, for example during the period 2015-2019 there were 80 collisions with 106 casualties.
- 2.4.7 Chapter 2 in the *National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)* sets out the need for development of the national road network and the Government's policy. This includes the Government's vision and four strategic objectives. The submitted **National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Table (7.12, Rev 1)** provides a full assessment against Chapter 2 of the *National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)*.
- 2.4.8 The four strategic objectives in Chapter 2 of the *National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)* are, to deliver:
- Networks with the capacity and connectivity and resilience to support national and local economic activity and facilitate growth and create jobs
 - Networks which support and improve journey quality, reliability and safety
 - Networks which support the delivery of environmental goals and the move to a low carbon economy
 - Networks which join up our communities and link effectively to each other
- 2.4.9 Paragraph 2.2 of the *National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)* recognises that '*there is a critical need to improve the national networks to address road congestion and crowding on the railways 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*'.
- 2.4.10 Paragraph 2.10 of the *National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)* states that '*the Government has therefore concluded that at a strategic level there is a compelling need for development of the national networks – both as individual networks and as an integrated system. The Examining Authority and the Secretary of State should therefore start their assessment of applications for infrastructure covered by this NPS on that basis.*'

- 2.4.11 **Paragraph 3.5** in the **Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1)** details the five strategic objectives for the Scheme, needed to address the issues identified with the functioning of the M3 Junction 9. The Scheme objectives are specific to the location and are consistent with the strategic objectives of the *National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)*. **Table 3.1** in the **Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1)** considers how the Scheme meets the five strategic Scheme objectives.
- 2.4.12 The Scheme's strategic objectives one, two, and three are: to reduce delays at M3 Junction 9 on all links M3, A33, and A34; 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; and improve the safety for all road users and reduce the annual collision frequency and severity ratio on the M3 Junction 9. **Section 4** in the **Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1)** sets out the Transport case for the Scheme and how the objectives will be achieved. This includes, but is not limited to, the Scheme showing journey time improvements for some of the most congested road links near M3 Junction 9. The accident assessment also indicates an overall reduction in accidents in the order of 537 collisions over the appraisal period.
- 2.4.13 The fourth Scheme objective is to ensure the Junction can accommodate additional traffic and support economic growth. **Section 5** in the **Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1)** sets out the Economic case for the Scheme. The full economic appraisal including monetised benefits and disbenefits is provided in the **Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (7.10, Rev 1)**.
- 2.4.14 The fifth Scheme objective is improvements for walkers and cyclists including connecting the National Cycle Network Route 23 which is severed by the current Junction layout. The third and fourth *National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)* strategic objectives relate to supporting the delivery of environmental goals and the move to a low carbon economy, and the effective linking up of communities. Paragraph 2.2 in the *National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)* makes reference to addressing the impacts on quality of life and environmental factors. The Scheme improves cycle connectivity, especially for the National Cycle Network route 23. The Scheme is expected to have a neutral impact on severance, in terms of severance of existing walker, cyclist and horse-rider connectivity. The Scheme will also bring improvements to visual amenity and landscape character over the long-term; wildlife and green infrastructure enhancements; and enhanced pollution and run-off control. The Scheme incorporates a range of design features and environmental mitigation that have been developed to minimise potential negative environmental effects as far as possible.
- 2.4.15 The **Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (7.10, Rev 1)** outlines the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) for the Scheme and has been prepared in accordance with the Department for Transport's (DfT) Value for Money Framework and Transport Appraisal

Guidance. **Table 5-23: AMCB Table** of the **Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (7.10, Rev 1)** provides a full breakdown of the monetised costs and benefits in line with the Transport Appraisal Guidance Unit A1.

- 2.4.16 **Section 5** of the **Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (7.10, Rev 1)** economic appraisal of the Scheme has assessed the benefits to users and the wider population. This is compared against the Scheme capital costs and maintenances and operational costs. The economic appraisal was carried out using standard procedures and economic parameters as defined by Transport Analysis Guidance Unit A1. The Scheme uses data extracted from the traffic model to calculate the BCR for the economic assessment by comparing the Scheme cost to the benefits of the Scheme over the 60-year appraisal period. The monetised impacts considered include: accidents; transport user impacts; environmental impacts e.g. local air quality, greenhouse gases (GHG) and noise. Other impacts have been qualitatively assessed in accordance with the Transport Analysis Guidance e.g. journey time reliability and physical activity
- 2.4.17 **Section 5.6** of the **Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1)** outlines that Value for money (VfM) has been assessed based on the Scheme costs and benefits reported and the DfT's Value for Money Framework. This included consideration of monetised and non-monetised impacts as detailed in **Section 5.4** and **5.5** respectively of the **Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1)**. With consideration of user benefits plus the effects of delays during construction, accident benefits, indirect taxation benefits, and monetised environmental impacts, the initial Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) is 1.35. Inclusion of the wider economic impacts gives an adjusted BCR of 1.72. **Section 6** of the **Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (7.10, Rev 1)** details the total present value of benefits, and the Net Present Value, that informs the two BCR figures. There are also journey time reliability, environmental, and social and distributional impacts which have not been monetised. Inclusion of all these impacts within the VfM assessment indicates the scheme represents 'Medium' Value for Money.
- 2.4.18 The **Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1)** concludes that the benefits of the Scheme significantly outweigh any harm predicted, and that the scheme complies with the *National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)*.

2.5 Common response D: Potholes and local roads

- 2.5.1 National Highways is responsible for the operation, development and maintenance of the Strategic Road Network in England. This includes motorways and major A roads. For all other public highways, the local authority, in this case Hampshire County Council, is responsible for the maintenance and repair of local roads as the local highway authority and not the Applicant. Any

existing issues concerning the local road network, including potholes, should be raised with the local highway authority in the first instance.

2.6 Common response E: Air quality

- 2.6.1 Air quality has been assessed and impacts reported in **Chapter 5 (Air Quality)** of the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-046)**. Air quality has been assessed using the UK-Wide industry standard methodology set out within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air quality (Highways England, November 2019).
- 2.6.2 Mitigation measures proposed to reduce potential impacts as a result of the Scheme are outlined in the **first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1)**, and are derived from **Chapter 5 (Air Quality)** of the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-046)**. These mitigation measures will be secured via requirements within the Development Consent Order (DCO).
- 2.6.3 Residual effects (effects after mitigation measures have been implemented) from construction dust, construction traffic emissions and operational traffic emissions were assessed and reported in **Chapter 5 (Air Quality)** the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-046)**. In summary, no significant residual effects during construction or operation were identified. No exceedances of the relevant air quality thresholds have been predicted. Consequently, the Scheme is not predicted to result in a significant effect on Air Quality.

2.7 Common response F: Traffic assessment

- 2.7.1 An assessment of predicted traffic impacts is reported in the **Transport Assessment Report (7.13, APP-166)**. The Scheme has been assessed using transport modelling with a forward forecast to 2047 prepared in line with Department for Transport guidance and datasets including predicted change in travel and freight demand. This incorporated the application of an Uncertainty Log to take account of other future infrastructure Schemes and future land-use development. This was developed in liaison with Hampshire County Council.
- 2.7.2 The traffic assessment indicates a reduction in congestion and journey times through M3 Junction 9 with the Scheme in place. The Scheme increases attractiveness of the M3 Junction 9 reassigning traffic that would otherwise be travelling via other routes on the local network.

- 2.7.3 The predicted modelled impacts associated the M3 Junction 9 are predominantly related to re-routing of existing traffic as opposed to induced travel demand.
- 2.7.4 An assessment of predicted traffic impacts during construction is reported in the **Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (7.10, APP-163)**. Impact analysis of the construction traffic management operations, as reported in the **Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161)**, was undertaken using the operational traffic model. The traffic assessment included a summary of the predicted operational impact of each of the four construction phases that are due to last more than three months. The assessment considered key performance indicators such as: journey times, gyratory network statistics, and relative delay heatmaps. The assessment indicated that journey times and network congestion were predicted to temporarily increase during the Scheme construction phasing, due to the reduction in network capacity, particularly on the M3 Junction 9 gyratory approaches.

3 Responses to relevant representations

3.1 RR-001 20s plenty for Hampshire

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-001	I would like to support the position held by WinACC. This Scheme is only likely to create induced demand, increase pollution and take much needed funding away from active travel. I am unconvinced that the congestion you are trying to reduce with this Scheme will be improved. Instead we need to look at traffic reduction.	<p>Please refer to the response RR-101 and the Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary of this please also refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ F: Traffic assessment

3.2 RR-002 Action on Carbon in Twyford

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-002	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have concerns about the increased traffic pollution this will bring locally - particulate and noise. 2. We have concerns about the increased traffic pollution that will spill over into our village that is used as a motorway 'rat-run': volume, speed, noise, particulate. 3. Our local needs are for safe cycleways and safe walking. To spend £200 m on this is excessive when we are denied spending on cycleways, traffic calming and road safety measures. 	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to the following common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ D: Potholes and local roads ▪ E: Air quality ▪ F: Traffic assessment <p>Twyford is located outside the Application Boundary and the traffic model shows a very small increase in the average daily traffic flows with the Scheme.</p> <p>The very small increase in traffic flows is below the levels which would trigger inclusion in the assessment criteria for air quality and noise and vibration as set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air quality (Highways England, November 2019) and LA 111 Noise and vibration (Highways England, May 2020). There is not considered to be a risk of changes in traffic flow which would exceed the LA 105 or LA 111 screening criteria, and therefore there are considered to be no significant effects on air quality or noise and vibration.</p>

3.3 RR-003 Ahmad Tauqir

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-003	A new junction will encourage further growth in car traffic at a time when there should be greater investment in public transport and infrastructure.	<p>This response has been noted. The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to the following common response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C: Need for the Scheme

3.4 RR-004 Alison Moore

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-004	We live close to this junction and my concern is the increase in noise, traffic pollution plus increase in traffic that may divert through our area.	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to the following common response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ E: Air quality ▪ F: Traffic assessment <p>Noise and vibration and air quality are assessed, and the impacts reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-052) and Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-046) respectively. Figure 11.1 in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration – Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-073) illustrates the location of the noise study areas, noise measurement locations and receptors.</p> <p>In relation to operational impacts for air quality, the study area (known as the affected road network) this is shown in Figure 5.2 in Chapter 5 (Air Quality – Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-065).</p> <p>If you would like to discuss this further, please contact Jonathan Nesbitt [REDACTED]@ardent-management.com) with details of your location.</p>

3.5 RR-005 Amy Battersby Harford

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-005	The amount of money necessary to make this change is not worth the outcome. It would be much more useful if it went into something more people could appreciate, such as a relief Scheme for people unable to pay their energy bills, or to provide cheaper shelter for the may homeless people in Winchester.	The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to common response C: Need for the Scheme.

3.6 RR-006 Anne Robinson

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-006	I object to this Scheme as it will lead to an increase in traffic and carbon emissions. In the Environmental Statement National Highways say the Scheme would cause an extra 37,070 tonnes of carbon emissions from construction (Table 14.4) and once operational increased and induced traffic would cause an extra 139,800 tonnes of CO2 over its 60 year lifetime (Table 14.6). This is unacceptable in the face of the nature and climate emergencies we are facing. Traffic should be reduced using sustainable travel alternatives.	<p>Your response is noted, please refer to Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) for the latest carbon figures. Please also refer to common responses for a summary of the application documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ F: Traffic assessment.

3.7 RR-007 Brian Walter Langer

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I'm a regular user of this A33/A34/M3 junction. I am especially interested in plans to free flow from A33/A34 to M3 southbound and northbound. I am eager to see the final plans for separating northbound A33 traffic from that for the A34 in a space constrained area. 	<p>Free flow links are being created from the A34 carriageways to and from the mainline M3 carriageways, as shown on the General Arrangement Plans (2.5, APP-009). In the northbound direction, the M3 Northbound carriageway is proposed to be widened to four lanes on the approach to M3 Junction 9. Two dedicated lanes will then diverge onto the realigned A34 northbound carriageway via a lane drop arrangement. In the southbound direction, the A34 southbound carriageway is to be realigned via an underpass beneath the M3 mainline carriageways, before the two lanes of the A34 southbound carriageway merge with the M3 southbound via a lane gain arrangement.</p> <p>The A33 is then realigned from Kings Worthy to the proposed M3 Junction 9 gyratory and becomes a bi-directional (two way) carriageway. The route of the realigned A33 carriageway is completely separated from the A34 carriageways, as shown on General Arrangement Plans (2.5, APP-009).</p>

3.8 RR-008 British Horse Society

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-008	Impacts on local rights of way and provision / mitigation for walkers, cyclists and horse riders who use them	<p>An objective of the Scheme is to provide improvements for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, which represent different forms of active travel. Section 12.8 of Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-053) sets out the walking, cycling and horse-riding opportunities that have been identified and embedded into the design of the Scheme. This includes improvements in accessibility to the existing National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23, a walking/cycleway adjacent to the A33 between Kings Worthy and Winnall, and provision of a route between Easton Lane and the Highways Depot. These improvements are intended to provide safer routes than are currently available, which is likely to encourage their uptake for those travelling from Winchester into the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>Impacts on local rights of ways have been assessed within Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-053). The Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, APP-008) also identify how the existing walking, cycling and horse-riding would be altered by the Scheme.</p>

3.9 RR-009 Catherine Goldring

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-009a	I am a landowner whose property lies alongside the A34. My land includes a SSSI - it adjoins Winnall Moor. I am concerned to know the precise details of the plans to protect & not jeopardise this sensitive habitat. I want to ensure that there is no impact to the boundary of my property & that there is no tree-removal planned. I am keen to know the noise attenuation plans. Are there any? If not why not?	<p>The Applicant's position is set out in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to common response B: Noise and vibration.</p> <p>Assessment of potential impacts to wildlife is set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-049), along with measures incorporated into the Scheme to avoid, mitigate, and compensate any identified impacts. The Applicant recognises the importance of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve for wet grassland, wintering birds and other such species such as Kingfisher and Roe Deer. However, the Nature Reserve lies outside the Application Boundary and there will be no impact on it from the Scheme.</p>

		<p>There is no noise mitigation proposed. Mitigation in the form of acoustic barriers is not proposed to form part of the Scheme, as the assessment reported within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-052) indicates that significant, long-term, residual operational noise impacts are not anticipated at any residential properties.</p> <p>If you would like to discuss this further, please contact Jonathan Nesbitt [REDACTED]@ardent-management.com).</p>
--	--	---

3.10 RR-010 Catherine Tuffrey

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-010	I am very concerned about the use of a huge amount to tax payers' money, better spent on reducing car travel, not increasing it. This is bad for the planet as well as the local air quality in our local area	This response has been noted.

3.11 RR-011 Charlotte Bailey

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-011	Carbon emissions from construction Pollution from diverted traffic during construction This will encourage more traffic when we need to reduce.	<p>The Applicant notes your comments, please refer to the common responses below for the Applicant's summary of the submission documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ E: Air quality ▪ F: Traffic assessment

3.12 RR-012 Charlotte Coleman

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-012	<p>I'm very worried about the proximity of the new road and pathways related to it, to our property. I'm very concerned that the landscape is done properly, with lots of mature trees and the roads being built down in a deep, if it is to go ahead, I am not keen on the new proposed layout.</p> <p>I also worry about the dust during construction as my son suffers with bad lungs.</p>	<p>If you would like to discuss this further in respect of your property, please contact Jonathan Nesbitt [REDACTED]@ardent-management.com).</p> <p>Figure 2.3 in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings – Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-062) sets out the environmental proposals and mitigation measures for the Scheme, including modifications to landform and proposed landscape elements (including areas of Woodland, Native Scrub Planting, and Chalk Grassland) located to the east of the modified highway and M3 Junction. A series of sections through specific locations along the M3 corridor are provided at Figure 2.8 in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings – Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-064) which identify the modifications to proposed landform to support noise attenuation and visual screening of the Scheme. Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (6.3, APP-102) includes outline requirements for proposed landscape elements, their specification, management and maintenance.</p>

		Regarding your concern about construction dust, please refer to common response E: Air quality. Further information can also be found in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-046) .
--	--	---

3.13 RR-013 Chris Hobson

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-013	Flow improvements needed to and from A34 and in merge with M3.	This response has been noted.

3.14 RR-014 Chris Todd

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-014	I strongly object to this development and the impact it will have on the South Downs National Park and local communities through air and noise pollution, visual impact and climate change. At a time when we need traffic reduction to reduce carbon emissions quickly enough, spending money on increasing traffic is perverse. It is not a good use of public money which should be targeted at achieving modal shift and carbon reduction.	<p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) has considered landscape and visual effects of the Scheme. This includes consideration of effects on the South Downs National Park as a designation, the landscape character for areas within the designation and wider landscape in which the Scheme is located, and on views and visual amenity.</p> <p>Section 7.9 of Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) presents the assessment of effects during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Please also refer to the common responses below for the Applicant's summary of the submission documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ E: Air quality ▪ F: Traffic assessment

3.15 RR-015 Christine Holloway

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-015	I oppose everything that will lead to an increase in traffic because of the harm caused by motor vehicles to the climate, physical health, mental health, children, sense of community, and wildlife.	This response has been noted.

3.16 RR-016 Claire Jones

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-016	I am concerned that this project is seeking to increase road capacity, and hence greenhouse gas emissions, at a time when we urgently need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transport.	The Applicant notes your comment, please refer to the common responses below for the Applicant's summary of the submission documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A: Climate F: Traffic assessment

3.17 RR-017 Clare Reynolds

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-017	This is unethical. The carbon footprint of this project is very high. We don't need a bigger motorway we need investment in our local roads which are blighted by potholes and we need better bus services. This is not the way forward.	This response has been noted. Please refer to common response D: Potholes and local roads.

3.18 RR-018 Climate Emergency Planning and Policy (Dr Andrew Boswell)

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-018a	Dr Andrew Boswell, Climate Emergency Planning and Policy I am an independent environmental consultant. I object to the M3 Junction 9: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The most important question is "to what extent does the project contribute, or undermine, securing the Net Zero Strategy ("NZS") and the net zero target?". It requires contextualisation within a robust risk assessment of the related policy delivery, and a robust assessment methodology of the significance of the greenhouse gas emissions ("GHGs"). Neither exist in the environmental statement ("ES"). 	<p>The Applicant notes your objection.</p> <p>With regards to your concern about contextualisation against the net zero target and Net Zero Strategy, the Climate Change Act 2008 sets a legally binding GHG reduction target for 2050. The 2050 target, and interim five-yearly carbon budgets set to date are, according to the Climate Change Committee (CCC), compatible with the required magnitude and rate of GHG emissions reductions required in the UK to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement, thereby limiting severe adverse effects.</p> <p>In October 2021, the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero published the <i>Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener</i> setting out policies and proposals for decarbonising all sectors of the UK economy to meet the net zero target. Following this, in March 2023, the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero published the <i>Carbon Budget Delivery Plan</i> which sets out the detail of how Government policy will enable Carbon Budgets 4, 5 and 6 are to be met. The Plan utilises Energy and Emission Projections (EEP 2021-2040) which make assumptions for future economic growth that allow for investment in, and the build out of, new infrastructure to come forward while still enabling the required trajectory toward net zero.</p> <p>There is no legislated methodology that should be followed to assess the likely significant effects of a Scheme. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and the Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA) guidance are both widely used to assess climate change in EIA. For a road scheme, the UK-wide industry standard methodology to use for assessments are those set out within the DMRB. National Highways follows these standards to ensure consistency in how all road Schemes are progressed and the outcomes evaluated. As a result, the assessments undertaken within Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) were undertaken in accordance with DMRB LA 114 D Climate (Highways England, June 2021). The DMRB in turn follows the <i>National Policy Statement for National</i></p>

		<p><i>Networks (NPS NN)</i>. The <i>National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)</i> sets the national policy framework against which decision makers can evaluate the outcomes of proposed road infrastructure project. As noted in Paragraphs 14.5.33-35 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), the methodology is consistent with the decision-making requirements set out in paragraphs 5.17 and 5.18 of the <i>National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)</i>, including the requirement that for road projects applicants should provide evidence of the carbon impact of the project and an assessment against the Government’s Carbon Budgets.</p>
RR-018b	<p>2. Recent Progress Reports from the Climate Change Committee (“CCC”) show that the success of the NZS and the related Transport Decarbonisation Plan (“TDP”) are by no means secured. No weight can be given to the proposition that they are. The same delivery risk was highlighted by the High Court in 2022 Net Zero Strategy case (A). Further, initial analysis of calculations underpinning the TDP (B) show that the TDP is far from being secured in any meaningful sense.</p>	<p>As outlined above, the Government has now set out the detail of how Carbon Budgets will be met in the Carbon Budget Delivery Plan (March 2023). The assessment does not rely on the Department for Transport (DfT) <i>Transport Decarbonisation Plan (TDP)</i> to secure mitigation that would reduce GHG emissions associated with the Scheme. Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) sets out the mitigation that has been secured through the design of the Scheme and confirmed other means such as the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1). Paragraphs 14.7.9-14 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) sets out the likely baseline evolution without the implementation of the Scheme, as required by the EIA Regulations, which includes policy context. The impact assessment and conclusions presented in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) are based on the Do-something (DS) and Do-minimum (DM) scenarios using the Scheme’s traffic model and DEFRA’s Emission Factor Toolkit (EFT). The DEFRA’s Emission Factor Toolkit (EFT) does not account for measures in the TDP. The TDP has therefore not been taken into account within the impact assessment for climate.</p>
RR-018c	<p>3. Chapter 14 is based upon an article of faith: the “inevitable success” of the TDP and policies within the TDP e.g.: at ES 14.7.14. The so-called “TDP Sensitivity Test” used in chapter 14 (e.g.: 14.10.17), and based on the same article of faith, is not a genuine scientific sensitivity test. No risk or error bounds assessment is given for it. Even the “upper bound” figures are far from secured. The method is not based on any standard, documented or official guidance.</p>	<p>The sensitivity test in Table 14.7 in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) is not part of the impact assessment. It provides additional context to demonstrate that Government policy and measures in the TDP, that are not accounted for in the EFT, could lead to reduction in road-user emissions. However, these reductions are not being relied upon or secured through the DCO application for the Scheme.</p>
RR-018d	<p>4. Significance of GHGs in Chapter 14 is assessed solely on “Scheme-only” (DS-DM) estimates [percentage figures in Table 14.7]. This does not comply with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 which require that the applicant must provide the cumulative impacts of the project and other existing and/or approved projects. The section “Cumulative assessment approach” (ES 15.3.11 and 15.3.12) does not address this issue because other locally committed developments are expressed in both the DS and DM forecasts, and are subtracted out before the assessment based upon DS-DM (at Table 14.7).</p>	<p>As noted in Paragraph 14.5.37 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), the assessment is inherently cumulative. The definitions for DM and DS scenarios are as follows, as set out in DMRB LA 105 Air quality (Highways England, November 2019):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DM scenario is ‘the scenario that represents the situation that would occur without the project in operation, which includes permitted developments’ ▪ DS Scenario is ‘the scenario that represents the situation that would occur with the project in operation, which includes permitted developments’. <p>Including other existing and/or approved developments within both the DM and DS scenario therefore complies with the DMRB and in turn the EIA Regulations. The Applicant notes that in respect of cumulative assessment of GHG emissions, the Secretary of State acknowledged in the M25 Junction 28 Improvement Project decision letter: ‘82. <i>The Applicant considers that as both the with Scheme and without Scheme scenarios include all likely developments and traffic growth factors, the assessment is inherently cumulative as regards operational carbon emission.</i>’</p> <p>The Applicant’s impact assessment follows this approach.</p>

RR-018e	<p>5. The Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA) "Assessing greenhouse gas emissions and evaluating their significance" guidance (February 2022) states that best EIA practice for GHGs is to use sectoral, regional and local carbon budgets to contextualise the project's GHG emissions. The IEMA guidance says comparison against national budgets is only of "limited value". Chapter 14 does not follow this guidance, and instead makes a sole assessment of significance against the entire UK economy carbon budget.</p>	<p>As set out in Paragraph 14.5.38 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), the Climate Change Act 2008 does not impose a legal duty to set carbon budgets at a smaller scale than national. The Government has not identified any sectoral targets for carbon reductions related to transport or any other sector. The Applicant notes that in respect of the assessment of significance against the UK Carbon Budgets, the Secretary of State acknowledged in the M25 Junction 28 Improvement Project decision letter: '92. <i>The Secretary of State considers, in the light of paragraph 5.18 of the NNNPS, it is necessary to evaluate whether (amongst other things) the increase in carbon emissions resulting from the Proposed Development would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets. As set out above, the CCC consider that the 2050 target and interim CBs [carbon budgets] should meet the goals of the Paris Agreement meaning a proposal which is compatible with the 2050 target and interim CBs is consistent with the approach to addressing the severe adverse effects of climate change...The Secretary of State considers that the approach to considering the impact on carbon emissions as set out in the NNNPS continues to be relevant in the light of international obligations and domestic obligations related to reducing carbon emissions that have come into force since the NNNPS was designated. The Secretary of State notes that the CBs are economy-wide and not just targets in relation to transport.</i></p> <p>The Applicant's impact assessment follows this approach and has therefore only been undertaken against national level carbon budgets which reflect existing Government policy to reach net zero by 2050, in accordance with the DMRB LA 114 Climate (Highways England, June 2021) and the <i>National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)</i>.</p> <p>The IEMA guidance states that '<i>It is down to the practitioner's professional judgement on how best to contextualise a project's GHG impact</i>'. While this IEMA guidance suggests a range of potential comparators for contextualisation of greenhouse gases, the UK Carbon Budgets are the only legally mandated carbon budgets. Given that there are no legal sectoral and/or local carbon budgets or trajectories to net zero in place, using the national UK Carbon Budgets to contextualise the Scheme's emissions would remain the most appropriate approach if the assessment were to apply the IEMA guidance</p>
RR-018f	<p>6. We are in a climate emergency, and it is a crisis of ever-increasing dimensions. Construction emissions of 37,070 tCO₂ and non-cumulative operation emissions at 67,670 tCO₂ [Table 14.7] from the traffic model area before 2037 demonstrate policy failure. And these emissions have a very real material impact on meeting UK carbon budgets and targets and cannot be justified within the planning balance. (A) R (Friends of the Earth) v Secretary of State for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy [2022] EWHC 1841 (Admin) (B) DfT Information release 'Traffic Level and Electric Vehicle Assumptions used in Decarbonising Transport: A Better, Greener Britain', Jan 12th 2023</p>	<p>There is no requirement in the CCA 2008, or in Government policy, for carbon emissions for all road transport to become net zero. A net increase in emissions from a particular policy or project is managed within the Government's overall strategy for meeting carbon budgets and the net zero target as part of 'an economy-wide transition'. As explained above, in March 2023, the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero published the <i>Carbon Budget Delivery Plan</i> which sets out how Government policy will enable the carbon budgets to be met. The plan utilises Energy and Emission Projections (EEP 2021-2040) which make assumptions for future economic growth that allow for investment in, and the build out of, new infrastructure to come forward while still enabling the required trajectory toward net zero.</p> <p>As summarised in Paragraph 14.10.16 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK's 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the 5th and 0.002% of the 6th carbon budget. This is considered to be a very small increase in the overall magnitude of emissions resulting 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, it is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate, in line with the position set out within Section 5.18 of the <i>National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN)</i> and DMRB LA 114 Climate (Highways England, June 2021)</p> <p>National Highways has set a programme and net zero targets within its Net zero highways: our 2030/2040/2050 plan (National Highways, 2021). The targets within this plan align with the 6th UK Carbon</p>

		<p>Budget and the trajectory to net zero by 2050. These targets include net zero maintenance and construction activities by 2040 with an interim target of 10% reduction compared to 2020 by 2025. Mitigation measures with the aim to reduce the Scheme's emissions in line with the Net Zero Highways Plan are reported in Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1). Mitigation has been secured through incorporating the measures within the design of the Scheme and the application drawings submitted with the DCO application, or through the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1). Measures include retaining existing pavements where possible, reducing the volume of material required to construct the Scheme and using alternative materials that are less carbon intensive. For the operation stage, mitigation includes the provision of high-quality accessible pedestrian, cyclist and horse-riding routes which will encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.</p> <p>Further work will be undertaken during detailed design, including the development of an internal Carbon Management Plan and Carbon Opportunities Tracker for the Scheme. This will enable mitigation to continue to evolve as the design of the Scheme progresses and to align the Scheme with the targets within the Net Zero Highways Plan.</p>
--	--	---

3.19 RR-019 Cllr Paula Ferguson

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-019	I would like to raise concerns about noise, disruption and deterioration in air quality for local residents living vary close to the junction and in the surrounding roads.	<p>The Applicant has addressed this in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ E: Air quality ▪ F: Traffic assessment

3.20 RR-020 Cycle Winchester

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-020-a	<p>Cycle Winchester is a community campaign group based in Winchester. The aim of Cycle Winchester is to make Winchester better by bike, i.e. to create a better Winchester (the city and surrounding villages) by promoting cycling as a convenient, healthy, inexpensive and environmentally-friendly way to get around, as well as to campaign for improved provision that will enable more people to cycle. In so doing, we also hope to reduce traffic congestion and pollution in order to make Winchester a more enjoyable place to live, work and visit. We are an independent group but are affiliated to Cycling UK, the national cycling charity, and two members of our team are registered members of Cycling UK's Cycling Advocacy Network (CAN). We believe that the M3 Junction 9 redevelopment provides major opportunities to improve utility cycling, recreational cycling and green tourism in the area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The cycle route across the junction to Easton Lane is part of National Cycle Route 23 provides a direct link between the city and the South Downs National Park, as well as to the villages of the Itchen Valley and 	<p>The Applicant notes Cycle Winchester's comments.</p> <p>The legal status of the new, altered or diverted public rights of way is defined in Schedule 3 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019). The route to the west of the M3, being the Winnall to Kings Worthy shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, APP-008) between points 16, 4 and 15 will be a cycle track. The realignment of the pre-existing bridleway from underneath the gyratory to Easton Lane between points 3 and 4 on sheets 6 and 7 will remain a bridleway. The route to the east of the M3 shown on the public rights of way and access plans between points 1 and 2 will be a bridleway. Under article 14 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019) any highway constructed, altered or diverted, which includes a bridleway or cycle track, must be constructed to the satisfaction of Hampshire County Council as local highway authority who must then, unless otherwise agreed maintain that highway from completion.</p> <p>The proposed walking and cycling elements are designed in accordance with the DMRB CD143 Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding (National Highways, 2021). The document is used for the design of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes on and/or adjacent to the motorway and all-purpose trunk road</p>

<p>the market town of Alresford, but the present crossing is woefully inadequate and unsafe and is under-used as a result.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed new non-motorised route between Junction 9 and Kings Worthy would link Kings Worthy (a large and growing satellite settlement of Winchester) with the employment and retail areas of Winnall and beyond that to the city itself and the new sports and leisure centre, providing an opportunity for increased commuting, utility and leisure journeys by bike and e-bike. <p>Both of the above would link into the emerging Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) network for the city and the surrounding district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed new bridleway would provide increased opportunities for recreational offroad riding, accessible from Winchester without the need for a car journey. Cycle Winchester was a member of a consultative group which met regularly with the National Highways project team to review the non-motorised user aspects of this project as they developed. We are happy with the level of discussion that took place with the consultative group: the project team were very open about the issues and the pros and cons of various solutions to them, and took on board feedback from ourselves and other members of the group. We are pleased with the progress that has been made towards improvement of existing walking, cycling and horse-riding routes and the provision of new ones. <p>However there are still aspects of these that concern us:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some aspects are not clearly-enough defined, especially in terms of the legal statuses and surface standards of the various routes. (This is of special concern as a historic failure to record the legal status of the original cycle route through Junction 9 led to a long dispute over the status of the route and whether NH's predecessors had to maintain it as a cycle facility or not. That ended up in a degraded path and a compromise solution that suits no-one, where half the route across the junction is now legally a bridleway while the other half isn't.) ▪ Some are sub-optimal in their design (e.g. an insistence on shared-use paths, sometimes built to minimum allowable dimensions, where current DfT standards make it clear that segregated facilities should be provided); ▪ Some could benefit from further improvement (e.g. the proposed new cycle route from Kings Worthy includes an at-grade crossing of a busy motorway link road which we think could be avoided). ▪ NH could do more to fund cycling, walking and horse-riding improvements in the surrounding area as part of the scheme mitigation, for example expansion of the Watercress Way and/or improvements to 	<p>network. In accordance with CD143, the widths of unsegregated shared use routes shall be a minimum of 3.0 metres where there are 200 users an hour or more (approximately 1 user every 20 seconds).</p> <p>The proposed at-grade crossing is located adjacent to the existing National Highways depot as shown on the General Arrangement Plans (2.5, APP-009). It should be noted that the main flow of traffic using the existing M3 Junction 9 gyratory is vehicles travelling via the M3 (Portsmouth / Southampton Docks) to the Midlands via the A34. This traffic currently must negotiate Junction 9 and travel via the existing A34 carriageway. In the proposed scheme layout, the A34 is accessed via dedicated free flow links to and from the mainline M3 carriageway. An existing section of the A34 is then to be realigned and reclassified as the A33, whereby the proposed toucan crossing will cross the A33. Traffic flows on the A33 will be significantly lower than the A34 and therefore the proposed design is appropriate.</p> <p>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 footpath, cycle path and bridleway are 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. Further improvements to the surrounding public rights of way (referred to as Watercress Way, and western end of South Downs Way) are outside of the Application Boundary.</p> <p>Cycle Winchester have requested a Statement of Common Ground and the Applicant will further explain its position and seek agreement as part of this process.</p>
--	---

	the western end of the South Downs Way between the M3 and Chilcomb village.	
RR-020-b	<p>We also have concerns about the construction process itself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Firstly, we want to make sure that diversions do not cause much higher traffic levels on other roads used by cyclists (especially the B3047, the B3420 Andover Road, the A272, Bar End Road and city centre routes generally); <p>Secondly, we want to ensure that any closures and diversions of the existing NCN23 cycle route are minimised and are discussed in advance and clearly notified and signposted. We are keen to ensure that NH lives up to its policies to improve non-motorised access across its network. While we are encouraged by progress to date, we wish to make sure that this progress is not lost (as happened once before in the early consultations for this project) and that NH continue to work on improving their plans to get the best possible result for non-motorised users.</p>	<p>Please refer to Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-043). A diversion via B3047, the B3420 Andover Road and the A272 will need to be implemented and phased with the M3 Northbound carriageway works including carriageway surfacing, lifting structures and gyratory replacement works. are planned. The works are planned to be undertaken during overnight off-peak closures (when there is less traffic on the network) and several extended weekend closures.</p> <p>Walking, cycling and horse-riding route closures and associated diversions would be avoided unless absolutely necessary. However, due to the nature of the work required on the M3 Junction 9 gyratory, there would be a diversion required to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23 as the new gyratory abutments are constructed. Please refer to Figure 2.6 (Temporary diversion of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes) of the ES (6.2, APP-063) which shows two temporary diversion routes for NCN 23.</p> <p>These diversion routes will ensure connectivity of the cycle route during construction phases. Paragraph 2.8.33 of Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the ES (6.1, APP-043) outlines the diversion routes for walkers and cyclists. The route for cyclists diverted from the eastern side of the gyratory during Phase 1 and 2 would be along Easton Lane and then south to Arlesford Road. During Phase 3 it is anticipated that the new gyratory bridge would have been constructed and thus access through the revised alignment of National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23 would be possible.</p> <p>Cycle Winchester has requested a Statement of Common Ground and the Applicant will further explain its position and seek agreement as part of this process.</p> <p>Please refer to Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161) for details of communication plan which will encompass proposals for maintaining positive discussions as the Scheme develops.</p>

3.21 RR-021 Daniel Chapman

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-021	Timing and road closures during construction.	This response has been noted.

3.22 RR-022 Daniel Lee

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-022	We have a climate and biodiversity crisis inc. consequences of the aforementioned on our health and well-being plus wider nature. These crises require a comprehensive comparative analysis of the current impacts of these crises from and to the current traffic situation versus the planned improvement proposals based on life-cycle analysis and future changes to modes of transport over the next 60years.	With regard to your concerns please refer to the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-042-APP-153) , associated Figures (6.2, APP-060-APP-077) and Appendices (6.3, APP-078-APP-151) which form Volume 6 of the Application for the Scheme under the Planning Act 2008 and has been prepared in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations). For a road scheme, the UK-wide industry standard methodology for assessment (including environment) is set out within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). The Applicant follows these standards to ensure consistency in how all road schemes are progressed and the outcomes evaluated and ensures that a comprehensive and comparative analysis has been conducted.

		<p>The Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-042-APP-153) includes a description of the Scheme, the reasonable alternatives considered and the main reasons for the option chosen, the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme and the measures to avoid or reduce such effects. It also includes the effects on a number of topics including (but not limited to) climate, biodiversity, population and human health, air quality, noise and vibration, landscape and visual and road drainage and the water environment.</p> <p>Chapter 4 (Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-045) sets out how the assessment of effects involves comparing a scenario without the Scheme and a scenario with the Scheme: these are referred to as the Do-Minimum and Do-Something scenarios respectively. The likely significant environmental effects for Do-Something scenarios are assessed for the baseline year and future year or series of future years, depending on the environmental topic and the assessment requirements within DMRB for specific topics.</p> <p>With regard your concern relating to life-cycle analysis, Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) considers life-cycle stages for the Scheme’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The first life-cycle stage is construction. The second life-cycle stage is operation which extends to 60 years and uses a validated traffic model to estimate operational road user GHG emissions.</p> <p>The traffic model defines the road network for all modes and the operational end-users. It covers the entirety of the South-East region of England, as required by the DMRB LA 114 Climate (Highways England, June 2021) Figure 14.1 in Chapter 14 (Climate - Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-076) shows the extent of the transport model.</p>
--	--	--

3.23 RR-023 Deirdre Hartz

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-023	Huge environmental impact. Spend on more pressing projects.	This response has been noted.

3.24 RR-024 Duncan Melling

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-024	I object to this proposal on environmental grounds	This response has been noted.

3.25 RR-025 Eastleigh Borough Council

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-025	<p>As a neighbouring Local Authority we would like to register as an interested party in order to keep track of the application and assess any impacts on local residents and the local environment. These are likely to be linked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ construction traffic movements; proposals for ameliorating noise exposure from the M3 in the Borough of Eastleigh; and 	This response has been noted.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ecological matters including water quantity and quality in the River Itchen (particularly with regard to the resultant impact on the salmonid spawning gravels and Southern Damselfly), and wildlife corridors. 	
--	---	--

3.26 RR-026 Elizabeth Braakenburg Dyce

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-026	Do not see that the need for this Scheme has been established	The Applicant considers the Need for the Scheme has been established in the Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1) , for a summary of this position please refer to common response C: Need for the Scheme.

3.27 RR-027 Environment Agency

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-027a	<p>Our ref: HA/2023/124853/02 Your ref: TR010055 Date: 13 March 2023</p> <p>Dear Sir or Madam, Application by National Highways Company Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme.</p> <p>Please find our relevant representation for the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme in section 4 of this letter, following on from our introductory comments below:</p> <p>Role of the Environment Agency</p> <p>The Environment Agency has a responsibility for protecting and improving the environment, as well as contributing to sustainable development. Our work helps to support a greener economy through protecting and improving the natural environment for beneficial uses, working with business to reduce waste and save money and helping to ensure that the UK economy is ready to cope with climate change. We will facilitate, as appropriate, the development of low carbon sources of energy ensuring people, and the environment, are properly protected.</p> <p>We have three main roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are an environmental regulator – we take a risk-based approach and target our effort to maintain and improve environmental standards and to minimise unnecessary burdens on business. We issue a range of permits and consents. We are an environmental operator – we are a national organisation that operates locally. We work with people and communities across England to protect and improve the environment in an integrated way. We provide a vital incident response capability. 	<p>The Applicant notes the comments and is keen to continue to work proactively with the Environment Agency (EA) to progress all ongoing matters and confirm a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are an environmental advisor – we compile and assess the best available evidence and use this to report on the state of the environment. We use our own monitoring information and that of others to inform this activity. We provide technical information and advice to national and local governments to support their roles in policy and decision-making. One of our specific functions is as a Flood Risk Management Authority. We have a general supervisory duty relating to specific flood risk management matters in respect of flood risk arising from rivers classified as ‘Main Rivers’ or from the sea. <p>Environment Agency area affected</p> <p>The proposed Scheme is located in one Environment Agency area – Solent & South Downs.</p> <p>1. Pre-application engagement</p> <p>The Applicant and their consultant team approached us in late 2017 to discuss their initial plans for the Scheme and the potential environmental issues that they would need to address. Since this early contact we have had a number of pre-application meetings and email correspondences with the Applicant and representatives of the Applicant. On 27 August 2019, we provided a formal response to the Applicant’s statutory consultation for the Scheme (under Section 42(1)(a) Planning Act 2008 and Regulation 13 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017). On 8 July 2021, we provided a further formal response to the Applicant’s second statutory consultation as their Preliminary Environmental Information Report had been updated to reflect some amendments to the proposal.</p> <p>2. Relevant Representation</p> <p>Our relevant representation outlines matters that we have focused on within our remit and where further clarification, details or mitigation is required to ensure that the proposal has no detrimental impact on the environment. In regard to this proposed Scheme, our particular focus has been on the following matters:</p>	
RR-027b	<p>Construction and operational impacts upon the River Itchen</p> <p>This concerns the construction and operational impacts upon the River Itchen (a designated Main River) and its riverine habitats and species. The river and its floodplain are designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Scheme works close to/within the river channel include improvements to the existing Kings Worthy Bridge, construction of a new footbridge and works on drainage outfalls (improvements to existing outfalls and installing two new outfalls). In our opinion, the submission documents demonstrate adequate consideration of the impacts that are within the Environment Agency’s remit, and proposals to</p>	<p>The Applicant appreciates the Environment Agency’s comments on the adequacy of both the design and assessment responses to date and in respect of ongoing consultation. Concerning the Schedule 2, Requirement 3(1) of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019), the Applicant has addressed the Environment Agency’s comments relating to this matter without needing to amend the Requirement. The Applicant understands that the EA is satisfied that it is the Applicant’s responsibility to consult with the Environment Agency on key matters relating to the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (siEMP).</p> <p>Surveys show that water vole are present to the west of the Application Boundary but are absent within the Application Boundary itself.</p>

	<p>avoid or mitigate such impacts. In particular, the submitted First Iteration Environmental Management Plan ('fiEMP') (document reference APP-156) specifies suitable environmental actions/commitments relating to works near the river (refs B15 – B18, B22, B28 – B30, WE1, WE2, WE6, WE17 – WE23, EH5). Furthermore, the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan ('OLEMP') (document reference APP-102), specifies commitments to enhancement for the River Itchen and suitable biosecurity measures to avoid risk to aquatic species (sections 1.15.2 and 1.19.6).</p> <p>The Applicant consulted with us on the drafts of these documents in March/April 2022 and addressed our comments on the documents at the time. We expect to be consulted on the second iteration Environment Management Plan ('siEMP') and final version of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan ('LEMP') which is to be an appendix to the siEMP. Schedule 2, Requirement 3(1) of the Draft Development Consent Order (document ref APP-019) specifies that consultation by the undertaker will be undertaken on the siEMP with the relevant planning authority and local highway authority but does not currently list the Environment Agency. This requirement shall need adjusting accordingly. An outstanding comment we have on the OLEMP (document reference APP-102) is to recommend that should Water Vole be present in any of the wetland, ditch, or watercourse features on site, then the approach to mowing of banks should be amended to minimise disturbance and reduce habitat loss and maintain vegetation cover.</p> <p>The LEMP should reflect this point accordingly. In addition to the Scheme's biodiversity net gain proposals (specified in the submitted Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report (document reference APP-131)), the Applicant is looking to work with us separately on further enhancements to the River Itchen as part of a project potentially funded under their Designated Funds regime. Plans are still in very early stages with limited details, and this does not form part of this application as the project is likely to be outside of the boundary and timescales for this Scheme. However, we look forward to continuing to work with the Applicant in this regard.</p>	<p>The Applicant is currently working with the Environment Agency on matters relating to water vole and will continue to liaise with the Environment Agency accordingly.</p>
<p>RR-027c</p>	<p>Construction impacts on groundwater quality</p> <p>There is a Source Protection Zone 1 area located to the north of the Scheme (as mapped in submitted Figure 9.1 within Chapter 9 'Geology and Soils' of the Environmental Statement (document reference APP-050)). Source Protection Zones are identified depending on how the groundwater behaves in that area, what constructions there are to get the water into the public water supply and the process for doing this.</p> <p>A Source Protection Zone 1 is one that requires the highest level of protection as groundwater is particularly sensitive. As a general rule of thumb, there can be 50-day travel time from any point below the water table to the source. Depending on the geology of the area, this travel time can be much less, particularly where chalk dissolution/sinkholes can be present, which is the</p>	<p>Regarding Source Protection Zone 1, the Applicant is currently working with the Environment Agency on these matters and will continue to liaise with the Environment Agency accordingly.</p> <p>Regarding groundwater contamination, the Applicant notes the importance of Requirement 8(1) of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019).</p>

	<p>case for the area where the Scheme is located. The submitted documents take note of this risk (Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement, section 4.8.6 (document reference APP-045)). The submitted Environmental Statement Chapters 9 and 13 (document references APP-050 and APP-054) sufficiently assess the risks to groundwater quality and address appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The fiEMP (document reference APP-156) also specifies particular measures to be factored into the construction works to protect groundwater (AQ17, GS1 – GS23, WE2 - WE11, WE20, WE22, WE23, WE26). Nonetheless, we reiterate that activities within the Source Protection Zone 1 area must be given due consideration and no groundwater hazardous substances should be used as additives or such like. The Applicant consulted with us on the drafts of the fiEMP (document reference APP-156) and Temporary (Construction) Drainage Strategy (Appendix J of the fiEMP) in March/April 2022, and on the Chalk Improvement and Stabilisation Technical Note (Appendix 13.3 of Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (document reference APP-054)) and Cavities Occurrence Assessment (Appendix A of the Drainage Strategy Report (which is Appendix 13.1 of Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment – document reference APP-054) in September/October 2022. Our comments on the documents were addressed at the time. As stated previously, we expect to be consulted on the second iteration Environment Management Plan ('siEMP').</p> <p>We note that further intrusive ground investigation is to be conducted (Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement, section 9.4.22 (document reference APP-050)) and the Applicant should inform us of the outcome of those investigations and/or update any risk assessments accordingly. Requirement 8(1) of the Draft Development Consent Order (document reference APP-019) is important for this Scheme to ensure that unidentified contamination is suitably remediated if discovered during the course of construction activities.</p>	
RR-027d	<p>Flood risk</p> <p>There are some small sections of the Scheme located within fluvial Flood Zones 2 and 3. However, works within these zones are minimal and the Applicant has adequately assessed the impacts within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, utilising suitable climate allowances as agreed with us (document reference APP-157). The new footbridge to be installed over the River Itchen is to be clear span with abutments outside of the river channel (as shown in the River Itchen Footbridge General Arrangement drawing contained within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (document reference APP-157)). The installation of a clear span bridge is a necessity in this area to minimise impacts on the river and ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank of the River Itchen will require a Flood Risk Activity</p>	<p>Regarding protective provisions, further information on in-channel works and footbridge design, the Applicant is currently working with the Environment Agency on these matters and will continue to liaise with the Environment Agency accordingly.</p>

	<p>Permit from us under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016.</p> <p>The Applicant is seeking to disapply such permits within the draft Development Consent Order (Part 1, 3(1)a) (document reference APP-019)), which is satisfactory to us subject to sufficient details being disclosed to us in advance and the inclusion of our Protective Provisions within the Development Consent Order (which are not currently included in the draft).</p> <p>Further details we are likely to need are regarding the proposed pontoon arrangements for in-channel works (with pontoons covering no more than 50% of the channel at any time and not used during sensitive times for fish migration and spawning (1st October to 15th June inclusive)), design drawings for the new footbridge, and further details about the dust mitigation measures for the concrete grinding relating to improvement works on the Kings Worthy Bridge. We are progressing discussions with the Applicant on the above.</p>	
RR-027e	<p>As indicated above, during the pre-application engagement with the Applicant's representatives, we have been given sufficient reassurance in regard to the above matters to conclude that we do not have any outstanding issues of significant concern. There are some minor matters for us to discuss further with the Applicant, such as addressing the position on permits/consents/licences needed for the Scheme, ensuring references are made in documents to the latest River Basin Management Plans (2021) and requiring some clarifications on details within the submission documents, but we are making progress on such matters and do not anticipate these being on-going issues.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require any further information. We look forward to continuing to work with the Applicant to resolve the matters outlined above, finalise any necessary requirements, and to ensure the best environmental outcome for this project.</p>	<p>With regard to further minor matters for discussion referred to, the Applicant is currently addressing the Environment Agency's comments on these matters and will continue to liaise with the Environment Agency accordingly.</p>

3.28 RR-028 Esther Dovey

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-028	<p>It has been proved repeatedly that if you expand roads, you get more traffic. Instead, what's required is better public transport, better walking & cycling facilities, and car sharing schemes, for example. And I do mean instead, not used as an excuse to carry on expanding roads at the same time!</p> <p>Given that we are in a climate and ecological emergency, we should be protecting countryside and reducing traffic, not spending hundreds of millions of pounds doing the exact opposite. The area has already been severely damaged by the motorway.</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ F: Traffic assessment

	<p>The remaining countryside is already fragmented and is not a very pleasant place to walk due to the traffic noise - this scheme would make it worse. The government should copy the Welsh government and have the courage and common sense to stop such damaging road schemes.</p>	
--	---	--

3.29 RR-029 Extinction Rebellion Winchester

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-029	<p>For too long we have been told that building roads solves problems but the reality is it just creates them. There is a plethora of evidence that expanding road capacity creates Induced Demand, journeys are made that simply wouldn't have been made previously, even the Department of Transport acknowledges this.</p> <p>This means that within a few years additional capacity fills up and emissions increase proportionately. For every pound we spend increasing road capacity and subsequently our carbon footprint, we could have invested it in sustainable transport such as bus and train networks that would actually reduce congestion and carbon emissions without the need to increase capacity. The M3 junction 9 scheme may cost up to £160m which could, for example, buy over 300 electric buses or build 100 miles of segregated cycleway. This would literally transform travel in Hampshire, reducing road congestion and most importantly reducing our carbon footprint, of which a staggering 60% (in Winchester) already comes from transport.</p> <p>Moreover, if money like this was diverted from road schemes up and down the country, we could fundamentally transform travel across the whole country, making a huge contribution towards reducing our carbon emissions.</p> <p>The plans from Highways England comprehensively fail to address the urgency of improving our natural environment, instead, they will erode both Winnall Moors and the South Downs National Park. This will inevitably result in damage to wildlife and further increase pressure on our chalkland streams.</p> <p>Rather than acknowledging the stark reality of this situation and the transformative change it demands, both the cabinet report and draft letter to Highways Agency focus on mitigating measures. It would take 15sqm of forest, a forest the size of our city, to sequester the additional 8 kilotons of co2e. Trusting Highways England to deliver mitigating measures of this magnitude is ludicrous. They have consistently failed to even calculate the true impact of road schemes from a climate perspective let alone mitigate them.</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ F: Traffic assessment <p>The predicted modelled impacts associated the M3 Junction 9 are predominantly related to re-routing of existing traffic as opposed to induced travel demand.</p> <p>The Scheme was included the Department for Transport's (DfT) Road Investment Strategy 2015/16 – 2019/20 (2015) (RIS1) and Road Investment Strategy 2 2020–2025 (2020) (RIS2). With respect to alternative transport options such as bus, train, and investment in other modes, a range of alternatives were considered and appraised during National Highways Project Control Framework (PCF) Stages 0, 1 and 2, the conclusion of which resulted in the preferred scheme of the M3 Junction 9 to be taken to detailed design in PCF Stage 3, in order to address the problem identified with the junction and the flow of movement from the A34 to the M3. The Scheme has been subject to a full options appraisal process as described in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-044) and Section 2 of the Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1). A thorough assessment of potential impacts to wildlife is set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-049), along with a suite of measures incorporated in the Scheme to avoid, mitigate, and compensate any identified impacts. The proposed new footpath/cycleway bridge over the River Itchen SAC/SSSI will be a clear span structure, with no piers within the river channel and the abutments would be set back from the riverbank which will avoid any direct impacts to the river. There will be no impact to the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve which is outside the Application Boundary.</p> <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 Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (6.3, APP-142-APP-143).</p> <p>The Scheme will deliver environmental enhancements through provision of substantial areas of new semi-natural habitats within South Downs National Park, including over 9ha of chalk grassland to the east of the M3. Chalk grassland is a Habitat of Principal Importance for Biodiversity in England, a Hampshire Biodiversity Action Plan habitat, a qualifying feature of nearby designated areas (such as St Catherine's Hill Site of Special Scientific Interest), and the protection and enhancement of this habitat is a key theme within the South Downs Local Plan (South Downs National Park Authority, 2019). The provision of chalk grassland has also been a key theme within consultation responses from stakeholders.</p>

		<p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) has considered landscape and visual effects of the Scheme. This includes consideration of effects on the South Downs National Park as a designation, the landscape character for areas within the designation and wider landscape in which the Scheme is located, and on views and visual amenity.</p> <p>There is no policy in place that requires schemes to offset residual GHG emissions. As set out in Paragraph 14.9.2. of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), the carbon reduction hierarchy, as defined in paragraph 3.22.1 in the DMRB LA 114 Climate (Highways England, June 2021) has been applied to mitigate the Scheme's GHG emissions. The carbon hierarchy sets out that measures to avoid/prevent and reduce emissions should be implemented prior to remediation or offsetting. Mitigation to avoid/prevent and reduce emissions are set out in Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1). Paragraph 14.9.17 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), confirms that tree and shrub planting is provided within the Scheme, which will provide carbon sequestration. The potential sequestration benefit has been estimated and presented in Table 14.5 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1). The Scheme comprises approximately 77 ha of retained and proposed planting (including woodland, hedgerows and grassland). As presented in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), based on Natural Carbon Stock Factors (NE, 2021), this is anticipated to sequester 1,370 tCO₂e per year once vegetation is mature. However, this has not been factored into the overall impact assessment in order to provide a worst-case assessment of carbon impacts.</p>
--	--	--

3.30 RR-030 Geoffrey Michael Fairris

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-030	I have access rights along Long Walk/Fulling Mill Lane.	<p>The Applicant is aware of these rights and access will be maintained as outlined in Sheet 3 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, APP-008). Safe means of access will be included within the detailed Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>If you would like to discuss this further in respect of your property, please contact Jonathan Nesbitt [redacted]@ardent-management.com).</p>

3.31 RR-031 Giles Gooding

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-031	I object to the M3J9 upgrade because it will increase emissions due to construction and increased traffic at a time when we legally obliged to reduce emissions.	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ E: Air quality ▪ F: Traffic assessment

3.32 RR-032 Grace Brennan

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-032	I object to the proposal on the grounds of further destruction of wildlife habitat, higher pollution levels and higher co2 emissions.	This response has been noted.

3.33 RR-033 Graham Wren

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-033	I use the M3 junction 9 daily often multiple times daily for work and pleasure. I hope to see improvement in traffic flow and a much safer road layout.	This response has been noted.

3.34 RR-034 Hampshire Chamber of Commerce

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-034	M3 Junction 9 Improvement - very important and vital for the area.	The Applicant thanks Hampshire Chamber of Commerce for their response.

3.35 RR-035 Hampshire Countryside Access Forum

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-035	<p>Hampshire Countryside Access Forum (HCAF) is an independent statutory body with members who represent the views of recreational users, land managers and others with an interest in countryside access. The main function of this group is to look at how the public rights of way network and access land is managed and improved, forum members will also be asked to comment on broader access, transport and countryside subjects, where there is an impact to the countryside, and access to it.</p> <p>HCAF advises the County Council and other organisations on improving opportunities to enjoy Hampshire's countryside and coast. The Forum encourages and assists access provision and gives strategic advice on issues of particular local relevance. We note that this Scheme will impact on the public rights of way network, National Cycle network and the access to the countryside for all user groups (including people walking, cycling, wheeling, using mobility vehicles and riding horses). This impact will be during construction and on completion of the Scheme.</p> <p>We are supportive of measures to improve access as a result of the Scheme, and keen to engage in order to ensure that proposals will deliver the benefits applicant has suggested. We are also keen to engage to ensure the minimum of disruption to users' access to the countryside during the Scheme's construction.</p>	The Applicant welcomes your support and ongoing engagement, Table 12.1.5 in Appendix 12.1 (Schedule of Population and Human Health Effects) of the ES (6.3, APP-141) separates each public right of way, bridleway and national cycle network route and describes the significance and magnitude of effect on each of these during both construction and in operation. All of which demonstrate benefits or no change when in operation. Where there are major adverse effects during construction, mitigations have been provided such as diversion routes and temporary pedestrian management.

3.36 RR-036 Hampshire County Council

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-036a	<p>Hampshire County Council (The Council) is a host authority for this application, with specific interests relating to local highway impact, Lead Local Flood Authority and Countryside Access (Public Rights of Way).</p> <p>The Scheme will provide a free flow link between the M3 (south) and the A34 and remove a substantial amount of traffic from the Junction 9 gyratory. The Council is broadly very supportive of the Scheme which will bring regional and national economic benefits, as well as improvements to the operation of the local highway network at peak times.</p> <p>There are a number of areas needing agreement that are subject to ongoing discussions with the applicant and summarised in the draft Statement of Common Ground. The Council is keen to continue to engage proactively with the applicant to reach agreement on these matters.</p>	<p>The Applicant has, and will continue to, engage with Hampshire County Council with a view to. During the pre-application phase of the Scheme, the Applicant discussed aspects of the design with Hampshire County Council. A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is being drafted by the Applicant and Hampshire County Council which documents this and will be submitted in due course.</p>
RR-036b	<p>Local Highway Authority</p> <p>The Council is the local highway authority for the non-strategic road network in Hampshire. The modelling and design work of the proposed arrangement is generally accepted, however there remain matters of important detail to agree relating to those works to take place on the Council's highway network as well as the transfer of existing and new highway assets to the Council as part of the proposals.</p> <p>Detailed discussions will need to continue to ensure that the terms of the DCO will not compromise the Council's need for adequate protection and control in respect of the detailed design and execution of works that will take place on its highway network and also that the Council has adequate protection in respect of approving and any responsibility for maintaining new highway assets that will be transferred over to it, either as new highway or de-trunked existing highway. The Council anticipates that these matters will need to be reflected in the DCO and dealt with in detail in the form of separate agreements.</p> <p>The Council is also seeking reassurance that the DCO will not disapply elements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA) and the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA). Or if they do disapply, then there is suitable wording within the DCO to replicate the requirements of these Acts. This will aid the Council's ability to manage and coordinate activities on the highway, to ensure they are safely executed.</p> <p>The Council is also in discussion with the applicant regarding the Outline Traffic Management Plan and the planned diversion routes to accompany each phase of construction works. In relation to impact on the local highway</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that Hampshire County Council is the highway authority for the non-strategic road network in Hampshire and will continue to engage on the proposed adoption of new and existing highway.</p> <p>Discussion with Hampshire County Council on the detail included within the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019) has been ongoing since February 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant has sought Hampshire County Council's opinion on the proposed diversion routes during construction and is working with the Council on traffic control measures on the local highway network.</p>

	<p>network, the Council has an area of specific concern which relates to the operation of the A33/B3047 junction (known locally as the Cart and Horses junction). The junction operates as a four-arm linked priority junction with ghost island right turn lanes on the A33 and has been subject to safety led improvements.</p> <p>The DCO works would increase the level of traffic through the junction on the A33. Whilst the approach to the junction from the south is included within the red line of the DCO, the junction itself is largely excluded with no works proposed. The Council disagree with this approach and would like to see mitigation secured as part of the DCO to enable a new junction layout to be delivered in response to the additional traffic resulting from the DCO Scheme. The Council and the applicant are continuing to engage on this matter and a further update may be available prior to the examination commencing.</p>	
RR-036c	<p>Lead Local Flood Authority</p> <p>The overall strategy is considered appropriate, with a mixture of infiltration and conveyance drainage with discharge points into the River Itchen which is under the remit of the Environment Agency. Additional information is still awaited as set out in comments to the Drainage Strategy Report. There are some outstanding points which relate to infiltration testing and groundwater monitoring. While the strategy is considered acceptable, it will need to be reviewed again following submission of outstanding information. The Council is seeking clarification on the request for the disapplication of section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 within the DCO, and the need for suitable management and approval for alterations to ordinary watercourses. Discussions are continuing to ensure that the Council's interest is reflected in the terms of the DCO.</p>	<p>Hampshire County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), have discussed and commented on the proposed drainage design. The Applicant has been able to address some comments raised by the LLFA during the pre-application stage and will continue to engage with the LLFA as the detailed design progresses when further infiltration testing and ground water monitoring will be undertaken.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the LLFA's comments on the disapplication of section 23 of <i>the Land Drainage Act 1991</i> and will continue to work with them to address these.</p>
RR-036d	<p>Countryside Access</p> <p>The Council is generally satisfied with the proposed new Public Rights of Way within the Scheme. Discussions are continuing to agree the provisions within the DCO for the satisfactory transfer of new Public Rights of Way to the Council to ensure that they will not compromise the Council's need for adequate protection and control in respect of the design, execution and maintenance of works that are intended to become the Council's responsibility. The Council anticipates that these matters will need to be reflected in the DCO and dealt with in detail in the form of side agreements.</p>	<p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Hampshire Countryside Service department on this matter.</p>
RR-036e	<p>Air Quality</p> <p>The local air quality impacts are positive, as the Scheme is forecast to result in less traffic within Winchester City Centre which has many sensitive receptors. The Council supports these benefits resulting from the Scheme. Hampshire County Council will continue engagement with the Applicant on these matters and detailed comments on the outstanding issues will be included in the Local Impact Report.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes this position.</p>

3.37 RR-037 Hazel Agombar

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-037	This Scheme will attract even more vehicles to the area. It will increase carbon emissions and worsen air quality. We should be moving away from road expansion - we face a climate crisis. I am opposed to the Scheme.	This response has been noted.

3.38 RR-038 Headbourne Worthy Parish Council

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-038	I'm concerned that active travel has not been prioritised appropriately.	<p>An objective of the Scheme is to provide improvements for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, which represent different forms of active travel.</p> <p>Section 12.8 of Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.3, APP-053) sets out the walking, cycling and horse-riding opportunities that have been identified and embedded into the design of the Scheme. This includes improvements in accessibility to the existing National Cycleway Network (NCN) Route 23, a walking/cycleway adjacent to the A33 between Kings Worthy and Winnall, and provision of a route between Easton Lane and the Highways Depot. These improvements are intended to provide safer routes than are currently available, which will likely encourage their uptake for those travelling from Winchester into the South Downs National Park.</p>

3.39 RR-039 Helen Feeney

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-039	In the midst of a climate and biodiversity emergency, this road building project does not make sense. The investment would be better spent on public transport or cycling infrastructure.	This response has been noted.

3.40 RR-040 Helen Gabriel

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-040	I do not support this development	This response has been noted.

3.41 RR-041 Historic England

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-041	<p>Historic England (retaining the formal title of the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England) is the government service championing England's heritage and giving expert, constructive advice.</p> <p>We summarise our representation regarding this proposed project as follows:</p>	The Applicant acknowledges the value of the consultations with Historic England and its willingness to discuss and agree points of common ground relating to the Scheme. It acknowledges the significance of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) in relation to these points, and specifically notes the requirement for further consultation on detailed design as set out in point 5.

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is some potential for this development to affect the historic environment, and consequently mitigation will be required to ensure these impacts are removed or minimised. We are aware the application includes an Environmental Statement (ES). 2. We have been in discussions with National Highways since 2020 on the details of the Scheme and have provided extensive pre-application advice to them so that appropriate consideration is made with regarding any potential impacts to the historic environment within the ES. 3. Specific issues addressed were: requirements for archaeological mitigation in response to the potential for non-designated archaeological remains to be impacted by the proposal; agreement on assessment methodology, study area and baseline information; the effects of soil deposition areas on nearby Scheduled Monuments; the retention of tree screening from adjacent heritage assets; the impacts of winter time lighting on St Gertrude's Chapel; the use of noise attenuating road surfaces to reduce noise pollution close to designated heritage assets and understanding and mitigating the impacts of any multi-span gantries and signage close to designated heritage assets. Agreement on enhancement opportunities associated with nearby heritage assets are also covered within the EMP. 4. We are satisfied that the above matters and proposed mitigation have been satisfactorily addressed within the documents included in the submission by National Highways, including the draft DCO. The matters are also covered and addressed in a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) that has been agreed between National Highways and Historic England. 5. Notwithstanding the requirement for eventual consultation with Historic England on detailed design, the enhancement opportunities and any changes to the Scheme, we do not feel it necessary for us to continue our involvement in the Examination process. As such, this letter stands as an explanation of our decision not to be registered as an interest party. 	<p>The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has now been agreed between the parties with no matters outstanding. It has been sent to Historic England for signature.</p>
--	---

3.42 RR-042 Ian James Douglass

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-042	I support the proposals for the M3 J9 Improvement Scheme.	The Applicant thanks you for your response, this has been noted.

3.43 RR-043 Iliana Todorovska

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-043	I have particular concerns around the cumulative impacts between this project and the increased capacity of the M3 and transformation into a Smart Motorway. I do not believe the assessment that there will be no noise impacts on the surrounding areas to be accurate.	On 15 April 2023 the Government announced that plans for new smart motorways would be cancelled, consequently there will be no cumulative impact. Please also refer to common response B: Noise and vibration.

3.44 RR-044 Itchen Valley Parish Council

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-044a	<p>General Interest</p> <p>This project will be taking place in part within The Civil Parish of the Itchen Valley. Itchen Valley Parish Council is one of the largest Parish Councils in the Winchester District. It includes the villages of Avington, Easton, Itchen Abbas and Martyr Worthy. These villages are immediately to the east of M3 J9. The junction is between the Parish and the City of Winchester. The M3, A31, A33 & B3047 roads run through the Parish. Parish life is intrinsically linked with M3 J9.</p> <p>On 29th September 2022 the Council had a presentation by Volker Fitzpatrick on the updates and latest modifications to the M3 J9 Scheme. The Parish is also focused on the junction of the A33/B3047.</p> <p>On 3rd November 2022, the Parish Council passed a resolution demanding a safer junction at the junction of the B3047 & A33. We want the project to be successful. Specific Interests Footpaths and bridleways: The Parish maintains footpaths and bridleways that link to the City of Winchester through Junction 9 and we are interested in how these transition through the project boundary area. The surfaces of these are of particular interest. Commuting: The Parish is keen to support Parishioners and visitors with accessible routes to walk or cycle from our villages into the City of Winchester.</p> <p>The River Itchen</p> <p>The River Itchen flows between Avington and Itchen Abbas and then Easton and Martyr Worthy before it gets to the project boundary. We are interested in the river levels and how these might be impacted during construction and after the junction is in use.</p>	<p>The River Itchen has been hydraulically modelled using a model which extends from Easton to the tidal extent of the River Itchen at Woodmill. This assessment has been used to inform the design of the Scheme. The modelling assessment is detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment (7.4, APP-157).</p> <p>As part of the hydraulic modelling assessment, the Environment Agency's (EA's) existing 2019 River Itchen model was updated to refine the flood risk within the Application Boundary and to inform the design of the Scheme in relation to the new bridge crossing of the Itchen and the location and design of the surface water drainage features.</p> <p>The only works proposed in the floodplain of the River Itchen is the new bridge over the River Itchen. This has been designed to be a clear span structure with abutments set back from the river channel. It has been designed to ensure no construction works are required within the river channel. There will be no impact on water levels, floodplain storage and conveyance during operational use once constructed. This has been confirmed through post-development modelling. Figure 2.4 in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings – Figures) in the ES (6.2, APP-062) shows public right of way through application boundary. The Scheme does not encroach on the existing floodplain and fluvial flood risk will not be increased as a result of the Scheme. This has been confirmed through comparison of baseline hydraulic modelling and post-Scheme hydraulic modelling. The footways and cycleways are proposed to be surfaced with traditional asphalt materials to form a bound surface layer. The proposed bridleway (to the east of the Scheme) is proposed to be an unbound material, typically compacted stone. The proposed bridleway (to the east of the Scheme) is proposed to be an unbound material, typically compacted stone.</p> <p>Water levels in the River Itchen will not be increased during either construction or operation. Appropriate drainage strategies during temporary and permanent phases have been designed to ensure that any additional surface water runoff arising from the Scheme is managed, attenuated and discharged at existing rates. Consequently, surface water flooding will not be increased as a result of the Scheme.</p>
RR-044b	<p>Construction</p> <p>The Parish Council is interested in how the construction will impact life and we are particularly interested in Phase 2 Construction and the impact of overnight diversions.</p>	<p>Please refer to common response F: Traffic assessment.</p> <p>Please refer to the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1) for the mitigation during construction and also refer to the Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161) during Phase 2 the construction works which will entail the construction of the M3 Underpass, the installation of the new gyratory bridges and other roadworks, there will be several full carriageway closures in this phase. The</p>

	<p>Landscaping: The junction is the primary “entrance” from the M3 and A34 into our Valley. We are interested in the landscaping of the Scheme.</p>	<p>Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161) provides details of suitable temporary diversion routes to reduce congestion during construction phase. All closures and diversion routes will be clearly communicated and signposted and there will be regular meetings with stakeholders.</p> <p>Section 5.9 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-046) provides the assessment of effects of the Scheme on air quality during construction and operation of the Scheme. In relation to temporary diversions (as summarised in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, App-043), a vast majority of these are overnight closures and diversions. Given the timing of these closures and their short duration, the potential resultant impacts on air quality are considered not to have the potential to result in ‘significant’ air quality effects as per the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality (Highways England, 2019).</p> <p>Section 11.9 of Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-052) provides the assessment of effects of the Scheme on noise sensitive receptors during construction and operation of the Scheme. In accordance with DMRB LA 111 Noise and Vibration (Highways England, 2020), dwellings within 25m of the kerbs of night-time diversion routes have been identified. In total, 1,318 residential dwellings are anticipated to experience noise impacts during traffic diversions at night. 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.</p> <p>Please refer to Figure 2.3 in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings – Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-062) that sets out the Environmental Proposals for the Scheme.</p> <p>The landscaping proposal has developed 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 (LCA) of Itchen Valley Sides, Itchen Floodplain, and East Winchester Downs.</p> <p>Sympathetically designed earthworks which reflect the existing landform provide the opportunity to utilise site-gained chalk material as the basis for new areas of chalk grassland throughout the Scheme but primarily on the downland landscape within the East Winchester Downs LCA. The creation of new scrub and woodland on the slopes of the proposed highway embankment and cutting slopes within the Itchen Valley Sides and Itchen Floodplain responds to the existing wooded context of the highway network. It also aids visual screening of the Scheme.</p>
RR-044c	<p>Noise: The Parish is interested to understand the impact on the levels of noise from the junction.</p>	<p>For a summary of the Applicant’s submission documents, please see common response B: Noise and vibration.</p>

3.45 RR-045 Jacqueline Porter

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-045	<p>As the County Councillor the Itchen Valley Division, the impact of the M3 junction 9 proposals both during construction, and in operation will have a huge effect on residents in my division. The entrance onto the M3 from the A33 will be in the division.</p> <p>As a City Ward Councillor for the Worthy’s, the northern end of the plan area will be in that ward. The effect of the changes in road layout at the northern</p>	<p>The Applicant’s position is in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ E: Air quality ▪ F: Traffic assessment

	<p>end of the site will have an impact on noise, journey times and congestion throughout construction, and the link to the A34 will affect the noise, air quality and congestion when the new junction is in full operation.</p>	<p>Please refer to Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161) for details of suitable temporary diversion routes to reduce congestion during construction phase. All closures and diversion routes will be clearly communicated and signposted and there will be continued regular meetings with stakeholders.</p> <p>Operational noise impacts relating to the Scheme have been assessed within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-052). Figures 11.19 to 11.22 in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration - Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-073) indicate the short-term and long-term noise impacts associated with the Scheme. These figures indicate that the noise increase at noise sensitive properties along the A34 are 'negligible', which relates to an increase of less than 1 dB in the short-term (opening year) and less than 3 dB in the long-term (15 years after scheme opening).</p> <p>The air quality impacts have been assessed within Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-046). Impacts within the vicinity of the A34 are shown in Figures 5.5 and 5.6 in Chapter 5 (Air Quality – Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-065). The Scheme is not considered to result in a significant effect on air quality.</p>
--	--	---

3.46 RR-046 James Batho

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-046	A city councillor in a ward affected by the M3 J9 project.	This response has been noted.

3.47 RR-047 James Brett

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-047	In my opinion the money could be better spent sequestering carbon by rewilding national parks/ increase nature reserves. This would also have the added benefit of the desperately needed increase in biodiversity. Invest in nature, rather than projects that destroy nature.	This response has been noted.

3.48 RR-048 James Miller

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-048	This is completely incompatible with preventing the climate crisis.	This response has been noted.

3.49 RR-049 Jane Rutter

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-049	As a local City and Parish Councillor I am keen to ensure that the impacts of noise, disruption of local traffic and air quality are properly assessed and mitigated.	<p>The Applicant has addressed this in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ E: Air quality

- H: Traffic assessment

3.50 RR-050 Jemma Giles

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-050	I live on the [redacted] that is literally on junction 9 of the M3. So we are very effected by any works on the junction. Very interested in the earthworks and tree screening that will be between us and the new works.	<p>Figure 2.3 in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings – Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-062) sets out the Environmental Proposals and mitigation measures for the Scheme, including modifications to landform and proposed landscape elements. A series of sections through specific locations along the M3 corridor are provided at Figure 2.8 in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings – Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-064).</p> <p>If you would like to discuss the mitigation works or any other matter in respect of your property further, please contact Jonathan Nesbitt [redacted]@ardent-management.com).</p>

3.51 RR-051 Jennifer Muriel Stables

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-051	<p>Reducing carbon dioxide emissions is the most important priority for humanity now. We are already heading for catastrophic effects from climate change and warming well above 1.5 degrees celsius. Businesses and politicians KNOW THIS.</p> <p>The time for accommodating traffic is past. It is now time to reduce traffic. Urgently. By all possible means. Actively encouraging traffic flow is just another act of self-harm and makes no sense. Where are the plans for reducing traffic? There is no point in continuing with the same old actions that got us into this mess in the first place. I urge you to think seriously about the future and your part in shaping it.</p>	This response has been noted.

3.52 RR-052 John Moore

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-052	Great concern that this will drive even more traffic down the A34 and create more noise and air pollution.	<p>Operational noise impacts relating to the Scheme have been assessed within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-052). Figures 11.19 to 11.22 in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration - Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-073) indicate the short-term and long-term noise impacts associated with the Scheme. These figures indicate that the noise increase at noise sensitive properties along the A34 are 'negligible', which relates to an increase of less than 1 dB in the short-term (opening year) and less than 3 dB in the long-term (15 years after scheme opening).</p> <p>The air quality impacts have been assessed within Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-046). Impacts within the vicinity of the A34 are shown in Figures 5.5 and 5.6 in Chapter 5 (Air Quality – Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-065). The Scheme is not considered to result in a significant effect on air quality.</p>

3.53 RR-053 Jonathan William Muir

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-053a	<p>I am the owner of a property which is at [redacted] and includes approximately one mile of the River Itchen and is an SSSI. The property is accessed via the A33 and will be impacted by the proposed project. You have notified me of that fact.</p> <p>In addition, as the A33 adjoins the river and land, the project must take into consideration the SSSI status, and include sufficient drainage, infrastructure and protection to ensure that any effluent, dirt, construction materials, or other materials do not enter the river system and pollute this environmentally important chalk stream and the bio-diversity it supports.</p> <p>In addition the construction of the project should include sufficient infrastructure and drainage to ensure that when complete, the expanded roads do not cause run-off from the road (including pollutants such as petrol, diesel, salt etc) to enter the river system or adjoining land.</p>	<p>The Scheme has been designed to avoid or reduce effects on road drainage and the water environment to include pollution control measures as part of the temporary and permanent drainage strategy to ensure that there are no detrimental impacts on the SSSI.</p> <p>During construction, mitigation measures have been identified with reference to <i>Protecting Groundwater and Preventing Groundwater Pollution Guidance (Environment Agency, March 2017)</i> and various Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA) publications. These set out current best practice measures associated with preventing and mitigating construction phase impacts on surface and groundwater resources in agreement with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). This mitigation is also included within the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1).</p> <p>For the operation of the Scheme, Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (6.3, APP-142-APP-143) confirms that the drainage strategy for the Scheme complies with the LLFA design criteria.</p> <p>The drainage strategy includes the following mitigation measures to ensure that runoff is captured and treated appropriately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Over-the-edge drainage of run-off from carriageways on embankments to filter strips and to infiltration ditches ▪ Attenuation and primary settlement treatment in filtration forebays and unplanted, lined detention basins ▪ Attenuation, secondary settlement and filtration treatment in vegetated extended detention basins, containing both wet and dry habitats ▪ Tertiary treatment in a grassed swale prior to discharge to the River Itchen <p>An assessment for the acute and chronic pollution of watercourses and groundwater has been undertaken for all attenuation basins and the single geocellular tank which ultimately discharge surface water runoff to the River Itchen. The assessment confirms that each detention basin provides sufficient removal of sediments and pollutants to preclude the exceedance of the thresholds for acute and chronic pollutant contaminations. The assessment is detailed in Appendix 13.2 (Hydrogeological Risk Assessment) (HgRA) of the ES (6.3, APP-144). The HgRA also considers nutrients and nutrient pathways. This is reported in Sections 13.6 and 13.9 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-054).</p> <p>A Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (7.7, APP-160) has also been completed. This concludes that the activities relating to the Scheme would not cause deterioration in the status of any WFD water bodies or prevent them from achieving either 'Good Ecological Status' or 'Good Ecological Potential' by 2027.</p> <p>The delivery of the mitigation is secured by its inclusion within the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1).</p> <p>Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-050) also considers pathways and receptors in relation to geology and groundwater.</p>

RR-053b	The main issues for me as land owner and protector of the river and associated land, is that I will need access at all times via the gate adjoining the A33 while the works are being undertaken and when they are complete. Critical maintenance and management of the site needs to occur and access will be required through the only access point on the A33.	The Applicant is aware of these rights and access will be maintained as outlined on Sheets 3 and 4 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, APP-008) . If you would like to discuss this further in respect of your property, please contact Jonathan Nesbitt ([REDACTED]@ardent-management.com).
---------	---	---

3.54 RR-054 Judith Lowndes

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-054	Many of the roads in my vicinity are in a very poor condition with potholes, cracks and deep drops at the sides which have caused damage to my and my family's cars and could potentially cause injury. Repairing these roads must be a priority over the proposed development of the M3 junction 9 interchange.	The Applicant notes this response, please refer to common response D: Potholes and local roads.

3.55 RR-055 Kate Needham

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-055	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The impact on the Climate Emergency ▪ The impact on biodiversity ▪ The impact of increased air pollution ▪ The impact of more industrialisation of the area ▪ The high cost of changing this one junction versus the lack of money needed to fix potholes and properly maintain our roads. ▪ The high cost of this one junction versus the lack of money to improve public transport infrastructure, cycle paths and walking routes. ▪ The effect on city centre traffic along Easton Lane, over Durngate Bridge, Union Street and along Eastgate Street. 	<p>The Applicant notes your comments, please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate change ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ D: Potholes and local roads ▪ E: Air quality ▪ H: Traffic assessment <p>Regard the impact to biodiversity, please note that a thorough assessment of potential impacts to wildlife is set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-049), along with a suite of measures incorporated in the Scheme to avoid, mitigate, and compensate any identified impacts. The assessment concluded there would be no significant effects on biodiversity.</p> <p>Please note that an objective of the Scheme is to provide improvements for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, which represent different forms of active travel.</p> <p>Section 12.8 of Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.3, APP-053) sets out the walking, cycling and horse-riding opportunities that have been identified and embedded into the design of the Scheme. This includes improvements in accessibility to the existing National Cycleway Network (NCN) Route 23, a walking/cycleway adjacent to the A33 between Kings Worthy and Winnall, and provision of a route between Easton Lane and the Highways Depot. These improvements are intended to provide safer routes than are currently available, which is likely to encourage their uptake for those travelling from Winchester into the South Downs National Park.</p>

3.56 RR-056 Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy Parish Council

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-056	<p>Our parish sits at the edge of the proposed works and we are broadly in favour of the improvements but obviously have the safety and interests of our parishioners at the front of our views. We welcome the cycle/walking/horse riding aspects but need to ensure the safety of its users and how it will interface with our parish roads.</p> <p>We also wish to ensure that disruption to our parish is minimised during construction phases.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes your broad support. Please refer to Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161) for details of a communication plan which will encompass proposals for maintaining positive discussions as the Scheme develops. For further information on how public rights of way will interface with the local road network, please refer to Figure 2.4 in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings – Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-062) that shows public right of way through application boundary. Refer to Table 3.1 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161) where the impact of the anticipated diversions and stakeholder requirements are tabled. The Applicant describes how the stakeholder’s requirements are accounted and the proposed mitigation including sufficient notification of closures. A detailed stakeholder management plan will be developed as the Scheme progresses to ensure consistent communication and engagement with all stakeholders.</p>

3.57 RR-057 Kristeen Ruffell

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-057	<p>I cannot conceive how this tallies locally, nationally or on a world view with the climate emergency we are already in, I do not agree with any money being spent on this project that will increase emissions on many levels. This project should be cancelled ASAP</p>	<p>This response has been noted.</p>

3.58 RR-058 Laura Blake

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-058	<p>I am opposed to this project. I have concerns as the Scheme increases traffic and carbon emissions and impacts on the South Downs National Park.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes your objection. The Applicant’s position is set out in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ H: Traffic assessment <p>With regards to your concerns on the South Downs National Park, impacts of the Scheme on the South Downs National Park have been assessed in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1). This includes consideration of effects on the South Downs National Park as a designation, the landscape character of areas within the designation and wider landscape in which the Scheme is located, on tranquillity, views and visual amenity (Special Qualities).</p>

3.59 RR-059 Lewis Troke

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-059	<p>I wish to Register my objection to this project is the lack of alternative proposals such as Rail Infrastructure (both Passenger and Freight).</p> <p>The money would perhaps be better spent on automating Southampton Docks fully, and providing rail links that would get transport off the roads. Further thought should be given to a multi-modal corridor. I am also deeply concerned at the implication to the A34 - the pull through of traffic and the proposed 'upgrade' that will involve.</p> <p>Also whilst the proposal does acknowledge that there will be considerable displacement of traffic from the scheme onto local roads and through Winchester this factor and it's potential impact needs to be made more widely known in the affected communities.</p>	<p>Please refer to common response C: Need for the Scheme. <i>The National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN) Chapter 2 sets out the need for development of the national road network and the Government's policy. The National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN) paragraph 2.22 states that 'Without improving the road network, including its performance, it will be difficult to support further economic development, employment and housing and this will impede economic growth and reduce people's quality of life. The Government has therefore concluded that at a strategic level there is a compelling need for development of the national road network'.</i></p> <p>The Scheme was included in the Department for Transport's (DfT) Road Investment Strategy 2015/16 – 2019/20 (2015) (RIS1) and Road Investment Strategy 2020–2025 (2020) (RIS2). With respect to alternative transport options such as rail links and a multi-modal corridor, a range of alternatives were considered and appraised during National Highways Project Control Framework (PCF) Stages 0, 1 and 2, the conclusion of which resulted in the preferred scheme of the M3 Junction 9 to be taken to detailed design in PCF Stage 3, in order to address the problem identified with the Junction and the flow of movement from the A34 to the M3. The Scheme has been subject to a full options appraisal process as described in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-044) and Section 2 of the Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1).</p> <p>Regarding concerns on the A34 and local roads, an assessment of predicted traffic impacts is reported in the Transport Assessment Report (7.13, APP-166). The traffic assessment indicates a predicted reduction in congestion and journey times through M3 Junction 9 with the Scheme in place. The Scheme increases the attractiveness of the M3 Junction 9 attracting traffic that would otherwise be diverting onto other routes in the local network. Traffic flows on a number of local roads within Winchester City are predicted to decrease with the Scheme in place.</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. Information on the Construction Traffic Management traffic modelling assessment can be found in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (7.10, APP-163).</p> <p>The Scheme has been publicised and consulted on in line with statutory requirements. Further information regarding the consultation, including how feedback has been considered can be found in the Consultation Report (5.1, APP-025).</p>

3.60 RR-060 Linda Diane Groves

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-060	<p>I believe this junction construction to be a waste of money saving little time for commuters such as myself, and causing more chaos on the M27 following years of upheaval as the smart motorway was developed. I believe this money could be better spent repairing the shoddy high ways that already exist across the county. The benefits of this project are very minimal as far as I can see. We need to be more eco friendly in our use of public funds. Thankyou.</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ D: Potholes and local roads

3.61 RR-061 Louise Conroy

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-061	Need to understand impact of M3 J9 improvement on A33 past my house. Am I going to construction traffic am I going to have increased traffic past my house during construction or on opening What are the environmental impact ...noise light pollution on my property during construction phases on opening and in the future.	Without further information regarding the exact property in question, the Applicant is unable to respond to this Relevant Representation. Please contact Jonathan Nesbitt ([REDACTED]@ardent-management.com) if you would like to discuss the mitigation works or any other matter in respect of your property.

3.62 RR-062 Lucinda Graham

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-062	Strongly opposed to £200 million improvements plans.	This response has been noted.

3.63 RR-063 Mark Paul Reach

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-063	The significant carbon impacts are concerning.	The Scheme does not have significant carbon impacts, for further information please refer to common response A: Climate.

3.64 RR-064 Michael Hart

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-064	This project is environmentally hostile to wildlife and plant life, and will during its construction cause much carbon dioxide to be emitted. And the extra cars using it will too Spend the money on fixing potholes instead.	The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate change ▪ D: Potholes and local roads A thorough assessment of potential impacts to wildlife is provided in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-049) . This includes a suite of measures incorporated in the Scheme to avoid, mitigate, and compensate any identified impacts, during both construction and operation of the Scheme. The assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on all aspects of biodiversity.

3.65 RR-065 Michael Nell

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-065	This Scheme encourages road traffic and will release massive volumes of carbon dioxide with the extensive use of concrete. Both of these are incompatible with reaching net zero by 2030.	The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ F: Traffic assessment

3.66 RR-066 Michael Robinson

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-066	I am a local resident that lives next to the motorway. I have concerns about how the change to four lanes will impact on noise and pollution for me and my fellow residents. I am interested to explore the possibilities of sound reducing fencing to help with any increase in noise. There is currently nothing in place.	<p>In order to establish the location of your property and to discuss your concerns further, please contact Jonathan Nesbitt [REDACTED]@ardent-management.com).</p> <p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ E: Air quality <p>With regard to your concern about four lanes, on the M3 northbound carriageway the existing four lane approach to Junction 9 will continue through the Junction until the proposed two lane diverge to the A34 northbound carriageway. The M3 carriageway after this point will then be two lanes heading northbound. On the M3 southbound, the existing carriageway is locally widened through the extents of Junction 9. The widening of the M3 carriageways occur within the 'bowl' of the Junction in a proposed area of cutting, whereby the interface with nearby properties is reduced. This is shown on Sheets 5-8 of the General Arrangement Plans (2.5, APP-009). Noise and vibration have been assessed and impacts reported in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-052).</p> <p>Mitigation measures proposed to reduce potential impacts as a result of the Scheme are outlined in the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1). Mitigation in the form of acoustic barriers is not proposed to form part of the Scheme, as the assessment reported within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-052) indicates that significant, long-term, residual operational noise impacts are not anticipated at any residential properties.</p>

3.67 RR-067 Michel Anthony Slinn

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-067	I think the current proposals are huge improvement on the first set of proposals. I would like to check on the final details when they are published and reserve further comment until then.	This response has been noted.

3.68 RR-068 Mitchell Bridges Ltd

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-068	Although the Scheme will no doubt secure benefits in the long term, the short term disruption to Junction 9 will have an impact on our business and its employees, with any major project initiative I feel communication and feed back is essential, that is why I would like to register so I can represent the interests of my business and other business around us.	The Applicant will continue to consult and engage through stakeholder meetings during the construction phase of the Scheme to allow the concerns of local businesses and communities to be raised, and any feedback be given. If you would like to discuss the mitigation works or any other matter in respect of your property further, please contact Jonathan Nesbitt [REDACTED] (@ardent-management.com).

3.69 RR-069 Naomi Bryer

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-069	Money could be better spent on up keep in roads and the local area.	Please refer to common response D: Potholes and local roads.

3.70 RR-070 National Air Traffic Services Ltd

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-070	Dear Sirs, NATS anticipates no impact from the M3J9 proposal and has no comments to make. We acknowledge receipt of the submission of a DCO from National Highways as per their correspondence dated 1-02-2023. Regards S. Rossi NATS Safeguarding Office	Thank you for your response, this has been noted.

3.71 RR-071 New Forest District Council

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-071	New Forest District Council recognises that there are unlikely to be any direct impacts on its communities. Nevertheless, the wider implications of the project on the strategic highway network southwards of the site are of potential interest for further consideration.	This response has been noted.

3.72 RR-072 Phillipa May Wood

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-072	I would like to register my objection to the proposed project on the basis that it is hugely damaging to the environment and runs counter to the UK's commitment to climate emergency measures	Please refer to common response A: Climate. Regarding the impact of the Scheme on the environment. In accordance with Regulation 6(2)(a) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Scheme constitutes EIA development. The aim of undertaking an EIA is to protect the environment by ensuring that the consenting body, in this case, the Secretary of State, when determining whether to grant planning permission for a

		<p>project, does so in the full knowledge of the likely significant effects, and takes this into account in the decision-making process.</p> <p>Chapter 16 (Summary of Effects) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) provides a summary of the effects upon the environment as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Following the implementation of mitigation measures outlined within the technical Chapters 5-14 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-046 – APP-055) and the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1), no significant residual effects are anticipated during construction and operation of the Scheme in regard to air quality, biodiversity, climate, material assets and waste, cultural heritage; and road drainage and the water environment.</p>
--	--	---

3.73 RR-073 Polly Perry

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-073	<p>It seems a lot do money to spend at a time when there's a cost of living crisis and reduced funding for many much needed other things. The impact on the environment in increasing road use rather than improving other more environmentally beneficial forward thinking ideas.</p> <p>Also, cycle paths seem pretty non existent or poorly orchestrated. I haven't had any major issues or hold ups on the current M3 and never wait too long at the roundabout.</p>	<p>With regard to your concerns on funding and the need for the Scheme, please refer to common response C: Need for the Scheme.</p> <p>An objective of the Scheme is to provide improvements for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, which represent different forms of active travel. Section 12.8 of Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-053) sets out the walking, cycling and horse-riding opportunities that have been identified and embedded into the design of the Scheme. This includes improvements in accessibility to the existing National Cycleway Network (NCN) Route 23, a walking/cycleway adjacent to the A33 between Kings Worthy and Winnall, and provision of a route between Easton Lane and the Highways Depot. These improvements are intended to provide safer routes than are currently available, which is likely to encourage their uptake for those travelling from Winchester into the South Downs National Park.</p>

3.74 RR-074 Ramblers Association - Winchester Group

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-074a	<p>Ramblers Association Registration Comments related to DCO for M3 junction 9 Improvement - DRAFT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Ramblers Association (Winchester Group) has been fully engaged with the Walkers, Cyclists and Horse-riders working group that has been promoted by the project management team since 2019. This working group has provided excellent opportunities for involvement with the Scheme planning with regard to Non-Motorised Users (NMU) and has benefitted from the very positive and constructive engagement of the members of the project management team. (a) The major objectives of the Ramblers in representing walkers' interests in this Scheme are: 	<p>The Applicant thanks the Ramblers Association for its engagement and its representation.</p> <p>During preliminary design, providing the proposed walking / cycling route on the western side of the realigned A33 leading to Easton Lane and Tesco was considered. However, the western verge within this area is heavily constrained by existing utilities. The verge also becomes constrained in terms of width as it runs adjacent to Homebase car park. In addition, the existing traffic splitter island leading to Homebase is currently an unsuitable width (in terms of design standards) for pedestrians and cyclists to safely cross. Increasing the width of this island would impact upon vehicular movements into and out of Homebase (HGV swept path modelling has demonstrated that this island cannot be increased in width). A formal crossing would then be required across Easton Lane to link the proposed footpath / cycle path to the existing National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23. Please refer to Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings - Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-063).</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ to secure a traffic free walking route between Winnall and Kings Worthy ▪ to ensure that the existing walking routes that cross the A33/A34 in the vicinity (that is the Itchen Way footpath and the Nun's Walk footpath) are not degraded by the Scheme but rather they be improved and ideally connected together. ▪ to ensure that the current walking (and cycling) route leading from Winnall to Easton Lane (east) across the junction 9 roundabout is moved away from the currently hazardous section of walking on a narrow pavement immediately adjacent to heavy traffic. <p>3. (b) The Ramblers Association welcomes the fact that these objectives will generally be met by the published plans. There are a number of relatively minor detailed matters of further improvement that are the subject of further discussion. See below.</p> <p>4. Walkers welcome the addition of a new public right of way (bridleway?) to the east of the motorway, linking the eastern side of the roundabout with the Long Walk to the northeast of the site.</p> <p>As discussed by the working group, instead of the Toucan crossing there is an obvious 'desire line' southbound, particularly for walkers, that remains to the west of the highways bordering the Homebase site to reach Easton Lane and the Tesco roundabout. If not properly provided for this could easily become the subject of an unofficial walkers' 'rat-run'.</p>	
RR-074b	<p>5. Ramblers have the following initial representations with respect to the DCO plans as published</p> <p>5. (a) 2.4 Rights of Way and Access Plans, Sheet 4 – also throughout Chapter 12</p> <p>An important existing public right of way is missing from the published plans. Itchen Valley Restricted Byway 19 terminates at the subway under the M3 on the 'Long Walk' less than 100 metres to the north of the northern end of the proposed new bridleway to the east of the motorway and leads directly eastwards to Easton Village. This will be a significant 'onward route' for many users of the new bridleway. Its existence must contribute to the added value of providing the new bridleway.</p>	<p>It is noted that this existing public right of way (Itchen Valley restricted Byway 19) is missing from the submission document Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, APP-008) and this shall be added to the next revision of the drawings. This existing route will not be affected by the proposed M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme.</p>
RR-074c	<p>5. (b) 2.5 General Arrangement Plans – throughout these plans the width of the proposed Winnall to Kings Worthy Walking and Cycling route is described as 3m wide (and the new footbridge 3.5m wide). The width is not specified in 2.4 Rights of Way and Access Plans.</p> <p>The width of the new route to the east of the motorway is not specified in either 2.4 or 2.5.</p>	<p>It is noted that the proposed walking and cycling widths are not prescribed in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, APP-008). The proposed walking and cycling elements are designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) CD143 Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding (Highways England, March 2021). The document is used for the design of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes on and/or adjacent to the motorway and all-purpose trunk road network. In accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) CD143 Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding (Highways</p>

	Our discussions within the working group have consistently identified that these paths need to be AT LEAST 4m wide to accommodate current good practice.	<p>England, March 2021, the widths of unsegregated shared use routes shall be a minimum of 3.0 metres where there are 200 users an hour or more.</p> <p>The width of the new Public Right of Way to the east of the Scheme (linking Easton Lane to Long Walk) is also proposed as 3.0 metres, and the new footbridge 3.5 metres wide. These are both referenced within Engineering Plans and Sections (2.6, APP-010).</p>
RR-074d	<p>5. (c) The legal status of both the Winnall to Kings Worthy route and the new route east of the motorway needs to be defined. (i.e.. Footpath, Bridleway, Restricted Byway, Byway, or 'other') so that legal requirements and ongoing maintenance implications can be clear. There is potential for much confusion along the length of the Winnall to Kings Worthy route because of the amount of re-use of existing highways etc.</p> <p>5. (d) Similarly the legal status of the east/west route through the roundabout needs to be simplified rather than showing a change of status mid-route. The reasons for the existing bridleway to end at the eastern edge of the current overbridge are historic and the result of failure of legal processes in the past. This would be a good opportunity to resolve the problem.</p>	<p>The legal status of the new, altered or diverted public rights of way is defined in Schedule 3 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019). The route to the west of the M3, being the Winnall to Kings Worthy shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, APP-008) between points 16, 4 and 15 will be a cycle track. The realignment of the pre-existing bridleway from underneath the gyratory to Easton Lane between points 3 and 4 on sheets 6 and 7 will remain a bridleway. The route to the east of the M3 shown on the public rights of way and access plans between points 1 and 2 will be a bridleway. Under article 14 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019) any highway constructed, altered or diverted, which includes a bridleway or cycle track, must be constructed to the satisfaction of Hampshire County Council as local highway authority who must then, unless otherwise agreed maintain that highway from completion.</p> <p>The creation of the cycle track to the west of the M3 and underneath the gyratory expands the current public rights of access to the west of the M3 will create a new link from the west to the east. The proposed layout on the east of the gyratory terminates the bridleway in a very similar position as per existing. The Applicant will be maintaining the current legal statuses of the public rights of way through the gyratory.</p>
RR-074e	5. (e) On the Winnall to Kings Worthy route it is disappointing to see the need for the at-grade signalised Toucan crossing outside the National Highway Depot and the need south of this for walkers (and others) to enter the environment of the new roundabout.	The Applicant notes the disappointment expressed by The Ramblers Association. This point has been subject to discussions with justifications for the proposed solution and technical information shared between parties. Unfortunately whilst alternative options have been explored, the proposed solution is the most appropriate when considering all of the constraints and impacts.

3.75 RR-075 Richard Cannon

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-075	To ensure the project is really worth it and if it goes ahead will it be another HS2 and stop halfway leaving a mess for whatever time it takes to get the money to carry on. Also similar to the Arundel By-Pass. I am deeply worried about the effects it will have on wildlife and nature in general if it's built, when it's being built and the after effects.	<p>Please refer to common response C: Need for the Scheme with respect to the benefits of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Funding Statement (4.2, APP-023) demonstrates that the Scheme if commenced will be sufficiently funded to enable completion.</p> <p>A thorough assessment of potential impacts to wildlife, including designated sites, habitats and species (aquatic and terrestrial), is set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-070), along with a suite of measures incorporated in the Scheme to avoid, mitigate, and compensate any identified impacts.</p>

3.76 RR-076 Richard Dilwyn Hawker

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-076	<p>This is a massive increase in width of the motorway, effectively doubling in size. Although the plan is to create 'species-rich' grassland, etc, the fact is that land is being taken to build this motorway. Existing wildlife and environment will be affected, totally unnecessarily. Bigger roads attract more traffic; this has been established many times. This will inevitably mean increased carbon emissions, at a time when we are, as a planet, and particularly as a nation, trying to lead the way in tackling climate change.</p> <p>This is in addition to the carbon emissions involved in construction. Better ways are available to solve transport problems, if they exist here, and these should be pursued very carefully before bigger roads are built. The Welsh government has realised this. England should surely realise this too. I object to this proposal.</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ H: Traffic assessment <p>The Environmental Statement (6.1, APP-042 – APP-059) and suite of Chapters within it assess the impacts on the environment. A thorough assessment of potential impacts to wildlife is set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-070), along with a suite of measures incorporated in the Scheme to avoid, mitigate, and compensate any identified impacts.</p> <p>The Scheme is not increasing the mainline width of the motorway.</p> <p>On the M3 northbound carriageway the existing four lane approach to Junction 9 will continue through the Junction until the proposed two lane diverge to the A34 northbound carriageway. The mainline M3 carriageway after this point will then be two lanes heading northbound as per the existing layout. On the M3 southbound, the existing carriageway is locally widened, although again this is through the extents of the Junction only. The A34 northbound and southbound carriageways are then realigned and existing sections of carriageway reused where possible to create the Scheme layout.</p>

3.77 RR-077 Richard Needham

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-077	<p>£200 million could be better spent on things with a positive impact rather than the negative impact this Scheme will produce. We need to have fewer cars on the roads, not make space for more.</p> <p>I am concerned about air pollution and the impact this will have on biodiversity and its carbon footprint. Winchesters air quality is already particularly bad and this will only add to it. We are in the 91st percentile for poor air quality. 90% of the country enjoy better air quality than we do here in Winchester. That's a shocking statistic We would be better spending this money on fixing the potholes and redoing the worn off markings on our current roads.</p> <p>We should be using it to create cycle ways pedestrianising our city centre and improving our public transport system, electric buses and trains. The money could be used towards making Winchester a beacon green city. With electric buses and taxis, lots of rewilding and creating more green spaces. Cycle ways and parks. Growth and expansion are unsustainable. We have to make some radical changes to the way we live, work and travel. The future is not in felling trees, concrete and tarmac. The future is Green or not at all. ????</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate change ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ D: Potholes and local roads ▪ E: Air quality ▪ F: Traffic assessment

3.78 RR-078 RJM Land Investments Ltd

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-078	<p>RJM is landowner of farmland/water meadows alongside the A34. The land includes part of the Barton Carrier river & is a SSSI - it adjoins Winnall Moor. I am concerned to know the precise details of the plans to protect & not jeopardise this sensitive habitat.</p> <p>I want to ensure that there is no impact to the boundary of the property & that there is no tree-removal planned.</p> <p>I am keen to know the noise attenuation plans. Are there any? If not why not?</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is set out in the application documents, for a summary of this please refer to common response B: Noise and vibration.</p> <p>Assessment of potential impacts to wildlife is set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-049), along with measures incorporated into the Scheme to avoid, mitigate, and compensate any identified impacts. The Applicant recognises the importance of Winnall Moors Nature Reserve for wet grassland, wintering birds and other such species such as Kingfisher and Roe Deer. However, the Nature Reserve lies outside the Application Boundary and there will be no impact on it from the Scheme.</p> <p>There is no noise mitigation proposed. Mitigation in the form of acoustic barriers is not proposed to form part of the Scheme, as the assessment reported within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-052) indicates that significant, long-term, residual operational noise impacts are not anticipated at any residential properties.</p> <p>If you would like to discuss this further, please contact Jonathan Nesbitt (j.nesbitt@ardent-management.com).</p>

3.79 RR-079 Robert Michael Jordan

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-079	<p>Just here to commend NH on including a new cycleway from Cart & Horses, Kings Worthy to Winnall, and bridleway from Easton Lane to Long Walk.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, this has been noted.</p>

3.80 RR-080 Robert Parker

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-080	<p>The expansion of the current highway system encourages traffic growth, increases carbon dioxide emissions to the atmosphere, further suppresses wildlife, pollutes our water ways and depletes our natural and finite resources. All to save a few minutes at a road junction. For the equivalent cost of this project, Hampshire County Council could resurface 500km of secondary roads. A much more worthy undertaking.</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate change ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ D: Potholes and local roads ▪ F: Traffic Assessment <p>Regarding the impact to biodiversity, please note that a thorough assessment of potential impacts to wildlife is set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-049), along with a suite of measures incorporated in the Scheme to avoid, mitigate, and compensate any identified impacts. The assessment concluded there would be no significant effects on biodiversity.</p> <p>The Scheme has been designed to avoid or reduce effects on road drainage and the water environment and includes pollution control measures as part of the temporary and permanent drainage strategy. For further</p>

	information please refer to Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-054) .
--	---

3.81 RR-081 Roberta Brockman

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-081	This project is a shameless capacity increase in order to encourage growth of traffic at a time when the government should be planning for traffic reduction. National Highways predicts a carbon cost of construction of 37,000 tonnes CO2 and extra user emissions of 140,000 tonnes, not counting the induced traffic from the capacity increase and assuming that transport decarbonises according to the Department for Transport's fantasy Decarbonisation Strategy.	<p>Please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ F: Traffic assessment <p>The assessment does not rely on the Department for Transport (DfT) (<i>Transport Decarbonisation Plan (TDP)</i>) for mitigation that would reduce GHG emissions associated with the Scheme. Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) sets out the mitigation that will be implemented through the design of the Scheme and secured through the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1).</p>

3.82 RR-082 Roger Lunn

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-082	I am concerned about the visual impact of the historic city of Winchester from the surrounding countryside and increase in noise levels and pollution.	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ E: Air quality <p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) has considered effects on views and visual amenity as a result of the Scheme. The assessment considers effects during construction and operation, immediately following construction and after 15 years. In accordance with the methodology set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 107 Landscape and Visual Effects (Highways England, February 2020), the assessment includes a range of representative view locations from which the visual effects of the Scheme are made.</p> <p>Representative view locations were established through a combination of site survey, visibility analysis and professional judgement. These locations were agreed with statutory consultees as documented in Table 7.1 of Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), and are illustrated on Figure 7.4 (Landscape and Visual View Locations) of the ES (6.2, App-067). View locations are included from a range of receptors, including views from the urban areas of Winchester including View Locations 4, 5, 10, 12, 17 and 18; and from the surrounding landscape in which views of the historic city of Winchester are visible including View Locations 8, 9, 13, 16, and 19. Views of the Scheme from the surrounding landscape to the east are typically backdropped by the historic City of Winchester, however the extent of visibility of the historic core varies. Section 7.9 of Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) presents the assessment of visual effects of the Scheme.</p>

3.83 RR-083 BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Royal Mail

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-083	<p>Royal Mail (RM) does not have an in principle objection to this proposed road Scheme but is seeking to secure mitigations to protect its operations during the construction phase. Under section 35 of the Postal Services Act 2011 (the “Act”), RM has been designated by Ofcom as a provider of the Universal Postal Service. RM is the only such provider in the United Kingdom. The Act provides that Ofcom’s primary regulatory duty is to secure the provision of the Universal Postal Service. Ofcom discharges this duty by imposing regulatory conditions on RM, requiring it to provide the Universal Postal Service.</p> <p>The Act includes a set of minimum standards for Universal Service Providers, which Ofcom must secure. The conditions imposed by Ofcom reflect those standards. RM is under some of the highest specification performance obligations for quality of service in Europe. Its performance of the Universal Service Provider obligations is in the public interest and should not be affected detrimentally by any statutorily authorised project. RM’s postal sorting and delivery operations rely heavily on road communications.</p> <p>RM’s ability to provide efficient mail collection, sorting and delivery to the public is sensitive to changes in the capacity of the highway network. RM is a major road user nationally. Disruption to the highway network and traffic delays can have direct consequences on RM’s operations, its ability to meet the Universal Service Obligation and comply with the regulatory regime for postal services thereby presenting a significant risk to RM’s business. Junction 9 of the M3 is a critical junction used by RM’s national and local collection, distribution and delivery operations.</p> <p>RM has four operational facilities within 10 miles, including Winchester Delivery Office c 0.75 miles distant. Highway works and Traffic Management for this Scheme risk impact on and delays to RM’s operations. Every day, in exercising its statutory duties RM vehicles use all the main roads that may potentially be affected by additional traffic arising / delays during construction of this Scheme.</p> <p>Any road disruption / closures, night or day, has potential to impact operations. RM does not wish to stop or delay this Scheme from being constructed, but does wish to protect its future ability to provide an efficient mail sorting and delivering service.</p> <p>In order to do this, RM requests that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the DCO includes specific requirements that during the construction phase RM is consulted by National Highways or its contractors at least one month in advance on any proposed road closures / diversions / alternative 	<p>The comments are noted. The Applicant has requested a meeting with BNP Paribas Real Estate to discuss the specific matters raised.</p> <p>Please refer to Table 3.1 in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161) which highlights commitments to meet the needs for specific customer groups. One of the customer groups is the Winnall Trading Estate Local Businesses, this includes Royal Mail. Royal Mail will be consulted at least 1 month in advance of any proposed closures/diversions that may impact the operation requirements of Winchester facility.</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan will periodically be updated in consultation with major road users including Royal Mail as outlined. There is a requirement for a Traffic Management Plan to be produced prior to commencement of the works as set out within Requirement 11 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019). The Traffic Management Plan will be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161).</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan to be secured under Requirement 11 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019) will include specific reference to Royal Mail within the Winnall Trading Estate Local Businesses customer group within the updated Table 3.1. The commitments within Table 3.1 include a detailed stakeholder management plan will also be developed to ensure consistent communication and engagement with local businesses including Royal Mail.</p> <p>Ongoing co-ordination with stakeholders will be undertaken through periodic traffic management/stakeholder co-ordination meetings. Attendance at these meetings will be in the form of invitations sent at least 5 business days in advance and sent by email.</p>

	<p>access arrangements, hours of working, and on the content of the final CTMP,</p> <p>2. the final CTMP includes a mechanism to inform major road users (including RM) about works affecting the local highways network (with particular regard to RM's distribution facilities near the DCO application boundary), and</p> <p>3. RM is able to join National Highways' consultation group with the Local Highways Authority and other major road users. RM reserves its position to object to the DCO application if the above requests are not adequately addressed.</p>	
--	---	--

3.84 RR-084 Rupert Cyril Pitt

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-084	<p>It is contrary to the local council (Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council) Declarations of Climate Emergency and their action plans It will not solve any congestion problem The road programme has never reduced overall congestion It will increase congestion elsewhere on the A34 leading to more road building demand It will increase congestion in the Twyford Down cutting and lead to further demands for widening. It will increase traffic pressures on the South Downs and New Forest National Parks It has no beneficial effects for the local area It will worsen air and noise pollution It will increase nature severance by further blocking nature pathways.</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ E: Air quality ▪ F: Traffic assessment <p>The Scheme is not contrary to the <i>Winchester City Council Carbon Neutrality Action Plan</i> (Winchester City Council, 2019) and <i>Winchester City Council's Carbon Neutrality Roadmap</i> (WSP, 2022) given that 'these are national infrastructure and will require a national response' and motorway transport emissions are excluded from them. Therefore, the Scheme's operational road-user emissions do not fall within Winchester City Council's target to be a carbon neutral Borough by 2030. It should also be noted that the road-user emissions set out in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), apply to the study area of the Scheme's transport model, which covers the region of South East England, and therefore these emissions are not limited to the boundary of Winchester City Council.</p> <p>A thorough assessment of potential impacts to wildlife is set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-049), along with a suite of measures incorporated in the Scheme to avoid, mitigate, and compensate any identified impacts. No significant effects through severance have been identified. In addition, the Scheme will deliver environmental enhancements through provision of substantial areas of new semi-natural habitats within South Downs National Park, including over 9ha of chalk grassland to the east of the M3 which will improve connectivity for wildlife.</p>

3.85 RR-085 Sarah Gooding

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-085	This project is not compatible with the UK commitment to net zero. The CCC has said we must stop road infrastructure building in order to reduce emissions. It will make little difference to congestion. This vast amount of money should be spent to improve local public transport, education or health.	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ B: Need for Scheme <p>Regarding congestion, the Transport Assessment (7.13, APP-166) discusses how the Scheme is predicted to reduce delays and congestion and therefore improve journey time reliability, in line with the Scheme objectives. An operational model analysis of predicted Scheme impacts is provided in Chapter 3 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (7.10, APP-163).</p> <p>The Scheme was included the Department for Transport's (DfT) Road Investment Strategy 2015/16 – 2019/20 (2015) (RIS1) and Road Investment Strategy 2 2020–2025 (2020) (RIS2). With respect to alternative transport options such as bus, train, and investment in other modes, a range of alternatives were considered and appraised during National Highways Project Control Framework (PCF) Stages 0, 1 and 2, the conclusion of which resulted in the preferred scheme of the M3 Junction 9 to be taken to detailed design in PCF Stage 3, in order to address the problem identified with the junction and the flow of movement from the A34 to the M3. The Scheme has been subject to a full options appraisal process as described in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-044) and Section 2 of the Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1).</p>

3.86 RR-086 Simon Burgess

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-086	This is a waste of money which should be better spent on public transport. The idea is outmoded and old fashioned. You are polishing a turd. The transport policy is broken if you have to resort to these measures!	This response has been noted.

3.87 RR-087 Simon Mole

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-087	<p>The proposed diversion are wholly unsuitable and impractical. They will adversely affect the Winchester inner ring road and residential areas such as Headbourne Worthy and Kings Worthy.</p> <p>There have been a series of serious (including fatal) accidents at the Cart & Horses Junction (B3047) where it joins the A33 Basingstoke Road. The diversions will increase the amount of traffic using this junction and will create more accidents. The applicant has failed to address this in their application.</p>	Please refer to Section 3.3.57 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161) , there are no planned diversions through Winchester City Centre. There are also no planned diversion routes through Kings Worthy / Headbourne Worthy.

3.88 RR-088 South Downs National Park Authority

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-088a	<p>Approximately 62% of the proposed Scheme area falls within the South Downs National Park and the majority of the remaining Scheme area is within the setting of the National Park.</p> <p>In summary, the proposal requires land from within the National Park to construct new roads / links and associated drainage and other works, provide a site for the temporary construction compound and provide land for various proposed mitigation measures. As acknowledged in the application submission, without appropriate and adequate mitigation, the proposal will result in significant adverse harm to the National Park.</p> <p>The South Downs National Park Authority (the Authority) will participate in the examination process and will be making a detailed representation at the appropriate time.</p> <p>However, at this stage our main issues (and as raised with the applicant throughout the process) are as follows:</p>	<p>The Applicant notes South Down National Park Authority's concerns. Our responses to each of them follow in turn.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that the total area of the Application Boundary is 109.77ha and the total area of the Application Boundary within the South Downs National Park is 68.09ha. Represented as a percentage, the total area of the Application Boundary within SDNP is 62%.</p>
RR-088b	<p>How the scheme meets the 'major development' tests. 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 tests 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.</p>	<p>Appendix A (Local Policy Assessment) of the Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1) assesses the Scheme against the major development tests within Policy SD3 of the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i>. Chapter 7 of the Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1) and the National Policy Statement for National Networks Accordance Table (7.2, APP-155) assess the Scheme against the tests laid out in the National Policy Statement for National Networks in relation to development in nationally designated areas.</p>
RR-088c	<p>Whether the scheme clearly demonstrates the mitigation hierarchy through the evolution of the proposals to show that National Highways have sought to minimise the impact on the National Park and comply with their statutory duty (under Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995) to have regard to the National Park Purposes and duty. In addition, the Authority has identified 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 priorities, set out below, should be used as the guiding framework for any Scheme proposal:</p>	<p>The Applicant has applied the mitigation hierarchy to the Scheme. This is outlined in Chapter 4 (Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP045). 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 Authority. These include removing three deposition areas and siting the construction compound to be adjacent to the Scheme in order to reduce the impact on the wider environment, the local community, and the users of the South Downs National Park Authority. Further details are included in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-044).</p>
RR-088d	<p>The landscape setting, this includes issues such as cutting into the Downland, land re-profiling, trees / woodland clearance and planting, and tranquillity (the landscape setting of this particular area featured prominently in the public inquiry into the designation of the National Park);</p>	<p>With regards to the landscape setting of the Scheme, as a result of statutory consultation in 2021, and the feedback received from South Downs National Park Authority, the Applicant has undertaken alterations to both the landscape designs and walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals. The Applicant has upgraded the footway to a proposed bridleway, and reinforced tree and shrub planting to the west of the route on the Scheme's embankments and cutting slopes and on the side slopes of the land-raising associated with reprofiling. This has been done to both open up views of the SDNP and provide visual screening of the Scheme where appropriate. The modifications will provide greater opportunities for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders to view the downland to the east, including re-created chalk grassland which is an integral part</p>

		<p>of the Scheme. Taken together this responds positively to creating further opportunities for recreational activities and access to the South Downs National Park. Lastly, the design solution also maximises tranquillity of these newly accessible areas, minimising audibility of the highway through sympathetic earthwork solutions. For further information please refer to Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1).</p>
RR-088e	<p>Water, particularly the quality and quantity impacts on the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation and Site of Special Scientific Interest, and Winnall Moors Nature Reserve;</p>	<p>The Scheme has been designed to avoid or reduce effects on road drainage and the water environment to include pollution control measures as part of the temporary and permanent drainage strategy to ensure that there are no detrimental impacts on the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation and Site of Special Scientific Interest. Section 13.9 of Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES (6.1, App-054) sets out the assessment of effects of the Scheme on the River Itchen, and Chapter 4 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (7.5, APP-158) sets out the effects on the River Itchen SAC, including changes to water quality.</p> <p>During construction, mitigation measures have been identified with reference to <i>Protecting Groundwater and Preventing Groundwater Pollution Guidance</i> (Environment Agency, March 2017) and relevant Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA) publications. These set out current best practice measures associated with preventing and mitigating construction phase impacts on surface and groundwater resources in agreement with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). This mitigation is also included within the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1). For the operation of the scheme, Appendix 13.1 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES (6.1, APP-142 and APP-143) confirms that the drainage strategy for the Scheme complies with the LLFA design criteria.</p> <p>Regarding Winnall Moors, since the 2021 statutory consultation, the Applicant has removed parts of the A34 northbound and A34 southbound from the Application Boundary, with the result that Winnall Moors Nature Reserve is outside the Application Boundary and therefore is not affected by the proposals. The Applicant has considered the Winnall Moors Nature Reserve in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-049). 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>
RR-088f	<p>Chalk grassland, including mitigation or compensation for areas directly impacted by the scheme, and</p>	<p>With regards to chalk grassland and mitigation, Figure 2.3 in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings – Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-062) sets out the environmental proposals and mitigation measures for the Scheme, including modifications to landform and proposed landscape elements (including areas of Woodland, Native Scrub Planting, and Chalk Grassland) located to the east of the modified highway and M3 Junction.</p> <p>The Scheme will deliver environmental enhancements through provision of substantial areas of new semi-natural habitats within South Downs National Park, including over 9ha of chalk grassland to the east of the M3. Chalk grassland is a Habitat of Principal Importance for Biodiversity in England, a Hampshire Biodiversity Action Plan habitat, a qualifying feature of nearby designated areas (such as St Catherine’s Hill Site of Special Scientific Interest), and the protection and enhancement of this habitat is a key theme within the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i> (adopted July 2019).</p> <p>The overall net gain in biodiversity units is lower with the reinstatement of chalk grassland as proposed, than it would be if a different habitat type were provided. For example, if ‘other neutral grassland’ was provided in place of chalk grassland then the predicted net gain in biodiversity would increase from +4.14% to +14.93%. This demonstrates that the Scheme could comfortably deliver over 10% BNG. However, whilst a change</p>

		from chalk grassland to other neutral grassland would be technically feasible, given the wider benefits, chalk grassland has been taken forward as being the most appropriate habitat for the Scheme. This approach is supported by Natural England, the Environment Agency and the South Downs National Park Authority.
RR-088g	Access to and from the National Park from Winchester for walkers, cyclists and other users (preventing any further severance and improving access where possible). We are currently assessing the proposals and will wish to raise detailed points at the relevant stage. We are also willing to continue to work with National Highways to try to overcome our objection.	<p>An objective of the Scheme is to provide improvements for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, which represent different forms of active travel. The current layout of the M3 and Junction 9 acts as a barrier between Winchester and the South Downs National Park, and the existing M3 corridor creates a degree of severance on the existing PRow network. As a result of statutory consultation in 2021, the Applicant has undertaken alterations to walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals. 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, and 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 shared use. Taken together these respond positively to creating further opportunities for recreational activities and access to the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-053) sets out the walking, cycling and horse-riding opportunities that have been identified and embedded into the design of the Scheme, see Section 12.8 of Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-053). This includes improving safety and accessibility between Winchester and the South Downs National Park. The assessment identified local public right of way as sensitive receptors, and assessed how the proposals would impact on this network. Temporary adverse effects were identified during the construction phase. However beneficial effects were identified during the operational phase, particularly on public right of way that intersect with the current gyratory layout.</p>

3.89 RR-089 Southampton City Council

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-089	<p>The A34/M3 Junction 9 Scheme will provide strategic access to the Port of Southampton on the important Midlands-Solent corridor for freight. Reliability and congestion at this junction has been highlighted by Transport for South East (TfSE) on a key freight corridor to the international gateway and Freeport at Southampton and the Scheme is in their draft Strategic Investment Plan (SIP). Southampton's Local Transport Plan (Connected Southampton 2040) also highlights need for reliable connections to the Port and city as they both grow. Unlocking congestion and capacity constraints at J9 will have positive impacts on local, regional and national economic growth particularly for trade through Southampton.</p> <p>Therefore, the Scheme will help to achieve this and should be supported. Our previous comments highlighted the need for the walking and cycling elements to be designed to LTN1/20 standards to ensure that there is connectivity around and across the junction, NCN23 goes through the junction - this route starts in Southampton and provides opportunities to access the South Downs National Park. These remain and the use of shared use paths for example should be minimised. It should be noted that this Scheme will need to show how it is achieving net zero carbon in line with national and local targets.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response. The Applicant notes that Southampton City Council support the Scheme.</p> <p>The proposed walking and cycling elements are designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) CD 143 Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding (Highways England, March 2021). The document is used for the design of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes on and/or adjacent to the motorway and all-purpose trunk road network. In accordance with CD143, the widths of unsegregated shared use routes shall be a minimum of 3.0 metres where there are 200 users an hour or more.</p> <p>The proposed walking and cycling routes as part of the Scheme are within a rural area. LTN 1/20 is more suited to urbanised areas, where high pedestrian and cyclist flows are anticipated. It should also be noted that the proposed walking and cycling route connects to the existing National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23 network. At the proposed point of tie-in, the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23 is a shared use path approximately 2m wide. Table 6-3 of LTN/120 states recommended widths for shared use routes carrying up to 300 cyclists per hour as 3.0 metres, which is the width as proposed for the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme. It is not expected that the proposed volumes of pedestrians and cyclists using the proposed route will be significantly high to warrant increased widths.</p> <p>In regard to your comments on net zero carbon, please refer to common response A: Climate.</p>

3.90 RR-090 Addleshaw Goddard LLP on behalf of Southern Gas Networks Plc

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-090	<p>Dear Sirs Highways England (Promoter)</p> <p>Application for an Order Granting Development Consent for the M3 Junction 9 Improvement project (Order).</p> <p>Planning Inspectorate Reference: TR010055 Objection on behalf of Southern Gas Networks Plc (SGN)</p> <p>8 March 2023</p> <p>Addleshaw Goddard LLP acts on behalf of SGN and is authorised to make this relevant representation on its behalf in objection to the proposed Order. SGN is the licensed gas transporter for the Order area, and objects so as to ensure the protection of its interests in land and apparatus and the safe and effective operation of its gas transportation network. As a responsible statutory undertaker, SGN's primary concern is to meet its statutory obligations and ensure that any development does not impact in any adverse way upon those statutory obligations.</p> <p>The Promoter seeks powers within the Order for the compulsory acquisition of land and rights in which SGN is interested. SGN therefore wishes to protect its position in light of existing apparatus which is both within, and in the vicinity of, the proposed Order boundaries through suitable protective provisions being secured in the Order. SGN's rights to retain its infrastructure in situ and rights of access to inspect, repair and renew such apparatus within the limits of the respective Order must be maintained at all times, and access by SGN and its servants and agents to that apparatus for the purpose of its undertaking must not be restricted.</p> <p>Accordingly, SGN will require appropriate protective provisions to be included within the Order to protect its statutory undertaking and to ensure that public safety is not compromised. Equally both the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State will need to be satisfied that the project will not cause a serious detriment to the carrying out by SGN of its statutory undertaking before granting consent to the proposed Order.</p> <p>In view of the above, and pending agreement with the Promoter, SGN objects to the Promoter's application and reserves its right to make further representations during the Examination process should that be so necessary. However, SGN is in the process of reviewing the draft Order and associated plans, and looks forward to engaging constructively with the Promoter in an effort to resolve all issues of concern.</p> <p>Should the Examining Authority require any additional information from SGN further to this representation, please contact Charlotte Jones of Addleshaw</p>	<p>Discussions are ongoing with SGN.</p>

	Goddard LLP, 3 Sovereign Square, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 4ER. Yours faithfully Addleshaw Goddard LLP	
--	--	--

3.91 RR-091 Southern Water

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-091	<p>This relevant representation is submitted on behalf of Southern Water Services Limited (“SWS”). SWS is the appointed water undertaker under the Water Industry Act 1991 for certain areas in the south-east of England comprising the Isle of Wight and parts of Hampshire, Sussex and Kent. SWS is also the appointed sewerage undertaker for the purposes of that same Act, comprising a larger continuous area stretching from Hampshire to Kent, including the Isle of Wight.</p> <p>As a result, SWS is subject to a number of strict statutory duties for the supply of water to c. 2.6 million people and providing sewerage services to c.4.6 million people. SWS is therefore a statutory undertaker for the purposes of section 127 of the Planning Act 2008. Should the proposed Development Consent Order (“the DCO”) be made to authorise National Highways to construct, operate and maintain the proposed alterations to Junction 9 of the M3 (“the Scheme”), it would permit development within the Order limits in areas where SWS is responsible for providing water and sewerage services.</p> <p>To fulfil its statutory duties, SWS maintains a wide range of apparatus that is critical to the continuing efficacy of its services. If made, the DCO would authorise the exercise of powers over or near land in which SWS maintains assets and/or has other rights for the purposes of discharging its statutory duties. Unchecked, the exercise of such powers in respect of SWS’s interests would cause severe detriment to it.</p> <p>Furthermore, should the DCO be made, it would authorise works within certain of SWS’s groundwater abstraction capture zones – further information is required from National Highways to confirm that the construction and operation of the Scheme would not give rise to any adverse effects on these zones, and that sufficient mitigation measures will be put in place. SWS notes the ‘standard’ set of protective provisions for the benefit of statutory undertakers contained in Part 1 of Schedule 10 to the draft DCO.</p> <p>It should be noted that SWS and National Highways have been positively engaging on some of these matters for some time and SWS sees no impediment at this stage to it being able to reach a satisfactory arrangement with National Highways during the course of the examination. However, absent such an arrangement having been formalised, SWS is obliged at this stage to formally object to the DCO application on the basis of the Scheme causing severe detriment to SWS’s apparatus and operations. SWS will</p>	Discussions are ongoing with Southern Water.

	<p>continue to engage with National Highways with a view to reaching a satisfactory arrangement during the examination.</p> <p>SWS does not propose at this stage to submit a Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary (“PADS”), given SWS understands there to be no SoCG between SWS and National Highways in front of the Examining Authority presently. However, SWS would be very happy to submit a PADS alongside any SoCG in due course, if the Examining Authority would consider it beneficial.</p>	
--	---	--

3.92 RR-092 Susan Bacchus

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-092	This project is a total waste of public money, leading to an increase in traffic, fossil fuel pollution and global warming. The government should be encouraging reduction in traffic, not the increase. There is nothing good I can say about this project whatsoever. It's a disaster for mankind.	This response has been noted.

3.93 RR-093 Susan Jayne Cook

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-093	<p>I have lived in the Village of [redacted] for some 28 years and the M3 has been a very big part of my daily commute.</p> <p>The proposed works will have a catastrophic effect on the Villages that surround these works that are very much overdue. We have more and more vehicles up our clogged up roads and we need to make this change to this junction input we must be mindful of the Residents that live nearby and of course we are in the SDNP so we must be vigilant at all times about our Habitat!</p> <p>This change also needs to be mindful of the Emerging Winchester Movement Strategy so please don't forget Pedestrians, Cycleways and Bridleways.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, this has been noted.</p> <p>There is a requirement for a Traffic Management Plan to be produced prior to commencement of the works as set out within Requirement 11 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019). The Traffic Management Plan will be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161), and is intended to ensure that disruption as a result of the construction of the scheme is minimised where possible.</p> <p>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) has considered landscape and visual effects of the Scheme. This includes consideration of the effects of the Scheme on the South Downs National Park as a designation, the landscape character for areas within the designation and wider landscape in which the Scheme is located, as well as on views and visual amenity.</p> <p>A thorough assessment of potential impacts to wildlife is set out in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-049), along with a suite of measures incorporated in the Scheme to avoid, mitigate, and compensate any identified impacts. No significant effects through severance have been identified. In addition, the Scheme will deliver environmental enhancements through provision of substantial areas of new semi-natural habitats within South Downs National Park, including over 9ha of chalk grassland to the east of the M3, all of which will improve connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>The Scheme seeks to facilitate and encourage active travel and sustainable forms of transport. The Scheme includes elements that either help ensure continued access for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders or bring</p>

		improvements in terms of current accessibility / severance. The Scheme has had regard to the Winchester Movement Strategy as outlined within Section 6 of the Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1) .
--	--	--

3.94 RR-094 Suzanne White

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-094a	As a local resident and motorist, I do not see a need for this development. I use this junction regularly and the improvements it will make to the journey are minimal in the light of the huge cost of the work and the irreparable damage it will do to the surrounding nature and environment.	<p>Please refer to common response C: Need for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (6.1, APP-042 – APP-153) sets out the effects of the Scheme and the measures designed to mitigate likely significant environmental effects arising from the Scheme. Where specific design, mitigation and enhancement measures have been applied, these are reported under each individual Chapters of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-042 – APP-151) and are summarised in the Non-Technical Summary of the ES (6.4, APP-153).</p> <p>Table 3.2 in the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1) details the commitments to environmental mitigation and is secured within the DCO Requirements.</p>
RR-094b	I work as a conservationist in the South Downs, restoring valuable chalk downland habitats, and this project will only decrease the biodiversity of the area. The mitigations planned will not be anywhere near enough to provide the minimum 10% increase in biodiversity net gain that will be required for infrastructure projects going forward. There are no wildlife corridors or green bridges planned to link vital habitats and wildlife will be further squeezed into a smaller area.	<p>With regards to biodiversity net gain, in 2022 a BNG assessment of the Scheme was undertaken. The methodology along with assumptions used, and the results were presented in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (6.3, APP-131) submitted with the DCO application in November 2022. Whilst the Scheme has undertaken this assessment it is not required to meet the minimum 10% BNG proposed by the Environment Act 2021 until it is in force, which for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects is likely to be November 2025.</p> <p>The BNG assessment of the Scheme presented in Appendix 8.2 (Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report) of the ES (6.3, APP-131) sets out the following results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in biodiversity (+4.14%) ▪ The Scheme would result in a predicted net gain in hedgerow units (+3.60) <p>The overall net gain in biodiversity units is lower with the reinstatement of chalk grassland as proposed, than it would be if a different habitat type were provided. For example, if 'other neutral grassland' was provided in place of chalk grassland then the predicted net gain in biodiversity would increase from +4.14% to +14.93%. This demonstrates that the Scheme could comfortably deliver over 10% BNG. 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 the most appropriate habitat for the Scheme. This approach is supported by Natural England, the Environment Agency and the South Downs National Park Authority.</p> <p>The Scheme will deliver environmental enhancements through provision of substantial areas of new semi-natural habitats within South Downs National Park, including over 9ha of chalk grassland to the east of the M3. Chalk grassland is a Habitat of Principal Importance for Biodiversity in England, a Hampshire Biodiversity Action Plan habitat, a qualifying feature of nearby designated areas (such as St Catherine's Hill Site of Special Scientific Interest), and the protection and enhancement of this habitat is a key theme within the <i>South Downs Local Plan</i> (adopted July 2019). As shown in Figure 2.3 in Sheet 2 of 11 in Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings – Figures) of the ES (6.2, APP-062) other habitats provided include native broadleaved woodland and native scrub, both on the highway estate and within adjacent farmland. Woodland</p>

		and scrub have been located to maintain and enhance connectivity for wildlife (including bats and dormice) within the Application Boundary and adjacent landscape.
RR-094c	This project does not cater for the future transport needs of the area. More long term thinking is required from National Highway in how to deliver sustainable transport solutions to achieve the government's Decarbonising Transport: A Better, Greener Britain ("the transport decarbonisation plan"). The planned walking and cycling route is paying lip-service to this but will be nowhere enough to discourage individual car use in the years to come.	The priorities set out in the Department for Transport (DfT) <i>Transport Decarbonisation Plan (TDP)</i> include increasing cycling and walking. The Scheme includes the provision of high-quality accessible pedestrian, cyclist and horse-riding routes which will encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes. Other priorities in the TDP relate to zero emission vehicles and railways which is beyond the scope of this Scheme.

3.95 RR-095 Thomas Rogers

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-095a	<p>These are my remaining comments from the 2021 consultation that I would like to enter into the Examination:</p> <p>1. Why has the existing R&W materials compound site situated right next to Junction 9 between the M3 SB On slip and the Spitfire spur road not been part of the construction compounds choice or explained in the Assessment of Alternatives - it is run by an established National Highways contractor, it is full of 'recycled' potential engineering fill material from the strategic road network and is adjacent to the site/junction and could reduce or at least ease the need for greenfield construction compounds.</p>	<p>The R&W Environmental recycling centre provides essential services for soils and water treatment. The R&W centre is not capable of accommodating continued operations in tandem with a construction compound.</p> <p>The R&W Environmental recycling centre footprint is half the 2.5 hectares required for the main compound to enable cabins, car parking and storage areas to be accommodated. Therefore, it was not deemed to be a viable option for the M3 Junction 9 compound.</p> <p>Appendix F (Draft Materials Management Plan) secured within the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1) will include investigation of sustainable procurement options for material resources, this will include local sources.</p>
RR-095b	<p>2. Regarding the 'Cart and Horses junction' on the A33 just outside the proposed Order Limits, there is a most fantastic opportunity to include in this Scheme (with collaboration between Hampshire County Council, Winchester City Council and National Highways) 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, all while Tier 1 contractors are on site with the main M3 J9 Improvements Scheme.</p>	<p>The Applicant's modelling shows that the Scheme is not predicted to negatively impact the safety levels of the Cart and Horses junction. Any changes made to this junction would need to happen outside of the DCO process. The Junction falls outside of the Scheme Objectives and is not included in the DCO application.</p>
RR-095c	<p>My family and I will remain interested in the quality of biodiversity and habitat opportunities set out in the Outline LEMP and would like to see those commitments made by some means or other that would enable longer than a 20 year duration of suitable maintenance.</p>	<p>Information on management and monitoring of habitat creation and enhancement measures is provided within Appendix 7.6 in the (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (6.3, APP-102). The management and monitoring for each landscape/ecology element created or enhanced is 25 years from completion of the Scheme.</p> <p>As set out in the Record of environmental actions and commitments contained within the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, 1), further detail will be provided within a full Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) secured through a DCO Requirement in consultation with statutory consultees.</p>

3.96 RR-096 Transport Action Network

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-096	<p>Transport Action Network objects to the DCO application as the Applicant acknowledges the Scheme would lead to increases in traffic and carbon emissions. This will make it more difficult for the UK to meet its commitments under the Climate Change Act and our Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) under the Paris Agreement. We disagree with the Applicant's assessment of significance of carbon emissions.</p> <p>We do not believe the Transport Decarbonisation Plan (TDP) which the Applicant's relies on demonstrates a credible pathway to reduce emissions from road transport fast enough. We also believe that comparing a Scheme's emissions against the entire UK's carbon budget for every sector is not a credible or robust comparison.</p> <p>The Applicant's should use the 2022 IEMA guidance and compare the Scheme against local and regional transport carbon budgets, to have a meaningful assessment of significance.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes your objections.</p> <p>With regard to concerns about increased traffic and carbon emissions, please refer to common response H: on Traffic Assessment and common response A: on Climate.</p> <p>There is no legislated methodology for the assessment of significance that should be followed to assess likely significant effects of a Scheme. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and the Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA) guidance are both widely used to assess climate change in EIA. For a road Scheme, the UK-wide industry standard methodology to use for assessments are those set out within the DMRB. National Highways follows these standards to ensure consistency in how all road Schemes are progressed and the outcomes evaluated. As a result, the assessments undertaken within Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement ES (6.1, Rev 1) were in accordance with DMRB LA 114 Climate (Highways England, June 2021). The DMRB in turn follows the <i>National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)</i>. The <i>National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)</i> sets the national policy framework against which decision makers can evaluate the outcomes of proposed road infrastructure projects. As noted in Paragraphs 14.5.33-35 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement ES (6.1, Rev 1), the methodology is consistent with the decision-making requirements set out in paragraphs 5.17 and 5.18 of the <i>National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)</i>.</p> <p>The assessment undertaken does not rely on the <i>Department for Transport (DfT) Transport Decarbonisation Plan (TDP)</i> to secure mitigation that would reduce GHG emissions associated with the Scheme. Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) sets out the mitigation that has been secured through the design of the Scheme and will be confirmed through other means such as the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1).</p> <p>The impact assessment and conclusions presented in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) are based on the Do-something and Do-minimum scenarios using the Scheme's traffic model and Defra's Emission Factor Toolkit (EFT). The EFT does not account for measures in the TDP. The TDP has therefore not been taken into account within the assessment of significance in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1).</p> <p>The sensitivity test in Table 14.7 in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) is not part of the impact assessment. It provides additional context to demonstrate that Government policy and measures in the TDP, that are not accounted for in the EFT, could lead to reduction in road-user emissions. However, these reductions are not being relied on or secured through the DCO application for the Scheme.</p> <p>In relation to carbon legislation and commitments such as the Climate Change Act Carbon Budgets and the Paris Agreement, the methodology for assessment is consistent with the decision-making requirements set out in paragraphs 5.17 and 5.18 of the <i>National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN)</i>, including the requirement that for road projects applicants should provide evidence of the carbon impact of the project and an assessment against the Government's Carbon Budgets.</p> <p>As set out in Paragraph 14.5.38 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), the <i>Climate Change Act 2008 (CCA)</i> does not impose a legal duty to set carbon budgets at a smaller</p>

		<p>scale than the national level. The Government has not identified any sectoral targets for carbon reductions related to transport or any other sector. As a result there is no requirement in the CCA, or in Government policy, for carbon emissions for all road transport to become net zero. A net increase in emissions from a particular policy or project is managed within the Government's overall strategy for meeting carbon budgets and the net zero target as part of 'an economy-wide transition'</p> <p>The Applicant notes that in respect of the assessment of significance against the UK Carbon Budgets, and consistency with the Paris Agreement, its approach follows that as acknowledged by the Secretary of State in the M25 Junction 28 Improvement Project decision letter: '92. <i>The Secretary of State considers, in the light of paragraph 5.18 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN), it is necessary to evaluate whether (amongst other things) the increase in carbon emissions resulting from the Proposed Development would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets. As set out above, the CCC consider that the 2050 target and interim CBs [carbon budgets] should meet the goals of the Paris Agreement meaning a proposal which is compatible with the 2050 target and interim CBs is consistent with the approach to addressing the severe adverse effects of climate change...The Secretary of State considers that the approach to considering the impact on carbon emissions as set out in the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN) continues to be relevant in the light of international obligations and domestic obligations related to reducing carbon emissions that have come into force since the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN) was designated. The Secretary of State notes that the CBs are economy-wide and not just targets in relation to transport.'</i></p> <p>Paragraph 94 of the M25 Junction 28, in respect of the UK Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) committed to under the Paris Agreement, notes that: 'The UK's NDC commits it to reduce net GHG emissions by at least 68% by 2030 compared to 1990. This represents an increase of ambition on the fifth carbon budget, which covers the period 2028-2032. The Net Zero Strategy sets out how the UK will therefore need to overachieve on the fifth carbon budget to meet its international climate targets and stay on track for the sixth carbon budget. This strategy sets out the action Government will take to keep the UK on track for meeting the UK's CBs and 2030 NDC and establishes the UK's longer-term pathway towards net zero by 2050. The Secretary of State is content that consenting the Proposed Development will not impact on the delivery of this strategy and will not lead to a breach of the UK's international obligations in relation to the Paris Agreement or any domestic enactments or duties.'</p> <p>As summarised in Paragraph 14.10.16 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), the Scheme is expected to contribute approximately 0.002% of the UK's 4th carbon budget and 0.001% of the 5th and 0.002% of the 6th carbon budget. The Scheme is therefore considered to not significantly affect the delivery of the Net Zero Strategy, the Paris Agreement, the legislated Carbon Budgets or the NDC.</p> <p>The impact assessment has therefore only been undertaken against national level carbon budgets which reflect existing government policy to reach net zero by 2050, and an analysis against a sector or local 2030 target has not been undertaken. Given that there are no legal sectoral and/or local carbon budgets or trajectories to net zero in place, using the national UK Carbon Budgets to contextualise the Scheme's emissions would remain the most appropriate approach.</p> <p>With regard to concerns about the use of IEMA assessment methodology, the Applicant has provided a table below to indicate where IEMA assessment principles have been followed. Section 5.2: 'GHG quantification principles' of the 2022 IEMA guidance (IEMA, 2022) sets out principles that GHG assessments should follow.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>These are replicated below, along with where these principles were followed within Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1).</p>																		
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1448 352 2223 506"> <p>GHG quantification principles (IEMA, 2022) quantification principles (IEMA, 2022)</p> </td> <td data-bbox="2223 352 2881 506"> <p>Where the principles are addressed within Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1, Rev 1)</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1448 506 2223 695"> <p>GHG quantification within EIA should follow the principles outlined in key documents such as the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard, BS EN ISO 14064-2 or PAS 2080 – Relevance, Completeness, Consistency, Transparency and Accuracy.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="2223 506 2881 695"> <p>Section 14.5, notably Paragraph 14.5.2 and Table 14.1.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1448 695 2223 915"> <p>The assessment should seek to quantify the difference in GHG emissions between the proposed project and the baseline scenario (the alternative project/solution in place of the proposed project). Assessment results should reflect the difference in whole life net GHG emissions between the two options.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="2223 695 2881 915"> <p>The GHG baseline is set out in Section 14.7. The difference in GHGs between the baseline and the Scheme is set out in Section 14.10.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1448 915 2223 1104"> <p>The assessment must include all material emissions, direct or indirect (based on the point above), during the whole life of the proposed project. The boundary of the assessment should be clearly defined, in alignment with best practice.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="2223 915 2881 1104"> <p>Table 14.1 sets out the emission boundary, including direct and indirect emissions.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1448 1104 2223 1188"> <p>The assessment should seek to present a reasonable worst case.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="2223 1104 2881 1188"> <p>See Paragraph 14.5.39.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1448 1188 2223 1272"> <p>Any exclusions, limitations, assumptions and uncertainties should be justified and reported where appropriate.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="2223 1188 2881 1272"> <p>See Paragraph 14.5.40.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1448 1272 2881 1419"> <p>Essentially, although the approach to assessment adopted in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) accords with the methodology within DMRB LA 114 Climate (Highways England, June 2021), it also broadly aligns with the methodology set out in the IEMA guidance as shown in above.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1448 1419 2881 1713"> <p>The IEMA guidance also explains in Section 6.2 that <i>‘the crux of significance is not whether a project emits GHG emissions, not even the magnitude of GHG emissions alone, but whether it contributes to reducing GHG emissions relative to a comparable baseline consistent with a trajectory towards net zero by 2050.’</i> Therefore, to assess the significance of a project’s whole life carbon emissions, an assessment of the Scheme’s carbon reductions has to be made against a baseline which contains a trajectory towards net zero. The very fact that a project may result in residual emissions is insufficient to render its emissions significant if it is in alignment with the UK’s trajectory to net zero.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1448 1713 2881 1900"> <p>The 2022 IEMA guidance further states that <i>‘the context of a project’s carbon footprint determines whether it supports or undermines a trajectory towards net zero’</i>. Given the previously mentioned context that there are no legal sectoral or local carbon budgets or trajectories to net zero in place, using the national UK Carbon Budgets to contextualise the Scheme’s emissions would remain the most appropriate approach if the assessment were to apply the IEMA guidance.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>GHG quantification principles (IEMA, 2022) quantification principles (IEMA, 2022)</p>	<p>Where the principles are addressed within Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1, Rev 1)</p>	<p>GHG quantification within EIA should follow the principles outlined in key documents such as the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard, BS EN ISO 14064-2 or PAS 2080 – Relevance, Completeness, Consistency, Transparency and Accuracy.</p>	<p>Section 14.5, notably Paragraph 14.5.2 and Table 14.1.</p>	<p>The assessment should seek to quantify the difference in GHG emissions between the proposed project and the baseline scenario (the alternative project/solution in place of the proposed project). Assessment results should reflect the difference in whole life net GHG emissions between the two options.</p>	<p>The GHG baseline is set out in Section 14.7. The difference in GHGs between the baseline and the Scheme is set out in Section 14.10.</p>	<p>The assessment must include all material emissions, direct or indirect (based on the point above), during the whole life of the proposed project. The boundary of the assessment should be clearly defined, in alignment with best practice.</p>	<p>Table 14.1 sets out the emission boundary, including direct and indirect emissions.</p>	<p>The assessment should seek to present a reasonable worst case.</p>	<p>See Paragraph 14.5.39.</p>	<p>Any exclusions, limitations, assumptions and uncertainties should be justified and reported where appropriate.</p>	<p>See Paragraph 14.5.40.</p>	<p>Essentially, although the approach to assessment adopted in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) accords with the methodology within DMRB LA 114 Climate (Highways England, June 2021), it also broadly aligns with the methodology set out in the IEMA guidance as shown in above.</p>		<p>The IEMA guidance also explains in Section 6.2 that <i>‘the crux of significance is not whether a project emits GHG emissions, not even the magnitude of GHG emissions alone, but whether it contributes to reducing GHG emissions relative to a comparable baseline consistent with a trajectory towards net zero by 2050.’</i> Therefore, to assess the significance of a project’s whole life carbon emissions, an assessment of the Scheme’s carbon reductions has to be made against a baseline which contains a trajectory towards net zero. The very fact that a project may result in residual emissions is insufficient to render its emissions significant if it is in alignment with the UK’s trajectory to net zero.</p>		<p>The 2022 IEMA guidance further states that <i>‘the context of a project’s carbon footprint determines whether it supports or undermines a trajectory towards net zero’</i>. Given the previously mentioned context that there are no legal sectoral or local carbon budgets or trajectories to net zero in place, using the national UK Carbon Budgets to contextualise the Scheme’s emissions would remain the most appropriate approach if the assessment were to apply the IEMA guidance.</p>	
<p>GHG quantification principles (IEMA, 2022) quantification principles (IEMA, 2022)</p>	<p>Where the principles are addressed within Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference 6.1, Rev 1)</p>																			
<p>GHG quantification within EIA should follow the principles outlined in key documents such as the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard, BS EN ISO 14064-2 or PAS 2080 – Relevance, Completeness, Consistency, Transparency and Accuracy.</p>	<p>Section 14.5, notably Paragraph 14.5.2 and Table 14.1.</p>																			
<p>The assessment should seek to quantify the difference in GHG emissions between the proposed project and the baseline scenario (the alternative project/solution in place of the proposed project). Assessment results should reflect the difference in whole life net GHG emissions between the two options.</p>	<p>The GHG baseline is set out in Section 14.7. The difference in GHGs between the baseline and the Scheme is set out in Section 14.10.</p>																			
<p>The assessment must include all material emissions, direct or indirect (based on the point above), during the whole life of the proposed project. The boundary of the assessment should be clearly defined, in alignment with best practice.</p>	<p>Table 14.1 sets out the emission boundary, including direct and indirect emissions.</p>																			
<p>The assessment should seek to present a reasonable worst case.</p>	<p>See Paragraph 14.5.39.</p>																			
<p>Any exclusions, limitations, assumptions and uncertainties should be justified and reported where appropriate.</p>	<p>See Paragraph 14.5.40.</p>																			
<p>Essentially, although the approach to assessment adopted in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) accords with the methodology within DMRB LA 114 Climate (Highways England, June 2021), it also broadly aligns with the methodology set out in the IEMA guidance as shown in above.</p>																				
<p>The IEMA guidance also explains in Section 6.2 that <i>‘the crux of significance is not whether a project emits GHG emissions, not even the magnitude of GHG emissions alone, but whether it contributes to reducing GHG emissions relative to a comparable baseline consistent with a trajectory towards net zero by 2050.’</i> Therefore, to assess the significance of a project’s whole life carbon emissions, an assessment of the Scheme’s carbon reductions has to be made against a baseline which contains a trajectory towards net zero. The very fact that a project may result in residual emissions is insufficient to render its emissions significant if it is in alignment with the UK’s trajectory to net zero.</p>																				
<p>The 2022 IEMA guidance further states that <i>‘the context of a project’s carbon footprint determines whether it supports or undermines a trajectory towards net zero’</i>. Given the previously mentioned context that there are no legal sectoral or local carbon budgets or trajectories to net zero in place, using the national UK Carbon Budgets to contextualise the Scheme’s emissions would remain the most appropriate approach if the assessment were to apply the IEMA guidance.</p>																				

		<p>Under section 6.3 of the IEMA guidance, the following is stated: ‘A project that is compatible with the budgeted, science based 1.5°C trajectory (in terms of rate of emissions reduction) and which complies with up-to-date policy and ‘good practice’ reduction measures to achieve that has a minor adverse effect that is not significant. It may have residual emissions but is doing enough to align with and contribute to the relevant transition scenario, keeping the UK on track towards net zero by 2050 with at least a 78% reduction by 2035/37 and thereby potentially avoiding significant adverse effects.’</p> <p>National Highways has set a programme and net zero targets within its Net zero highways: our 2030/2040/2050 plan (National Highways, 2021). The targets within this plan align with the UK Carbon Budget trajectory to net zero by 2050. These targets include net zero maintenance and construction activities by 2040 with an interim target of 10% reduction compared to 2020 by 2025. Mitigation measures with the aim of reducing the Scheme’s emissions in line with the Net Zero Highways plan are reported in Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1).</p> <p>Mitigation has been secured through incorporating the measures within the design of the Scheme and the application drawings submitted with the DCO application and will be confirmed through the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1). Measures include retaining existing pavements where possible, reducing the volume of material required to construct the Scheme and using alternative materials that are less carbon intensive. For the operation stage, mitigation includes the provision of high-quality accessible pedestrian, cyclist and horse-riding routes which will encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.</p> <p>Further work will be undertaken during detailed design, including the development of an internal Carbon Management Plan and Carbon Opportunities Tracker for the Scheme. This will enable mitigation to continue to evolve as the design of the Scheme progresses and to align the Scheme with the targets within the Net Zero Highways plan.</p> <p>Given that the Scheme is required to align with the Net Zero Highways plan, and that the plan in turn aligns with the UK Carbon Budgets, it can be considered that the reduction measures secured through the application for the Scheme contributes to reducing GHG emissions relative to the UK Carbon Budget trajectory net zero by 2050. Based on this, the Scheme is considered to have a minor adverse and not significant effect in accordance with IEMA guidance. This conclusion corresponds with the conclusions in the Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) which states that the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect on climate, in line with the position set out within Section 5.18 of the <i>National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)</i> and DMRB LA 114 Climate (Highways England, June 2021).</p>
--	--	--

3.97 RR-097 Transport for the South East

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-097	Transport for the South East (TfSE) is a sub-national transport body (STB), which provides a single voice on the transport interventions needed to support sustainable economic growth across its geography. The South East is crucial to the UK economy and is the nation’s major international gateway for people and business with some of the largest ports and airports in the country. High-quality transport infrastructure is critical to making the South East more	Thank you for your response, this has been noted.

<p>competitive, contributing to national prosperity and improving the lives of our residents.</p> <p>TfSE's transport strategy (2020) set out an ambitious vision for the area. Through area studies, we identified multimodal packages of transport interventions. Underpinned by a credible, evidence based technical programme, we consulted on our draft Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) in the autumn of 2022. When published in spring 2023, the SIP will present a compelling case for decision making. Prioritised in the SIP as part of our Wessex Thames - Highways Package TfSE supports proposals for upgrades to the M3 Junction 9 to improve flow of traffic directly between the M3 and the A34.</p> <p>A pinch point which presents significant reliability and capacity issues on a nationally significant corridor connecting UK manufacturing industries in the North and Midlands with the international Port of Southampton. The A34/M3 also provides a link for commuters and visitors travelling to and from the south coast. The economic benefit of accommodating more freight and unlocking growth in this area is a key objective for TfSE. The upgraded junction will help to unlock additional freight capacity and ensure reliable freight movements away from the Solent ports, increasing their competitiveness and supporting the ambition of the wider Solent Freeport initiative which aims to continue expansion and support 26,000 new jobs in the area.</p> <p>Our transport strategy seeks to deliver sustainable economic growth that achieves the right balance between the economic, social and environmental pillars of sustainable development. This means that any intervention in the area's transport networks to address connectivity challenges must ensure that the environment is protected and where possible enhanced and that opportunities to improve the health, wellbeing and quality of life for everyone are realised.</p> <p>We welcome the focus given to addressing the environmental challenges and National Highways objective to deliver a Scheme that minimises environmental impact and seeks to protect and enhance the quality of the surrounding environment through responsible design. Identified in the SIP and Linked to this Scheme is introduction of Smart motorway running from Junction 9 to 14 of the M3 to reduce traffic in Winchester city and other motorway diversion routes.</p> <p>TfSE support the pause to the Smart motorway programme until safety concerns are resolved but the need for capacity improvement of this section of the SRN is a priority and will require an alternative solution if Smart motorway safety issues cannot be resolved.</p>	
---	--

3.98 RR-098 Twyford Parish Council

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-098	<p>The Twyford Parish Council is very concerned about the diversion works proposed during phase 2 of the works. This relates to the increased use of the Hockley Cross Interchange (Junction 11) and its interface with the B3335 / A3090.</p> <p>National Highways have already acknowledged deficiencies in the operation of the traffic lights at this junction and the impact it has on pedestrians, cyclists and other users of the B3335. Since a re-timing of the operation of traffic lights is required during the operation of the diversion route, along with a significant increase in volume of vehicles, the Parish Council is concerned that this will lead to a worsening of the impacts as a result of the deficiencies already identified.</p> <p>In order to mitigate the effects of the J9 works, improvements to the operation of the traffic lights and road layout at the Hockley Cross Interchange (Junction 11) and its interface with the B3335 / A3090 must be carried out prior to the works commencing on the J9 improvements.</p>	<p>Diversion routes will be reviewed as part of the update to the Traffic Management Plan during the detailed design stage in order to minimise disruption. There is a requirement for a Traffic Management Plan to be produced prior to commencement of the works as set out within Requirement 11 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019). The Traffic Management Plan will be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161).</p> <p>Section 3.3.58 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161) states the following:</p> <p>During the detailed design stage, the following will be required in addition to those already developed for Stage 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final review of suitability against all areas of the customer service standard for diversion routes for planned works and activities and explanation of where the standard is not met. Description of the signing provision and any other activities required to reduce the disruption to customers and communities, including the use of VMS. <p>Information on the Construction Traffic Management traffic modelling assessment can be found in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (7.10, APP-163).</p> <p>Improvements to traffic lights and road layout at the Hockley Interchange (Junction 11) is not included in the DCO application.</p>

3.99 RR-099 UK Health Security Agency

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-099	<p>Thank you for your consultation regarding the above development. The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) welcomes the opportunity to comment on your proposals at this stage of the project.</p> <p>Please note that we request views from the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities (OHID) and the response provided is sent on behalf of both UKHSA and OHID. We can confirm that: With respect to Registration of Interest documentation, we are reassured that earlier comments raised by us on 27th August 2019 have been addressed.</p> <p>In addition, we acknowledge that the Environmental Statement (ES) has not identified any issues which could significantly affect public health. OHID had previously raised concerns with the use of the DMRB LA112 methodology within the Population and Human Health chapter, as it doesn't include an assessment of significance for those elements scoped in and as required under the EIA Regulations.</p>	<p>This response has been noted.</p>

	<p>Upon review of the results of the applicant's assessment, we recognise that in this instance any additional assessment of significance is unlikely to significantly alter the findings. Following our review of the submitted documentation we are satisfied that the proposed development should not result in any significant adverse impact on public health.</p> <p>On that basis, we have no additional comments to make at this stage and can confirm that we have chosen NOT to register an interest with the Planning Inspectorate on this occasion. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or concerns.</p>	
--	---	--

3.100 RR-100 Ward Councillor for Badger Farm and Oliver's Battery

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-100	It is badly needed to reduce congestion on M3 and A34	Thank you, this response has been noted.

3.101 RR-101 Winchester Action on the Climate Crisis

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-101	<p>It would be reckless to proceed with this project until it is clear it will not undermine the government targets to reduce emissions to net zero by 2050, and until alternative less harmful ways of reducing the congestion have been rigorously explored.</p> <p>This work has not yet been done, or at least the results have not yet been published nor the results evaluated. National Highways has not yet provided sufficient data to estimate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the embedded carbon released in the construction proposed ▪ the expected growth in traffic volumes resulting from the increase in capacity ▪ the increase in vehicle emissions caused by the growth in traffic volumes ▪ the increase in vehicle emissions caused by higher speeds through the junction ▪ the carbon intensity of vehicle fuel supplies allowing for the change in fuel between now and 2050 especially taking account of emissions caused by vehicles fuelled directly by fossil fuels, and vehicles fuelled indirectly by fossil fuels by using energy (electricity, hydrogen) produced by burning or reforming gas. <p>National Highways have not provided their trajectories for changes in vehicle energy use, nor changes in the balance of electricity generation. No full analysis has been done on other ways of reducing congestion at this junction:</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ C: Need for the Scheme ▪ H: Traffic assessment <p>Table 14.4 in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) sets out the construction emissions of the Scheme, including embodied carbon. Table 14.6 in Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) sets out the road-user emissions resulting from the Scheme. This is based on the Scheme's traffic model which accounts for traffic growth and link speed along the affected road network. As noted in Paragraph 14.5.40 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), the <i>DEFRA Emissions Factor Toolkit (EFT)</i>, which has been used to calculate road-user emissions, takes account of likely changes to national vehicle fleet composition such as increasing uptake of electric vehicles. The output of the EFT includes both direct emissions from vehicle tailpipes and indirect emissions associated with the charging of electric/plug-in-hybrid vehicles. Analysis beyond this, such as fuel supply and energy generation, has not been undertaken given that this is outside the control of the Applicant.</p> <p>The Scheme was included the Department for Transport's (DfT) <i>Road Investment Strategy 2015/16 – 2019/20 (2015) (RIS1)</i> and <i>Road Investment Strategy 2 2020–2025 (2020) (RIS2)</i>. With respect to alternative transport options such as rail links and public transport options, a range of alternatives were considered and appraised during National Highways Project Control Framework (PCF) Stages 0, 1 and 2, the conclusion of which resulted in the preferred scheme of the M3 Junction 9 to be taken to detailed design in PCF Stage 3, in order to address the problem identified with the Junction and the flow of movement from the A34 to the M3. The Scheme has been subject to a full options appraisal process as described in Chapter 3</p>

<p>e.g. improving railway freight capacity between Southampton and the Midlands, developing good frequent public transport between Basingstoke and Southampton, developing a frequent low-carbon bus network across Hampshire, and trebling cross-country trains bringing them back to their pre-covid frequency. Only once National Highways has made a convincing greenhouse gas reduction case should they be allowed to proceed, and then only if there are no less carbon-intensive alternatives.</p>	<p>(Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-044) and Section 2 of the Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1).</p>
--	--

3.102 RR-102 Winchester City Council

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-102a	<p>As host authority Winchester City Council (WCC) wish to register as an Interested Party. Detailed representations will be made in the Local Impact Report however at this time following review of the published documents, WCC wishes to make the following comments and look forward to being involved in the process to discuss matters further.</p>	<p>This response has been noted.</p>
RR-102b	<p>Climate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2,000 tCO₂e per year is emitted compared to the status quo or ‘do nothing’ scenario. WCC has targets to become a carbon neutral district by 2030. ▪ The additional carbon is therefore in opposition to aims to achieve the Council’s target. ▪ Emissions will rise by 139,800 tCO₂e over the lifetime of the scheme and the local impacts must be given deeper consideration. ▪ The Climate Change Baseline conditions cease at 2010 and do not include the warmest years on record which are within the last decade. ▪ Given interrelated impact of climate change on flooding, it is not acceptable to increase flooding risk in the locality and mitigation is required to remove risk. Submissions should take account of recent flood events in the city including significant events in 2014 and 2020 (flood records up to 2006 have been used; para 14.14.6). ▪ Mitigation proposed for emissions during the operation of the scheme are currently inadequate. 	<p>The Applicant recognises the value of Winchester City Council’s targets which are aimed to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030. However, as set out in Paragraph 14.5.38 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1), the <i>Climate Change Act 2008 (CCA)</i> does not impose a legal duty to set carbon budgets at a smaller scale than the national level, including the local authority level. Similarly, the Government has not identified any sectoral targets for carbon reductions related to transport, or any other sector. There is no requirement in the <i>Climate Change Act 2008 (CCA)</i> or in Government policy for carbon emissions for all road transport to become net zero. A net increase in emissions from a particular policy or project is managed within the Government’s overall strategy for meeting carbon budgets and the net zero target as part of ‘an economy-wide transition’.</p> <p>In October 2021 the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero published the <i>Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener</i> setting out policies and proposals for decarbonising all sectors of the UK economy to meet the net zero target. Following this, in March 2023 the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero published the <i>Carbon Budget Delivery Plan</i> which sets out the detail of how Government policy will enable Carbon Budgets 4, 5 and 6 are to be met. The plan utilises Energy and Emission Projections (EEP 2021-2040) which make assumptions for future economic growth that allow for investment in and the construction of new infrastructure while still enabling the required trajectory toward net zero.</p> <p>The impact assessment has therefore only been undertaken against national level carbon budgets which reflect existing Government policy to reach net zero by 2050. An analysis against a sector or local 2030 target has not been undertaken in accordance with the DRMB LA 114 Climate (National Highways, 2021) and the <i>National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN)</i>.</p> <p>In addition to there being no legal requirement for road transport to become net zero, there is also no policy in place that requires schemes to offset residual GHG emissions. As set out in Paragraph 14.9.2. of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) the carbon reduction hierarchy, as defined in paragraph 3.22.1 in the DMRB, has been applied to mitigate the Scheme’s GHG emissions. The carbon hierarchy sets out that measures to avoid/prevent and reduce emissions should be implemented prior to remediation or offsetting. Mitigation to avoid/prevent and reduce emissions are set out in Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) Paragraph 14.9.17 of Chapter</p>

14 (Climate) of the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1)** confirms that tree planting is provided within the Scheme, which will provide carbon sequestration. The potential sequestration benefit has been estimated and presented in **Table 14.5** of **Chapter 14 (Climate)** of the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1)**. However, this has not been factored into the climate impact assessment in order to provide a worst-case assessment of carbon impacts.

Motorway transport emissions are excluded from Winchester City Council's *Carbon Neutrality Action Plan* and WCC's *Carbon Neutrality Roadmap* (WSP, 2022) given that 'these are national infrastructure and will require a national response'. As a consequence, the Scheme's operational road-user emissions do not fall within WCC's target to be a carbon neutral Council by 2030. It should also be noted that the road-user emissions set out in **Chapter 14 (Climate)** of the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1)** apply to the study area of the Scheme's transport model. This covers the South East Region of England, and therefore these emissions are not limited to the boundary of WCC.

Section 14.14.3 of **Chapter 14 (Climate)** of the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1)** was based on the latest information at the time of writing. The Met Office [has](#) since published updated historic climate averages for the period 1991-2020 on its website, including maps and data. These are provided below for completeness. These show that the observations have not changed substantially to those reported and therefore do not change the assessment or conclusions within **Chapter 14 (Climate)** of the **Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1)**.

	1981-2010 historic climate averages reported in Chapter 14 (Climate)	1991-2020 historic climate averages
Average annual maximum temperature	14.6°C	15.0°C
Warmest month on average	July (mean maximum temperatures of 22.7°C)	July (mean maximum temperatures of 22.9°C)
Coldest month on average	January (mean minimum temperature of 1.3°C)	February (mean minimum temperature of 1.4°C)
Average total annual rainfall	746.5mm	753.6mm
Wettest month on average	November (average monthly rainfall of 88.6mm)	November (average monthly rainfall of 91.4mm)
Driest month on average	April (average monthly rainfall of 50.1mm)	June (average monthly rainfall of 45.2mm)

Flood risk from all sources has been considered and assessed in the **Flood Risk Assessment (7.4, APP-157)**. **Figure 3.5** of the **Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (7.4, APP-157)** maps all known historic flood events based on data provided by the Environment Agency. It confirms that land within the Application Boundary has not been subject to Environment Agency-recorded flood events.

As part of the hydraulic modelling assessment detailed in the **Flood Risk Assessment (7.4, APP-157)**, the Environment Agency's existing (2019) River Itchen model was updated to both refine the flood risk within the Application Boundary and to inform the design of the Scheme in relation to the new bridge crossing of the Itchen as well as the location and design of the surface water drainage features. Baseline flood mapping confirms that the northern and western parts of land within the Application Boundary, particularly at the A34

		<p>Winchester Bypass and M3 north of Long Walk, extend into an area of floodplain. The only works proposed in the area of floodplain is the new bridge crossing.</p> <p>The new bridge over the River Itchen has been designed to be a clear span structure with abutments set back from the river channel. It has been designed to ensure that no construction works are required within the river channel. There will be no impact on floodplain storage and conveyance during operational use once it has been constructed; and this has been confirmed through post development modelling. The proposed bridge soffit provides significant freeboard above the modelled 1-in-200 year annual flood event probability as well as a +120% climate change allowance. It will therefore not introduce a constriction to in-channel flows. The Scheme does not encroach on the existing floodplain when considering the design event as a whole, and fluvial flood risk will not be increased as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Appropriate drainage strategies during temporary and permanent phases of the Scheme have been designed to ensure that any additional surface water runoff arising from the Scheme is managed, attenuated and discharged at existing rates. Consequently, surface water flooding will not be increased as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>National Highways has set a programme and net zero targets within its Net zero highways: our 2030/2040/2050 plan (National Highways, 2021). The targets within this plan align with the UK Carbon Budget trajectory to net zero by 2050. These targets include net zero for maintenance and construction activities by 2040 with an interim target of 10% reduction compared to 2020 by 2025. Mitigation measures with the aim to reduce the Scheme's emissions in line with the Net Zero Highways plan are reported in Section 14.9 of Chapter 14 (Climate) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1).</p> <p>Mitigation has been confirmed through incorporating the measures within the design of the Scheme and the application drawings submitted with the DCO Application and will be secured through the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1). Measures include retaining existing pavements where possible, reducing the volume of material required to construct the Scheme and using alternative materials that are less carbon intensive.</p> <p>For the operation stage, mitigation includes the provision of high-quality accessible pedestrian, cyclist and horse-riding routes which will encourage and enable travel by low-carbon, sustainable modes.</p> <p>Further work will be undertaken during detailed design, including the development of an internal Carbon Management Plan and Carbon Opportunities Tracker for the Scheme. This will enable mitigation to continue to evolve as the design of the Scheme progresses and to align the Scheme with the targets within the Net Zero Highways Plan.</p>
RR-102c	<p>Historic Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submission is comprehensive and professional and addresses the built heritage assets which could be affected by the proposal. ▪ No direct result to built heritage is anticipated and impacts would be indirect resulting from a change in setting. Such impacts are minor in scale and severity. 	<p>The placement of signage and street furniture will be refined during detailed design. It will be located in accordance with design standards and requirements and health and safety regulations whilst also acknowledging the need to limit indirect impacts upon cultural heritage assets (as set out in Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy) of the ES (6.3, APP-096). 3D visuals will be considered and prepared as appropriate should any street furniture or signage prove to be required within the Conservation Area.</p>

	<p>The City Council would like to investigate wider road signage and street furniture further to ensure visual clutter in conservation areas are avoided and 3D visuals should be provided.</p>	
RR-102d	<p>Archaeology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overall no significant archaeological concerns. Although permanent adverse effects to buried archaeological assets will occur these can be satisfactorily mitigated and wider benefits outweigh the harm caused. ▪ There are clarification requests regarding inclusion of working zones, areas of fill, requirement to ensure archaeology is considered in the soil management plan, improvements to archaeological outreach and public engagement, archive deposition and on-going maintenance of information panels which have been communicated to the applicant. 	<p>We will continue to liaise with the Council's Archaeological Advisor through detailed design to build upon the outline mitigation strategy Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy) of the ES (6.3, APP-096) and deliver a detailed mitigation strategy at the end of the detailed design stage.</p> <p>All working zones and areas of intrusive works are considered within Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy) of the ES (6.3, APP-096). Archaeology will be considered within any cut and fill strategies, and the location of spoil arising from archaeological investigations will be considered in the soil management plan. The details of archaeological outreach and public engagement, archive deposition and on-going maintenance of information panels to be set out within a detailed mitigation strategy will be delivered at the end of detailed design and agreed with Winchester City Council's Archaeological Advisor.</p>
RR-102e	<p>Public Protection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No high level objection in principle to the assessment methodology of the Environmental Statement. However these conclusions rely on the assumption that various mitigation measures will be implemented principally through commitments made in the draft DCO and delivered through the Environmental Management Plan. ▪ The Environmental Management Plan requires further revision. Traffic diversions may not be a worst case scenario as the air quality and noise impacts modelled from these diversions make the assumption that these diversion routes will be followed. Reviewing the diversion routes, some may not be used as intended which moves the noise and air quality to other roads. WCC reserve the right to continue to assess noise impact during construction (particularly if smart motorway schemes proceed) and will feedback any concerns to National Highways. ▪ Chapter 11 concludes that only with mitigation are construction stage impacts acceptable at identified sensitive receptors. It references that these will be delivered through measures identified within the Environmental Management Plan. It is noted that proposed conditions 3 and 14 of the draft DCO relate to such matters. However, the first iteration does not contain the referenced Noise and Vibration Management Plan. ▪ In terms of air quality it is stated that construction dust impacts will also be mitigated through the Environmental Management Plan and it is acknowledged this is included as requirement 3 of the draft DCO. ▪ The commitment to a Section 61 Control of Pollution Act 1974 prior consent is welcomed and early dialogue is requested so WCC can be satisfied that the mitigation this delivers will provide the level of mitigation assumed within Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement. 	<p>The first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1) is a live document that will be further refined during detailed design to form the second iteration environmental Management Plan (siEMP) as the project progresses. During detailed design stage, the following will be required in regard to diversion routes, in addition to those already developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Description of the type of closures needed and diversion routes proposed to be used for each with an indication of how many times this closure/diversion is anticipated to be utilised during the works. ▪ Confirmation that the diversion routes have been agreed with the Operations Directorate, Regional Control Centre, local authorities and emergency services. ▪ Final review of suitability against all areas of the customer service standard for diversion routes for planned works and activities and explanation of where the standard is not met. ▪ Description of the signing provision and any other activities required to reduce the disruption to customers and communities, including the use of VMS. <p>The Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) will be prepared during detailed design and will be appended to the second iteration Environmental Management Plan (siEMP). The Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) will outline how construction noise and vibration will be managed (and monitored) throughout the construction of the Scheme including any noise limits agreed with the Winchester City Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO).</p>

RR-102f	<p>Ecology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Further information is required regarding protected species including bats, dormouse, badger and birds. ▪ Confirmation required on bat surveys as transect surveys last undertaken in 2017. ▪ WCC requires both the draft mitigation and compensation strategy and NE comments in order to be confident that the EPS mitigation licence will be granted. ▪ WCC should be provided with additional Badger survey reports and the draft mitigation and compensation strategy. ▪ Further bird surveys are required in accordance with current bird survey guidelines. ▪ WCC supports the commitment to provide chalk grassland which is of local significance rather than using other types of grassland. 	<p>Information in relation to protected species is presented within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-049) and the associated Appendices 8.1a – 8.1z2 of the ES (6.3, APP-104 – APP-130). As stated in Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-049) the validity of survey data has been periodically reviewed to make certain it is sufficient to inform the assessment. A commitment has been made in Table 3.2 of the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1) to update surveys where required prior to construction. The Applicant has held meetings with Winchester City Council on 9 February 2023 and 12 April 2023, and has either provided further information requested, or will be providing it when it becomes available. At the meeting on 12 April 2023, Winchester City Council confirmed that it is content with the level of further information provided/to be provided and have no further comments.</p> <p>Baseline information on bat activity used to inform the Environmental Statement was discussed at the meeting with Winchester City Council on 12 April 2023. The following data has been used to inform the baseline presented within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-049):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bat activity surveys 2017 ▪ Update bat activity surveys 2020 ▪ Bat trapping surveys 2020 and 2021 ▪ Habitat surveys from 2017, 2020, 2022 confirmed that during that timescale there were no changes to habitats which would affect the use of the site by bats ▪ Desk study 2022 <p>Winchester County Council agreed that the level of data on bat activity is sufficient to inform the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-042-APP-153).</p> <p>The only European Protected Species (EPS) mitigation licence being sought for the Scheme is for dormice. Comments from Natural England’s (NE) Discretionary Advice Service on the draft dormouse licence application (submitted to Natural England in December 2022) were received on 14 March 2023. These were shared with Winchester City Council on 19 April 2023. Natural England has requested further information and some points of clarification on the details within the draft licence application, however the comments demonstrate Natural England that is content with the overall approach set out in the draft licence application, including the use of dormouse translocation, and has no objection to the overall principle of the proposed mitigation. The Applicant will share the draft dormouse licence application with Winchester City Council following current updates.</p> <p>The Applicant shared the most recent badger survey report (<i>M3J9 Improvement Badger Bait Marking/Reverse Bait Marking Survey</i> (July 2022)) with Winchester City Council on 2 March 2023, and the draft Proposal for Badger Settle Closure on 19 April 2023.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes Winchester City Council support to the approach to landscape design proposed for the Scheme, particularly in relation to reinstatement of chalk grassland which is also supported by South Downs National Park Authority and other organisations.</p>
RR-102g	<p>Trees</p>	<p>The draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019) makes provision under Schedule 2, Requirement 5 that no part of the authorised development is to commence until a written landscaping scheme which</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan to be approved by governing authority before any works start on site. There will be an impact on visual public amenity value due to the number of individual trees and groups of trees being removed, with the additional impact of removing Ash trees because of Ash dieback needing removal regardless of the development for public safety. 	<p>include an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan has been approved by the Secretary of State in consultation with the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>Changes to visual amenity have been considered in Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1). Ash die back is considered within Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) and the Preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) (7.3, APP-101).</p>
RR-102h	<p>Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns raised in 2021 consultations now appear to have been addressed. Confirmation required on compound locations and future maintenance strategies. <p>Further section requests have been made directly to the applicant and 3D views of gantry signage, bridges and tunnels are required.</p>	<p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-043) details the compound locations. The description below should be read in conjunction with Figure 2.1 (Preliminary Construction Plan) of the ES (6.2, APP-061):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A central temporary construction compound (A272S Ch822 -961), 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. Additionally, the area would be utilised 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 (M3N Ch725), used to facilitate construction of the new gyratory bridge. A small satellite compound located between the A33/A34 and M3 (M3NB MER Ch118). Activities at this compound would include car parking and storage as well as staff welfare facilities, which would typically be two storeys at approximately 5m in height. <p>Appendix 7.6 (Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the ES (6.3, APP-102) includes outline management maintenance strategies for the proposed landscape scheme. These maintenance strategies will be refined and developed through detailed design. This is secured in Requirement 5 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019).</p> <p>The Applicant is in consultation with the stakeholder regarding these requests. Figure 2.7 (Scheme Long Sections) of the ES (6.2, APP-064) provides additional sections.</p>
RR-102i	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversion routes need to be assessed in various weather conditions as this may alter their availability due to flooding and safety concerns. Confirmation required as to whether variable speed limit technology will be installed on this section (regardless of all-lane motorway plans). The construction of increased cycle pathways and passageways may need to be supported by cycling infrastructure such as bike stands. Moreover, the safety of cyclists and pedestrians should be considered, with data collection on collisions prior to and post construction. 	<p>The Applicant assumes that all diversion routes are acceptable in all weather conditions as they all comprise adopted highways and are maintained appropriately.</p> <p>Variable speed limit technology is not proposed as part of the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme.</p> <p>Consideration for bike stands will be made during the detailed design process. However it should be noted that the proposed walking and cycling route provides direct connectivity between Kings Worthy and the existing National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 23. As such, there are no formal destinations along the route or urbanised areas which would require the need for bike stands. Cyclist and Pedestrian safety will form part of the design process and Department for Transport design standards will be followed.</p>

3.103 R-103 Winchester City Council

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-103	Impact on the adjacent residents in the local villages Impacts on residents at Winnall particularly during the implementation phase Visual impact on the local landscape, including the SDNP.	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ E: Air quality <p>With regard to impact to residents in local villages, in accordance with Schedule 4 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations), the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-042-APP-153) considers a number of topics including (but not limited to) air quality, landscape and visual, noise and vibration and population and human health. The assessment reports on the likely significant effects during construction and operation of the Scheme.</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. Information on the Construction Traffic Management traffic modelling assessment can be found in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (7.10, APP-163).</p> <p>With regard to visual effects on the South Downs National Park, Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) has considered landscape and visual effects of the Scheme. This includes consideration of the effects of the Scheme on the South Downs National Park as a designation, the landscape character for areas within the designation and wider landscape in which the Scheme is located, as well as on views and visual amenity. Section 7.9 of Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) presents the assessment of effects during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures proposed to reduce potential impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme are outlined in the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1).</p>

3.104 RR-104 Winchester City Council

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-104	<p>As an elected representative in the Worthy's, I am concerned about several aspects of this project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to keep a close an eye on how this project improves or makes worse travel between the Worthy's and Winnall - whether that is by vehicle, by bike or walking. The last iteration of the plan appeared to improve all of this. 2. The Cart & Horses junction where the B3047 meets the A33 is notorious. We believe HCC will in due course address this. Changes in how the Junction 9 M3 project affect the A33 will affect the options available for the Cart & Horses. Changes in timetable will also impact it. As this junction is 	<p>The Applicant's modelling shows that the Scheme is not predicted to negatively impact the safety levels of the Cart and Horses junction. Any changes made to this junction would need to happen outside of the DCO process. The junction falls outside of the Scheme Objectives and is not included in the DCO application.</p> <p>Advanced warnings of closures and diversions are committed to as part of the Traffic Management Plan. Refer to Table 3.1 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, APP-161) where the impact of the anticipated diversions and stakeholder requirements are tabled. The Applicant describes how the stakeholder's requirements are accounted and the proposed mitigation including sufficient notification of closures. A detailed stakeholder management plan will be developed as the Scheme progresses to ensure consistent communication and engagement with all stakeholders.</p>

	<p>likely to be en-route from Kings Barton to the M3, I also have a role as Chair of the Kings Barton Forum, so I would like to be kept informed.</p> <p>3. In the course of the construction work, we anticipate diversions and restrictions which could lead to more traffic flowing through the Worthy's. I want to be kept apprised of this too.</p> <p>4. During construction there are likely to be even longer queues for south bound traffic on the A34. This will cause people to follow SatNav through our village. I'd like to keep abreast of situations where the construction plans will lead to this.</p>	
--	--	--

3.105 RR-105 Winchester Friends of the Earth

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-105	<p>We have made multiple representations in relation to this Scheme (letters of 18-2-18, 25-8-19, 6-7-21). Nothing has altered except the growing insanity of this Scheme.</p> <p>National Highways continues to behave as if the Climate Crisis did not exist; it continues to pretend that there is an economic and a traffic justification, in defiance of all the evidence, that roadbuilding has no beneficial effect on the overall economy, but rather the reverse; that roadbuilding has never reduced overall congestion.</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common response A: Climate.</p>

3.106 RR-106 Winchester Green Party

RR Ref	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant Response
RR-106	<p>We object this project because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ it will lead to increased carbon dioxide emissions and air pollution by increasing car traffic across the region - it will increase noise pollution ▪ it will increase traffic through Winchester during building phase - the funds to pay for this project would be better used to build a cycling network, improve public transport links and invest into train links; <p>this would have a much bigger impact to reduce emissions, reduce congestion and improve resilience to train services between Southampton and the North - the building site will increase light pollution as the building site next to Bushfield farm already does.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes your objections.</p> <p>The Applicant's position is as set out in the application documents, for a summary please refer to common responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A: Climate ▪ B: Noise and vibration ▪ C: Need for Scheme ▪ E: Air quality <p>Regarding increased traffic through Winchester during construction, 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 Construction Traffic Management traffic modelling assessment can be found in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (7.10, APP-163).</p> <p>The Scheme was included the Department for Transport's (DfT) <i>Road Investment Strategy 2015/16 – 2019/20 (2015) (RIS1)</i> and <i>Road Investment Strategy 2 2020–2025 (2020) (RIS2)</i>. With respect to public</p>

		<p>transport options such as train, and investment in other modes, a range of alternatives were considered and appraised during National Highways Project Control Framework (PCF) Stages 0, 1 and 2, the conclusion of which resulted in the preferred scheme of the M3 Junction 9 to be taken to detailed design in PCF Stage 3, in order to address the problem identified with the junction and the flow of movement from the A34 to the M3. The Scheme has been subject to a full options appraisal process as described in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-044) and Section 2 of the Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1).</p> <p>With regards to light pollution, Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1) considers the effects of light pollution during both construction and operation of the Scheme. Mitigation to minimise construction lighting impacts on visual receptors is secured through Requirement 3 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, APP-019) It is also stated in the first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (7.3, Rev 1) that: <i>‘There will be static lighting points fixed to temporary structures such as the masts, cabins, workshops, gantry cranes and silos with the lamps up to 10m in height. These will be used to illuminate regularly used work areas, the car park and access areas. Baffles will be installed on all lighting columns and light is to be angled to face works.’</i></p>
--	--	---