

**M3 J9\_ISH2\_1st AUG\_PT2**

Created on: 2023-08-01 12:35:52

Project Length: 01:34:40

File Name: M3 J9\_ISH2\_1st AUG\_PT2

File Length: 01:34:40

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:03 - 00:00:40:24

Thank you very much. I'll just check with Mrs. Norris. That recording's okay. We okay to go? Thank you. Just before we continue with the part of the agenda, I'd just like to come back to Mr. Gilliam's question. Earlier, we said we'd look at it during the break, so and thought I'd give you a little bit of a forewarning about what we we are going to be doing so that you've got a chance to think about it, um, that your submission has arrived and it has gone into deadline for that was because it was, it was after the deadline for a date for deadline three.

00:00:40:26 - 00:01:11:03

So in the fact that nobody else has had opportunity to see see that submission yet, what are we going to ask you to do is as part of the traffic and transportation element, we will ask you to give us a summary with a five minute summary. Um, we will ask if anybody wishes to respond, but we will not make that obligatory. We will then give people the opportunity to respond in further deadlines to your submission, and that will include our consideration of your submission as well.

00:01:11:05 - 00:01:20:17

So hope that, um, gives you some opportunity to think about your five minutes. Um, summary at the beginning when we come to the traffic and transport element.

00:01:21:14 - 00:01:22:27

That's very fair. Thank you.

00:01:24:05 - 00:01:30:04

Thank you very much. So we will continue where we left off with the part of the agenda. Thank you very much.

00:01:32:29 - 00:01:36:18

Thank you, Mr. Sims. So resuming with the

00:01:38:15 - 00:01:41:28

requirement. Five landscaping.

00:01:43:25 - 00:02:04:06

So if I go first to South Downs National Park Authority, you have referred to the need to strengthen development consent order requirements in relation to the positioning and depth of planting. Are there any specific drafting changes that you seek in relation to this article?

00:02:06:29 - 00:02:07:14

Um.

00:02:08:04 - 00:02:10:28

Ma'am. Nick Grant for the National Park Authority. Um.

00:02:11:29 - 00:02:43:21

There are some specific changes we seek to this article. We are conscious, of course, that things like our request for 25 metre buffers etcetera is probably better in the various MPs. Um, but in terms we have some concerns about both this article, how that interacts with some of the plans and how it relates to Article six, which I don't see is on the agenda, could go through them effectively because they tie into one another, can just go through our headline points to give the Appellant Yes, that would.

00:02:43:23 - 00:02:44:15

Be very helpful.

00:02:44:21 - 00:03:14:20

Thank you. Um, so. The first request that we would have for Article five three is in 53A. We would request the inclusion of of timing alongside things like location, number, species, planting density, etcetera. This is part of our concern to make sure that given that advanced planting is relied on and is something we support, that that is made crystal clear.

00:03:15:15 - 00:03:16:27

We also agree.

00:03:16:29 - 00:03:50:13

With the suggestion put in first written question 9.1.47 that the landscaping scheme should refer to things like the fencing. We've seen the appellant's response saying fencing is dealt with by requirement seven, but that seems to be focused on DMB sorry, manual of contract documents for highways works and stuff, not fencing as a component of landscape. And so we respectfully suggest that that be included as well.

00:03:51:13 - 00:04:09:21

With regard to and linking with article. Should say also we welcome the amendment to Article 51 which reflects what was discussed at Issue one. So thank, thank National Highways for that. Um. In terms of how this then interacts with article with requirement sex. Um.

00:04:13:10 - 00:04:43:14

The we have a concern in effect, both regarding establishment periods and timing and chalk grassland and how that is being secured and protected. So that's what's driving those are the two sorts of substantive matters driving these these article tweaks that are being suggested. Um, so there is a suggestion in the applicants response to first written question 9.1.48 which is rep 2-051.

00:04:43:24 - 00:05:22:13

Um, that advanced planting will have a longer establishment period than other planting. Um, purely because couldn't initially lay my hand on where the establishment period is said to start run from or run to. I've seen reference to the fact that it's five years, but we couldn't figure out where the five years starts. Um, we would welcome clarification as to effectively what date the establishment period for any given landscape element is said to run from. Um. We note that Article 63 includes, in effect, an obligation to replace trees and shrubs only for the first five years.

00:05:22:27 - 00:05:38:11

This was queried by the in first written Qs and in response the applicant refers after that to the various MPs, MPs, etcetera. And indeed there is some tie in in.

00:05:40:15 - 00:05:51:16

The lamp at 102, but that again refers to a five year effectively establishment period. And effectively what we're trying to get at is.

00:05:53:19 - 00:05:54:14

A.

00:05:57:07 - 00:06:24:16

We're not sure and we're not clear what Article six three is adding over and above the. What's secured in the plans. We welcome it. We just we're just not clear as to the interaction and be if it is an additional layer of protection. We would request that it be extended not just to trees and shrubs, but to any effectively. Growing landscape

00:06:26:01 - 00:06:50:06

element, for want of a better word. The reason being is, as I said, we have a concern about chalk grassland that can take a while to establish and is difficult to manage and it doesn't seem to be caught by Article six three replacement period. So we request that Article 63 be in effect broadened to any organic landscape element that might die or need replacing. Um.

00:06:51:25 - 00:07:22:27

In terms of the. Timing of that. Think they raised a question about whether five years is enough. Um, and again, we don't dispute that five years is often seen as standard. We've had it on various other inquiries. Um, but again, we would welcome a, in effect a longer planting and replanting period. We're not clear that that protection is there in the various MPs and MPs and whatnot. Um, and again the reason being and it's a drum, I'm afraid you'll find me beating time and time again is the context.

00:07:22:29 - 00:07:38:12

We're in a national park, so if there is ever a time for a longer replanting re-establishment period, this is it. Um, I think that's pretty much it. On that's in effect a summary of our headline points on articles five and six.

00:07:41:02 - 00:08:17:10

And thank, thank you very much. And, um, was in fact going to ask the applicant, even though it's not on the agenda, as you point out. Um, should the require should the establishment period in requirement six three in fact be ten years after planting rather than five? And also for the avoidance of doubt, should there be specific reference made in requirement five two advanced planting, which possibly which does sort of reflect and tie in with South Downs National Park Authority.

00:08:17:21 - 00:08:24:22

So perhaps if you could respond to all those points and questions, the applicant.

00:08:27:05 - 00:08:34:27

At Katherine Tracy for the applicant. Um. Mum think I'm going to have to take most of those points away because my landscape and visual

00:08:36:28 - 00:08:54:06

specialist isn't available to me today. And they're quite detailed points about establishment of various habitats. So I'm not in a position right now to be able to commit one way or the other as to whether those are reasonable, but more than happy to take those points away.

00:08:55:24 - 00:09:00:24

I think one of the key points was to ensure establishment of that chalk grass.

00:09:01:22 - 00:09:14:21

Yes, And we know the concerns. It. I hesitate, may be able to speak to our biodiversity specialist. Um, but I do just need to take that away and respond. Later.

00:09:16:25 - 00:09:17:17

Thank you.

00:09:25:21 - 00:09:35:23

Just checking with Winchester City Council that you don't have any comments or concerns in relation to requirement 5 or 6.

00:09:36:16 - 00:09:37:07

Thank you, ma'am.

00:09:38:19 - 00:09:41:14

Uh, nobody else wants to raise any points on those.

00:09:48:26 - 00:09:54:19

They're moving. Moving on now to requirement nine. That's archaeology.

00:09:58:18 - 00:10:30:23

Again, this was discussed to some extent. At issue specific hearing one. Um, so Winchester City Council in response to first questions in relation to requirement nine six, you did state that the current drafting was not sufficiently precise to enable the provision to be effectively enforced, nor provides sufficient certainty that the archive would be housed in a suitable repository and remain publicly accessible.

00:10:31:21 - 00:10:47:01

And as I say, we discussed it this at one. So does Winchester City Council still seek further details of the proposed archive mitigation provision and have things moved on at all in that respect?

00:10:48:13 - 00:11:10:07

Thank you, ma'am. Robert Green for Winchester City Council. That issue is still standing and believe in issues specific hearing one. We were going to be provided with examples of other schemes and how it's been worked without an agreement. So we'll just await those details if they're not being provided already and I believe we'll discuss it, the applicant and ourselves in the statement of Common Ground as well, so we can confirm that later. Thank you.

00:11:17:09 - 00:11:47:19

Thank you. And if could go to South Downs National Park Authority, there has been an amendment to requirement nine seven so can ask does the latest nine seven over your concern your concerns in relation that's the to make it explicit that consultants with the city archaeologist also includes references to your archaeologist. Thank you, ma'am.

00:11:47:21 - 00:11:48:16

Kelly Porter from the.

00:11:48:18 - 00:12:18:25

South Island National Park Authority. Yes, the the addition does overcome that concern. And just picking up on on our concerns as well with point six, we still don't think that's sufficient. I acknowledge that the applicant has made some additional submissions at deadline three to address the issues we talked about at the hearing, but at the moment we still don't think that overcomes our concerns and obviously we're still seeking a Section 106 agreement to secure those financial contributions.

00:12:21:02 - 00:12:23:22

And thank you, Mrs. Tracy.

00:12:26:13 - 00:12:42:00

Katherine Tracy for the applicant. Our position is as we set it out at deadline three. More than happy to share that with Mr. Greene. Think you might have overlooked that, but we'll make sure that you've got those references and we can continue to discuss with with both parties.

00:12:56:28 - 00:13:27:26

Requirement 12 Detailed design. I'll take those two points together that are set out in the agenda. And so if I go to the. Applicant. The prospect of a design code being agreed and potentially secured by a draft requirement was discussed. One. Can you provide me with any update on progress made in that respect?

00:13:29:08 - 00:13:48:15

Katherine Tracy for the applicant? Yes, ma'am. We are currently working up a draft design code principles document. It doesn't yet have a name. Um, and that's. In production behind on our side. We will then look to share that with.

00:13:50:18 - 00:14:00:16

When whichever the authorities want to see it, but particularly South Downs before we submit it. Again. Again, we're still hoping to submit that a deadline five.

00:14:02:18 - 00:14:03:10

Thank you.

00:14:08:13 - 00:14:13:00

So to submit it having taken on board. Comments.

00:14:13:21 - 00:14:18:09

That would be the intention. But we'll see how far down that road we get.

00:14:26:20 - 00:14:27:05

But.

00:14:31:00 - 00:14:31:23

Is there anything.

00:14:31:25 - 00:14:37:03

Else? South Downs National Park Authority or Winchester City Council want to add on that?

00:14:39:04 - 00:14:43:24

Or you're simply waiting what is being drafted at the moment.

00:14:43:26 - 00:14:51:05

Effectively that we welcome national highways putting a draft together. We're aware it's happening. We look forward to seeing it and taking that forward.

00:14:55:14 - 00:14:57:27

Nothing further from Winchester City Council, man. Thank you.

00:15:02:05 - 00:15:32:19

So on the third bullet point of this agenda item, if I turn to Hampshire County Council, your local impact report at 1025 suggests an additional subparagraph to requirement 12. Um, I just wanted to check if any progress had made in agreeing with this applicant. And if not, if you could explain why you say it's necessary for you to be able to approve the detailed design of local highway elements of the scheme.

00:15:37:18 - 00:16:07:01

Chelsea Mikula of Hampshire County Council. On the first question, there's been no progress in terms of reaching agreement with the applicant on this issue. You see, our key point is the way the current articles drafted is we're only given a consultative role in in respect of design on those parts of the of the development that take place on local highway.

00:16:09:03 - 00:16:29:06

We've suggested this alternative wording because in our view, where we're going to have ultimate maintenance responsibility for that highway. We wish to have more than just a consultative role. We also want to be able to approve that design, and that's consistent with what we'd expect elsewhere.

00:16:30:24 - 00:16:51:22

However, I would say that this does appear to be a matter that raises similar issues that may arise in the trunking conversation. And so perhaps actually it's best that we park this as well for that discussion with the applicant and deal with it all at once there. Because think our position hasn't moved further forward than what we have in the earlier.

00:16:54:22 - 00:16:58:11

Is that the position is is there anything else you wish to add on that?

00:17:00:20 - 00:17:22:09

Katherine Tracy for the applicant at our position remains that it's the Secretary of State that has to approve and sign off. Notwithstanding that, you have to go through a meaningful consultative process. And then we have to explain why in the event that Hampshire weren't satisfied with the design, why they, um, why that's an appropriate, um,

00:17:23:28 - 00:17:41:21

a position then for the Secretary of State to essentially overrule their concerns. However, we are happy to, to take that and roll it into the wider discussion around trunking and classification of roads. And if there's any movement there, then we, we will keep that under consideration.

00:17:47:15 - 00:17:48:09

Thank you.

00:17:50:13 - 00:18:21:07

So Requirement 13 surface water drainage. Again, this is a matter raised by Hampshire County Council in your local impact report and you seek various amendments to requirement 13 and a new subparagraph two. Now you'll have seen the applicant's deadline three response and that rejected the new subparagraph two included an amendment to the original subparagraph two.

00:18:21:09 - 00:18:31:00

Do you still seek those amendments that you originally requested and has any progress being made in discussions with the applicant on this point?

00:18:35:28 - 00:18:38:08

Tom Calloway. Hampshire County Council.

00:18:39:03 - 00:19:12:19

And think what Hampshire County Council needs to do is just to ensure that, um, we review where it's stated the information is kept and make sure it satisfies any of the amendments that are outstanding. It require a little bit more discussion and clarification, I think. And what we'll see. We welcome amendments relating to maintenance. Um, I think that's pretty much it really. We just need to satisfy ourselves and if we need to a little bit further discussion and clarification.

00:19:17:18 - 00:19:20:00

And does the applicant have anything to add to that?

00:19:22:04 - 00:19:24:23

At Katherine Tracy for the applicant? No, not at this stage, ma'am.

00:19:31:23 - 00:20:01:20

So moving on to whether any additional requirements are necessary. Um. Hampshire County Council. You've proposed a draft requirement to secure provision of a local highway legal agreement. Now, we've we've already discussed this will ask the question, but anticipate the same answer. So what is the progress on this? And has any agreement been reached between the applicant and Hampshire County Council?

00:20:04:26 - 00:20:20:14

Uh, James Hammond, Hampshire County Council. Um, this is still another point that's in discussion, really. It's still very much in the same vein as the legal agreements. Um, and we're hoping that we can resolve

00:20:22:03 - 00:20:26:06

those matters together. Still in discussion from our point of view.

00:20:44:08 - 00:20:48:09

And if I turn to the applicant. Can you confirm that to be the position?

00:20:50:04 - 00:20:53:10

Katherine Tracy for the applicant? Yes, that's correct. We're still in discussions with Hampshire.

00:20:59:13 - 00:21:34:28

Then the next point was, um. The draft requirement proposed by South Downs National Park Authority to control the phasing of different stages of the proposed development. And that's included in the South Downs National Park Authority Local impact Report table. And you'll have had the applicant's response that this is not appropriate for this scheme. Just wanted to check if this was still sought and if so, why would you say it's necessary and whether any progress have been made with the applicants on this topic?

00:21:36:15 - 00:22:14:00

Um, ma'am. Nick Grant for the National Park Authority. Yes. It's still sort. No progress has been made. Um, the reason we seek it is whilst we understand, of course, that this isn't necessarily a phased development in the ordinary way of 200 houses, then 200 houses and 200 houses. Um, and it's a continuous build. Obviously that build is going to happen in stages. We note that various plans and consents of plans for that part of development and what we consider would be helpful is an overall plan explaining what is going to be built and when.

00:22:14:07 - 00:22:47:02

Um, because that's obviously going to have an impact on things like planting and mitigation. Also, frankly, probably quite useful for those who use public highways and rights of way to understand what's going to be closed when so an overall this will be built on this date at this time. Obviously, there's going to be some flux and flexibility because no building project runs exactly that way. But an indication for us we think is required, again, particularly given the context, even if it's not something that controls it necessarily controls phasing.

00:22:47:15 - 00:23:14:23

Um, so that's with respect why we want it and um, we don't consider that to unreasonable and ask, particularly as national highways itself should have some idea of what it's building when at least reflected its internal documentation. And what we're not asking for all the unvarnished details. Um, that's we don't anticipate that is a significant bit of extra work. Um, so that in effect is our submission on that point.

00:23:19:17 - 00:23:25:06

And the drafting that you've set out for that requirement. Um.

00:23:26:29 - 00:23:40:03

That's what you're seeking. Um, and what about in terms of. Securing the phasing, um, in accordance with that requirement.

00:23:41:06 - 00:24:17:12

Um. Mum. Nick, run for the National Park Authority? Yes, that's. That's a working text. We understand there might be changes. As you see, it only really bites at something being submitted at the start before all development starts, because that's the purpose of it. We want to see what's going to build be built when we are not wedded to specifically controlling each phase if that's going to be a problem. That's not our intention. Um, but. We would we would like that indicative plan at the start. And if there are tweaks that need to be made to this to reflect that and to make it workable for national highways, we're happy to take those on board.

00:24:17:14 - 00:24:19:24

The precise wording isn't something will die in a ditch over.

00:24:25:11 - 00:24:26:12

Mrs. Tracy.

00:24:27:06 - 00:25:10:27

Katherine Tracy for the applicant. Our position is that it's not needed or necessary. All the information, if they're looking at what may be diverted, at what point will be will be set out in the various traffic management plans and the camps and all the plans that will be produced under that. This is if it's just an information pointing document, it's asking us to duplicate information that's already going to be provided elsewhere. This isn't a scheme that is phased. There are construction phases, but those are very much for the benefit of the of the contractor in their sequencing to to get things built and make sure the highway network continues to operate, um, during that process.

00:25:10:29 - 00:25:23:27

So from our perspective, I don't think this is something we would want to to have imposed upon us. It's it is all there in all the other documentation.

00:25:31:01 - 00:25:39:10

Sorry. Could I could just return to you could respond to that mean they're basically saying you can pick that up anyway?



00:25:39:24 - 00:25:40:09

Uh.

00:25:40:18 - 00:26:13:01

Yes, ma'am. Um, two things on that. Uh, first and foremost, there is a lot of documentation, a lot that needs to be trawled through, not just by us and the small team in the National Park Authority, but anyone wanting to get access to actually understand what's going to be built when, like members of the public and those who cycle, you know, on cycle networks. Um, I am not clear that all those plans actually say what's going to be put in place in advance of the first build, not for a part, which is where a lot of them bite, but for the before any development can start.

00:26:13:12 - 00:26:41:00

So pulling it together in an easy and accessible manner in my submission is not a particularly bad thing. As, say, if the construction plans for particular contractors are working documents for them, that's fine. We don't particularly need to see them, but it would be helpful to understand what phasing is going to be built when what mitigation will be put in place, when and whether it's got a chance to grow so that we can see and factor that in. So with the greatest of respect that those points don't answer our concerns at all.

00:26:46:14 - 00:27:08:25

This is Tracy. I think it's probably something worth discussing with South Downs as to exactly what we propose to be set out where and certainly in terms of diversionary routes and things. The traffic management plans ensure that there are various procedures put in place to make sure the public and others do know. So I think it's probably worth just exploring off line.

00:27:15:01 - 00:27:15:19

Right.

00:27:17:16 - 00:27:57:05

So the next item on the agenda relates to draft requirements and amendments proposed by South Downs National Park Authority, and that's in relation to public rights of way and temporary routes. And again, various amendments are sought in your local impact report and that's in relation to public rights of way clarification as to with legal status and to ensure that before a temporary routes brought into use, the local planning authority and local highway authority in conjunction with local access groups are consulted and agreed to diversion routes.

00:27:57:07 - 00:28:10:22

Could you perhaps summarize for me why these changes and amendments are sought and again whether any progress has been made in discussions with the applicant on these matters?

00:28:13:27 - 00:28:46:08

Thank you, ma'am. Kelly Porter from the National Park Authority. Um, I can do the update first. Yes. We had a meeting with National Highways yesterday, and we have actually requested sort of a single document or schedule that sets out the minimum widths of all the rights of way what the legal statuses are. Because again, it's a point of clarification around, um, different information is held in different documents and it isn't easy to understand and in some instances, some of the information appears still to be missing.

00:28:46:29 - 00:28:49:01

So we have we have made that request.

00:28:51:12 - 00:28:59:01

No, thank you very much. And could I just check if, um, Cycle Winchester wish to comment on this?

00:29:01:25 - 00:29:02:10

Um.

00:29:03:09 - 00:29:05:28

Soon we'll be talking about the rights of waste.

00:29:06:00 - 00:29:13:00

You will be talking? Yeah. Yeah. If you don't want to. Generally, we're talking about drafting here, but just thought you might want to comment.

00:29:13:02 - 00:29:13:17

Yeah.

00:29:13:19 - 00:29:36:23

Generally, principle. The idea. The principle that there should be a clear single document. I think it's significant that already one of the rights of way issues that we have been talking about in relation to diversions, there's actually two different versions of that in different places in the. In the applicant documents. So yeah, that needs some clarification. I think an overall summary would be a good thing.

00:29:38:19 - 00:29:39:08

Thank you.

00:29:41:02 - 00:29:43:06

Mrs. Tracy. Anything you want to add?

00:29:45:19 - 00:29:46:18

No, thank you, ma'am.

00:29:53:09 - 00:30:15:25

Just a final point for me on, um. Requirements. And again, it's the South Downs National Park Authority Local impact report. And you did make reference to the inclusion in the requirements of reference to construction workers travel plan. Is that something that you still pursuing?

00:30:17:25 - 00:30:34:01

It is, ma'am. Sorry, Nick. The National Park Authority. It is, ma'am. It may well be that there is something to the same effect in one of the other documents. Traffic management plans, whatever. In which case, just point us to it. But the principal of that sort of plan is certainly something we still pursue.

00:30:36:25 - 00:30:38:18

Market returned to the applicant on their.

00:30:39:05 - 00:30:53:20

Katherine Tracy for the applicant. It will be part of the traffic management plan. There isn't a construction, an outline, construction travel. Construction workers travel plan at the moment. But it would come forward as part of the tmp.

00:30:54:18 - 00:30:55:03

Um.

00:30:55:26 - 00:31:07:10

That grant for the National Parks Authority. That's very helpful. And the being consulted on the traffic management plan is one of the things that you can expect from us coming through when we give our list of things we'd like to be consulted on.

00:31:10:10 - 00:31:18:14

Thank you. Are there any other additional requirements that people are seeking or wish to discuss here?

00:31:22:10 - 00:31:54:19

In that case, we'll move on to schedule ten of the draft of our consent order, which relates to protective provisions. So if I could ask for the applicant to provide me with an update on these matters and whether you anticipate that agreement on them all will be reached during the course of the examination. I think in particular, there were concerns expressed by Southern Water Services Limited and Southern Gas Networks.

00:31:55:12 - 00:31:57:04

So if it could be updated, please.

00:31:58:09 - 00:32:23:09

Yes, ma'am. Katherine Tracy for the applicant. In respect of Southern Water and Southern Gas Networks, we are in communications with their respective legal teams and protective provisions are being progressed. I think we've already updated in respect of the Environment Agency this morning and at the moment there aren't any needed with, but that's wrapped into the wider legal agreement point.

00:32:24:25 - 00:32:30:03

And I'm not aware that there are any. There's anybody else asking for protective provisions.

00:32:31:25 - 00:32:43:26

Yeah, I was just wanting to get your confirmation on that, that nobody else is seeking any specific provisions rather than those on standard terms.

00:32:53:02 - 00:33:09:21

The next section on the agenda relates to Section 106 planning obligations and any other agreements. So we have touched on a number of potential agreements outside the DCO this morning. Um.

00:33:11:15 - 00:33:31:03

South Downs National Park Authority. If. Go to first. Your local impact report is looking for an appropriate Section 106 planning obligation to mitigate harm through funding, walking, cycling and horse riding and improvements in the area. Could you tell me why you consider that to be necessary?

00:33:36:04 - 00:34:10:06

Thank you, ma'am. Kelly Porter from the South. National Park Authority. Um, well, obviously, our starting position is the test is to conserve and enhance the national park. And one of our purposes is access to, to and from the national park. And we already know that Winchester suffers because of the existing M3, and this is an opportunity. But for the applicant to improve those access and enhance the national park and obviously we've given examples of where we think those enhancements could take place in our in our local impact report.

00:34:12:12 - 00:34:35:28

Ma'am, that grant for the National Park Authority. If I may just add, you'll recall from the discussion in one that we consider there are harms arising from this development which haven't been mitigated in the package which has been put forward. And so the basis for this 106 obligation is that it goes some

way to further mitigating or ameliorating the harms that are being that were arising from the development as it is.

00:34:44:10 - 00:34:59:16

So just in terms of clarification, what you've both said. Are you saying that mean you mentioned to conserve or enhance? Does it fall into both categories what you're seeking here?

00:35:01:20 - 00:35:05:04

Yes, ma'am. Because the test is conserve and enhance. Yes.

00:35:20:17 - 00:35:48:24

And again, if stick with South Downs National Park Authority for the time being. Again, you're looking for appropriate financial recompense built into the archiving process and for that to be secured through a Section 106 agreement. We've already touched on this earlier today. Um, and again, um, I take it there's nothing you want to add to what we've said already on that?

00:35:49:15 - 00:35:54:05

Nick Grant for the National Park Authority. No, nothing to add to the discussion that's already taken place.

00:35:56:12 - 00:36:03:29

So if I could turn to Mrs. Tracy for the applicant. Do you want to respond to. That.

00:36:05:28 - 00:36:24:26

All right, Katherine Tracy for the applicant. And the applicant's position at the moment is that no further Section 106 agreements are required. We've already responded to the archiving point and in respect of a package of a contribution towards a package of measures

00:36:26:15 - 00:36:36:12

we don't consider, it's necessary. But notwithstanding that, we haven't actually had anything specific from South Downs National Park other than the very extensive.

00:36:38:24 - 00:36:44:02

Options set out in the local impact report. But our position is that it's not necessary.

00:36:47:13 - 00:36:55:27

So I'll just let South Downs National Park Authority come back on that. Have we got, you know, more specific proposals that you seeking?

00:36:56:09 - 00:37:19:03

Ma'am, Two points. First, the what's in appendix C is we submit pretty specific If there are parts that national highways think are acceptable or not, then that forms a useful basis for discussion. Two In some of the discussions that have been happening offline, I understand we have been back with specific proposals to national highways. Those discussions have happened relatively recently, I think, yesterday.

00:37:22:09 - 00:37:38:26

Okay. So it might be that there is a disconnect between what we're saying and what's being understood or something along those lines. But certainly from our perspective, we have been we have provided specific proposals, but perhaps that's something that can further be usefully clarified outside of this hearing.

00:37:40:09 - 00:37:41:00

Thank you.

00:37:43:03 - 00:37:43:25

It's Tracy.

00:37:45:08 - 00:37:50:18

If I'm behind the curve, then more than happy to pick up with my team with South Downs offline.

00:38:08:22 - 00:38:19:01

Right. Moving on to other agreements. Hampshire County Council. I think we've touched on all the agreements that you were seeking. Um.

00:38:22:24 - 00:38:46:03

You want a completion of legal agreements with national highways before the close of the examination? We response to our questions 6133 sets out all that you require to be included within that. Um, and again, I just wanted to check if progress on that and where the heads of terms had been agreed.

00:38:54:08 - 00:39:03:22

Those discussions are ongoing. We've sent over heads of terms, but we haven't reached a point of agreement yet. Um, sorry. Josie McCullough for Hampshire County Council.

00:39:06:13 - 00:39:09:23

And the applicant. That's the position. And then.

00:39:11:09 - 00:39:16:16

They're seeking that by the close of the examination. From every point of view, is that likely?

00:39:17:27 - 00:39:21:13

Katherine Tracy for the applicant? Yes, I think it is.

00:39:31:10 - 00:39:33:19

I think it's just a final.

00:39:35:00 - 00:39:35:20

Councillor

00:39:37:05 - 00:40:09:29

Porter can't speak as a county councillor here, but noticed in the earlier, but unfortunately it wasn't seen on the negotiations. Agreements with individual statutory undertakers can ask if the internet infrastructure providers have also been discussed and nothing's been discussed with them. Certainly in over the last nine years the development of high speed internet to Telkom, which is just on the other side of the motorway, has been a significant barrier.

00:40:10:01 - 00:40:25:24

The M3 has been a significant barrier and they still do not have high speed internet and it's less than a mile from Winchester. And I wondered if this has been a conversation with the as part of this with the Internet providers.

00:40:28:16 - 00:40:30:17

I'll ask the applicant to respond to that.

00:40:31:18 - 00:40:52:06

At Katherine Tracy for the applicant. We've had no specific engagement with any of the Internet providers or telecommunication providers. They do all benefit from standard protective provisions in the DCO, which protects their current apparatus in the in the network in respect of any new apparatus that falls outside of the DCO.

00:40:55:19 - 00:40:58:09

That's Jackie Porter. Believe that's an opportunity lost.

00:41:00:04 - 00:41:03:03

No, thank you. And apologies again for for missing you.

00:41:07:04 - 00:41:24:21

Right before we just finish on the draft development consent order, kind of ask if there are any other interested parties present that want to raise any other measures or amendments sought in respect of the draft development consent order.

00:41:32:07 - 00:41:32:27

Yes.

00:41:35:21 - 00:42:13:00

Uh, thank you, ma'am. Chris Gillam, Winchester, Friends of the Earth. Uh, can I make a general point about all these requirements and safeguards? When schemes actually get built, thing things happen. A great deal of experience with when Twyford Down Cutting was built. There were major things that the construction did not do. There were major things that they did that they shouldn't have done. And just for, for example, the the Itchen navigation canal was they broke the banks, diverted the river.

00:42:13:03 - 00:42:44:09

It's never been repaired. When they reprofiled the the down on the old bypass, they dumped concrete underneath the chalk when it was supposed to be just a chalk filling. Um, various things. The they transferred the turf to the from the donkeys to the the top of Twyford Twyford down and then neglected it completely. It completely died. It's recovered now after about 30 years.

00:42:44:11 - 00:43:23:07

But there was no aftercare for this supposed transfer of habitat. So there are major things that they actually do regardless of what requirements and safeguards are put in place. And I'm following up from what I think the county council were asking is what kind of mechanism is there for making sure they make good what mechanism is there for getting the applicant to do to do what they said they're going to do and to not do or to undo the things they have done that they ought not to have done?

Thank you.

00:43:24:27 - 00:43:45:06

Okay. Thank you. Think that's probably the purpose of today to try and ensure that the draft, if it was eventually made, did provide sufficient controls to avoid that scenario should the development go ahead. Ms.. Tracy, was there anything you wanted to say?

00:43:47:24 - 00:44:05:12

No mean, that's the primary purpose of the requirements in the. Is to provide the local planning authorities with all the information they need in order to monitor the development coming forwards. And they are the relevant enforcing authority in the event that something doesn't happen as it should.

00:44:11:00 - 00:44:22:08

But that draws to a close the discussion on the draft developing consent order today, and I'll now hand over to my colleague, Mr. Sims.

00:44:24:01 - 00:44:55:19

Uh, thank you very much, Mr. McCoy. Um, so we will now, um, transfer seamlessly into traffic and transportation. If anyone needs to move around, please do so. Now, um, I will just mention a couple of things and just before we go in and I will ask Mr. Gillam to, to start before we go into the main item of the agenda. And I'm going to take the decision to swap two bits of the agenda around. So the road safety element was second and the, um, journey time saving was third on the agenda.

00:44:56:00 - 00:45:29:16

In retrospect, it seems more logical to do the journey times straight after the traffic modeling if that's not going to cause anyone any problems. Um, and the only other thing wanted to mention was just if, if anyone had looked at the documentation in Annex one, the transport assessment report was referenced, but the combined modeling and appraisal report wasn't referenced. It there's a lot of overlap between the two, and it may be that both are referenced, but just wanted to highlight that it could be that both of those documents could be referenced.

00:45:29:18 - 00:46:05:01

But as I say, there's a lot of duplication between the two documents. Anyway. Okay. So, um, I will ask Mr. Gillam, um, first, so as I said earlier, to give you a little bit of preparation time, um, we're happy to give you five minutes. Mr. Gillam just to summarize your document, but as I said earlier and will repeat, um, as nobody else has had an opportunity to see that the chances of comments and, um, questioning will be limited or, or not at all.

00:46:05:12 - 00:46:17:15

And any follow up will happen in the written responses. And there's plenty of time still for those to happen. So, um, if you're happy to give us your five minutes, we will. We'll take that now. Thank you very much.

00:46:18:12 - 00:46:51:21

Thank you. Thank you, sir. Chris Gillam, Winchester, Friends of the Earth. Um, in fact, I did write a brief summary before came just in case it was that was the way it was going to be. Um, traffic modelling and appraisal is largely about black box methodology. It cannot be right that an examination of this scheme should accept at face value that such a methodology that serves the subjective ambitions of the applicant can deliver objective and credible outputs without understanding what happens inside the black boxes.

00:46:52:01 - 00:47:31:29

I do not think it is possible to make a case specific to this scheme without first making a general case about the appraisal methodology. Over many years I have looked into the web tag black boxes and have made a case to government and its parliamentary committees which fundamentally question the evidence on which the methodology is based. That case has never been refuted by the Department for Transport in any significant part, it has been simply ignored. The case is that when economic appraisal is fo fo science based on unproven assumptions and almost no basic evidence, web tag is highly circular.

00:47:32:01 - 00:48:06:13

It starts with assumption of economic benefit from which for which no macroeconomic evidence exists and computes benefit at a microeconomic level on the assumption that it is improving. The efficiency of acquiring that benefit then adds up those micro benefits and deems that to be a proof of the macro benefit. That is not scientific induction, it is merely a coherent cycle of error. Major incremental road capacity increase actually cross correlates with subsequent GDP growth in a negative way.

00:48:06:23 - 00:48:40:28

How then can a national benefit arise as every road scheme applicant claims? The main assumption within web tag that leads to its false conclusions is that the cost function of statistical optimization reflects willingness to pay in a trading in a trading market. The problem arises with this when we ask who is it that is deemed willing to pay? Web tag assumes that it is the road user, but the road user is very highly subsidized and the subsidy is regressive.

00:48:41:00 - 00:49:15:16

The poorest do not benefit from it. The externalities of road transport will exceed three times the total tax and duty take on the activity and the poorest bear the burden of the externalities. The Eddington report was very clear that all externalities should be paid for by the user, but if they were the elasticity of road demand to the price the user pays is such that traffic levels would revert to those pertaining 60 years ago. This implies that around 80% of current road traffic is serving a negative economic purpose.

00:49:15:18 - 00:49:48:19

So so far as the welfare of the nation is concerned. All this suggests we are on the wrong side of the optimum level of road traffic and the economic good of the nation. Any increase, any increase makes us poorer. Failure to perceive the regressive subsidy that underlies this is probably why we already have backfire responses. For example, David Mamet's myth of travel time saving where the nation is seen to be travelling further and further for the same economic purposes.

00:49:49:05 - 00:50:25:00

Another benefit is claimed by Webb. Apart from reduction of the user costs and that is a benefit of improved road safety, the DFT has never substantiated this claim with any research. Even if we accept Webb tag as a soundly based appraisal methodology, there are significant other problems with its implementation now, and especially with this scheme. Problem for transport traffic forecasting is notoriously porcupine. However, overestimate forever overestimating and generating imaginary use of benefit thereby.

00:50:25:26 - 00:50:47:12

But now we know that the Department for Transport has two very different graphs one that is used as here to generate user benefit and one to generate its transport decarbonisation pathway. One is a prediction, the other is policy. Policy, one dramatically lowers the user benefits.

00:50:49:22 - 00:51:20:27

The applicant brings another black box to this appraisal. Wider economic benefit claims of this sort are notoriously unjustified and the applicant ignores even the web tag warnings on the matter by providing no plausible economic narrative, especially especially to justify why it thinks it's a wider economic benefit does not simply display displaced economic welfare from somewhere else and why it is not contrary to the levelling up agenda.

00:51:21:26 - 00:52:02:08

The headline Economic appraisal is unimpressive. The benefit cost ratio sitting about the lower octal of values for highways projects. The elements of the appraisal are also highly questionable. The applicant gives no convincing reason for not applying optimism bias to its construction costs, claiming its estimate is most likely unless the applicant uses this specific statistical term differently from the rest of us. Most likely has to carry a confidence level, an error bar if correction is made to the traffic forecast to bring them in line with the transport decarbonisation pathway.

00:52:02:10 - 00:52:55:06



There will be a significant drop in the supposed user benefits and accident benefits. The traffic model validation over the streets of Winchester has high mean variance in the fit between observed and model traffic, which together with the variance in observed traffic levels, means that no statistically significant credence can be given to suggestions of a traffic benefit on the streets of Winchester, nor that monetised air quality advantage can be deduced if we make reasonable assumptions about optimism, bias and rebasing traffic forecast to the decarbonisation profiles, but make but make no adjustment for unrealistic climate cost modelling, then the net present value for this scheme still becomes significant, still becomes significantly negative.

00:52:55:11 - 00:53:22:22

All that is left to make the benefit cost ratio possible. Positive is the fanciful wider economic benefit estimate which comes out of a black box magic without any serious economic narrative to justify it. The applicant has not made a reasonable case for assuming that this scheme is value for money, even with an appraisal methodology which is highly suspect and mostly evidence free. Thank you for.

00:53:24:05 - 00:53:31:06

Thank you very much. Um, would the applicant wish to respond or. Not.

00:53:34:10 - 00:53:52:10

Uh, Katherine Tracy for the applicant. We will not respond at this time. Would just flag that it? I don't know if it's where it's been put on the Planning Inspectorate website, but it isn't available for the rest of us to see. So if it hasn't gone into deadline for that's currently locked down and unavailable.

00:53:52:20 - 00:54:06:09

That that's exactly what has happened. So which is why I'm not asking you to give a response and will ask for the follow ups in written representations and written responses after today.

00:54:07:08 - 00:54:14:20

But if that could be moved into something that we could see that's visible because we we don't have access to D4 documentation at the moment.

00:54:15:29 - 00:54:50:12

Yeah, we will make that happen. Thank you very much. And thank you, Mr. Gillum. So, um. The first item on the agenda is um, relating to non-strategic modelling in their local impact report. Hampshire County Council confirmed that he was satisfied with the traffic model and it had been calibrated and validated and was suitable on a regional regional level forecasting, but should be used with more caution on local roads and junctions. In their reply to Deadline three, the applicant states that no further modelling is necessary.

00:54:50:21 - 00:55:08:09

Can Hampshire County Council explain their concerns if there are any remaining with the modelling on Junction nine and if they feel that assessment of traffic signals is still required? Could you also highlight any other junctions or local roads which you consider should be subject to more detailed modelling please?

00:55:10:13 - 00:55:45:18

Thank you. Ben Clifton from Hampshire County Council. Absolutely correct. We are satisfied with the use of the strategic model. Our reference to applying more caution to local junctions was really reflected in in our commentary in our local impact report, specifically regarding the impact on Eastern Lane and traffic flows at Junction nine of the artery. We in our local impact report on page nine, we we reference we take an extract of the of the junction model for junction nine.

00:55:46:05 - 00:56:26:06

Our concern and it's something we are in discussion with the applicant around is really a matter of kind of clarity about the outputs from the model, particularly in relation to Eastern Lane, but also the A27 two, which are both Hampshire County Council Highway Network and around the the impact of the forecast max queue links. And as mentioned is something we are in discussion with. It's not something that I feel there's a huge benefit to to going into detail here, but it was really just to understand how that model would reflect the operation and whether there would be any what the requirement would be.

00:56:26:08 - 00:56:42:14

If you'd like to consider the use of signals, whether they would provide a benefit in terms of managing those those queue lengths. Um, the second the second area we referenced was regarding the operation of the car and Horse Junction. But note that's, that's a separate item. So I'm quite happy to, to.

00:56:42:27 - 00:57:00:26

We'll leave that to the item on the agenda regarding that. Um, have those concerns or the discussion about the level of modelling progress with, with the applicant to a point where you're comfortable that the discussion is about the, the detail rather than the principle?

00:57:01:29 - 00:57:29:24

Yes, I think that's fair. We have had further information, particularly around Eastern Lane and Junction nine, but as said, we are kind of pushing forward into that sort of finer detail, um, to sort of almost satisfy ourselves as a highway authority that we can, can, can follow the outputs and the conclusion of those outputs as presented in the application. So I'm, I'm comfortable that that can be taken through the written process rather than a matter of principle, if you like.

00:57:29:26 - 00:57:54:20

Okay. Thank you. And the second half of my question was, was whether you felt that there were other junctions that would benefit from more detailed modelling, um, on the basis that, um, unless I have missed something in the documentation, the detailed modelling is only at the rotary of you. Are you comfortable that you have sufficient information on other parts of your network in enough detail?

00:57:56:20 - 00:58:04:09

Yes, we are with the proviso with our comments on on the car and horses junction. But in regard to the remainder of the network, we we are satisfied we have

00:58:05:25 - 00:58:28:29

investigated some some of the outputs in terms of the the predicted changes in flows on the Winchester network and calibrated them against our own locally taken traffic counts just to ensure that the the narrative if you like that's been shown through that model. Um we're comfortable kind of reflects our our position with it and we are as said generally satisfied.

00:58:30:01 - 00:58:34:06

Thank you very much. Is the applicant got anything they'd like to respond?

00:58:36:06 - 00:59:13:05

Nope. Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. The the case for some of these might be overlapping and kind of work together. The case for the scheme highlights that there's the significant delays on the 272 Spitfire link will be reduced. However, as we've just mentioned, the only modelling that is visible is shown in the documentation is queuing at the directory. Is there additional data available for flows and queuing on the A27 two that is available? And in addition, the heat map delay appear to show similar colouring in the do minimum and do something situations.

00:59:13:07 - 00:59:27:02

So can this be explained in a bit more detail? And and again an understanding of whether further delay modelling is has been seen by yourselves at Hampshire on the Spitfire link and whether you're comfortable with that.

00:59:29:19 - 00:59:53:24

Ben Clifton from Hampshire County Council. In terms of the modeling of the A27 two, our focus is predominately been on the the operational model of the Junction nine and queuing associated at that junction. Um, I would probably pass over to the applicant to respond on the, on the heat maps. It's not something that we've raised particular specific concern with.

00:59:57:12 - 01:00:03:01

I lost the applicant. The same question then, please. Yes, I'll come to you. I'll come to you in a second, Mr..

01:00:14:15 - 01:00:21:12

So Kevin Lumsden, on behalf of the applicant there. There's information related to the journey that flows.

01:00:21:22 - 01:00:23:07

Might be closer to the microphone.

01:00:23:15 - 01:00:53:10

So sorry. Those queues and delays and around a bit of charity, which was two different models for going through the ones in strategic modelling, looks at the wider transport network and the other is an operational model that looks very much at the detail of individual car movements and queuing and their reactions with each other, which covers the duration a bit beyond. It goes down a bit fairly and it goes up and down the 34 in the M3 and along eastern lane. And those flows, delays and queues can be made available.

01:00:53:16 - 01:01:04:08

Okay. Yes. Think think. It'd be very useful to have those as a submission after the the the this hearing please. Thank you very much. That'd be very helpful. Um.

01:01:05:29 - 01:01:10:20

Mr. Gag. You had your hand up. If you'd like to ask me any question or. Thank you.

01:01:10:22 - 01:01:18:27

Thank you, sir. Phil Garg Winchester Action on the Climate Crisis. Um, I.

01:01:18:29 - 01:01:50:20

Have a general question about the traffic modeling, and I apologize if I've missed an appendix somewhere, but I do not. As a layperson and as someone who has been involved in strategic planning in a number of local authorities, uh, basically all modeling and all discussion is usually preceded with a comprehensive statement about the current state of affairs.

01:01:50:29 - 01:02:25:18

And indeed the government guidance suggests there should be a comprehensive analysis of what currently happens with traffic across the area, both in detail and overall. So I don't see any application, any analysis of what is happening currently. All we seem to have are comparisons in two dates in the future of what will happen if something happens or if the minimum happens.

01:02:25:27 - 01:02:56:12

This, I suggest, is a very opaque set of data, and I would ask the inquiry to consider asking for equivalent data about what currently happens that would then facilitate a coherent discussion about what is proposed and a much more coherent analysis of what this proposal is going to achieve.

01:02:56:14 - 01:02:57:10

Thank you, sir.

01:02:59:02 - 01:03:03:17

Thank you, Mr. Guy. Can the applicant respond, please?

01:03:05:14 - 01:03:33:02

Kevin Lumsden on behalf of the applicant. Each of the models undergoes a base year calibration and validation to represent observed data with respect to travel patterns, traffic flows, journey times. And and it's from that Bayesian model that's then extrapolated into the three forecast years of 27, 43 and 47. And that's the strategic model and the operational model. So subject to that.

01:03:35:27 - 01:03:38:03

Thank you very much, Mr. Gillham.

01:03:39:27 - 01:04:10:08

Thank you, sir. Chris Winchester, Friends of the Earth. Um, it took me a months to get hold of the traffic validation, the model validation for the Winchester network. Um, and what it shows is, is that the sort of standard deviation of the model match the model fit to one, presumably one survey set of data is has a standard deviation of around 20%.

01:04:10:14 - 01:04:43:24

If you look at any reasonable method, any reasonable data around how um, traffic varies within the Winchester network, it's highly variable. Um, then you must be presuming standard deviations of model to reality fits of well over 30, 30, 33 to maybe even 50 or 60%. And that I'm very surprised that Hampshire County Council say that matches their model.

01:04:43:26 - 01:05:13:28

I've never even heard of this county council model for the streets of Winchester. Would be very interesting to see what it does. It's never appeared in any of the movement strategy documents that we've seen. Um, so the point the point is that the appraisal is assessing do something minus do minimum differences in traffic in Winchester, in Winchester streets. Not just this isn't the whole appraisal thing, but particularly with air quality.

01:05:14:00 - 01:05:38:10

It's it's claiming claiming a benefit for those differences measured against a variance of the the data and the model fit to the data of sort of 30, 35, maybe 40%, maybe even 50%. There's no way in which that information can be significantly statistically significant. I'm wondering how how they do it.

01:05:40:01 - 01:05:43:27

Would the applicant like to give any further commentary on the traffic modelling?

01:05:48:22 - 01:06:19:03

Kevin Lumsden on behalf of the applicant. There are variations obviously in observed traffic flows and what transport guidance and request that you do is look at more than one day, look at typical weekdays across a longer period of time so that you're looking at ideally a typical weekday flow per direction and by time period similar to the journey times, they're not journey times are extracted as one offs. They looked at broadly over a period of time to give some form of confidence. That was a typical event.

01:06:19:11 - 01:06:21:24

Weekday event is used as part of the appraisal.

01:06:24:12 - 01:06:25:05

Oh, yes.

01:06:25:16 - 01:06:37:14

What's going on? Winchester? Friends of the Earth. Are you. Are you saying that there. There's a whole set of data on the observed flows within the streets of Central Winchester.

01:06:40:12 - 01:07:03:04

Kevin Lumsden on behalf of the applicant. And the focus very much of the strategic model is the is the M3 Junction nine. And there are constant counts going on in many, many places throughout the strategic network. And observations that we use within Winchester are not single day, predominantly, not single day counts of of a one off Tuesday afternoon. They are taken over a period of time.

01:07:05:26 - 01:07:28:25

And you can just remind everybody that the question should come through through the the examiners authority. Um, I'm, I'm quite happy for, for further questions to be asked of the applicant. Um, following this, this hearing. Um, I'm very happy to take one further, one further point on, on this if you would like to. Mr. Gillam.

01:07:30:29 - 01:07:59:00

I think if we if we're pursuing it further, I would like I would like to see what the data is on the observed traffic within Winchester Network, what data they're relying on for saying they've got statistical significance. It's not about the strategic road network part of the appraisal. It's very specifically in this appraisal. They are talking about benefits on the streets of Winchester and I want to know what the statistical significance is of the assertions they're making on that.

01:08:00:26 - 01:08:17:25

If you could follow. Follow this with with those questions. Now, that's fine. No worries at all. If you can follow this hearing with those questions, then that will give the applicant and indeed Hampshire County Council as well the opportunity to to respond to those in writing as well. Um.

01:08:21:03 - 01:08:33:10

No, that's fine. And perhaps if you have a response, having heard what Mr. Gillum has said. Now, if you can if you have a response available in your post hearing submissions, if you could include that there.

01:08:41:00 - 01:08:41:20

Mr. Grant.

01:08:42:15 - 01:09:14:04

Thank you, sir. Nick Grant, South Downs National Park Authority. And if the applicant is doing some more clarification, a small point we would welcome clarification on is the extent to which the models, which, as I understand, have been looked at, the baseline in 2017 reflect, if at all, working and travelling patterns in the post-COVID world. It's a small subset of the point that's already been made about Baystate versus where we are in 2023.

01:09:14:06 - 01:09:16:09

But given that that would.

01:09:17:25 - 01:09:31:16

We don't have our traffic expert here. It's not a point we're pursuing with particular vigor. But that's a point that seems if there's an answer to it, we may have missed it, but certainly possible. But that clarification would be most welcome.

01:09:32:07 - 01:09:37:12

Thank you. With the applicant like to reply on that point now or follow up.

01:09:38:17 - 01:09:56:22

Katherine Tracy for the applicant, we can include it in our post hearing submissions, but we have used the appropriate traffic model with the latest data at the point that the application was submitted. Um, so we're, we can specify what that is, not being a traffic model.

01:09:58:24 - 01:09:59:10

Thank you.

01:10:01:17 - 01:10:02:16

Okay. Thank you.

01:10:06:05 - 01:10:11:00

Sorry. I beg your pardon. I missed you. So. Yeah. Mr. Takei.

01:10:13:10 - 01:10:45:04

Thank you, sir. Yeah, I was going to mention this later on, but this is probably a good place for it. Um. I may have missed it, but I don't think there's any. Modeling or statistics that's been presented in relation to cycling. Given that one of the five strategic objectives of this project was to improve walking and cycling. I think it's notable that there are no current figures collected. There's no modelling using modelling tools available, such as the propensity cycle tool.

01:10:46:00 - 01:11:08:00

In order to establish what changes might take place as a result of these, find that a little bit disappointing suggests that it wasn't really taken seriously. There are various assertions made about changes to levels of cycling as a result of the project, but they're not backed up by any figures.

01:11:10:26 - 01:11:28:23

There is an item on the agenda that covers that under public rights of way. So we will not forget it. And it is a question further under the public rights of way. Um, on the agenda there. So thank you for your point, but we won't forget that when we come to the public rights of way later. Thank you.

01:11:30:21 - 01:11:32:22

Okay. Thank you for that One moment.

01:11:39:01 - 01:12:14:02

So I'd just like to go on to the assessment of rail freight modelling within their written submission of oral submissions that after the open floor hearing Winchester Action on the Climate crisis stated that the operators of Southampton Dock have a target to increase and the share of rail transport from and to the docks by 33%. Um, can Mr. give any further detail on this from his perspective? And then can the applicant also explain how the strategic model reflects the aim of rail transfers, particularly with the location of Southampton and Solent ports?

01:12:14:18 - 01:12:56:18

Thank you. Thank you, sir. Um, the. The will certainly give what details have of that. But the point was more a general point about whether the requirements of the NPS and then that the applicant

should consider across mode different ways of addressing the problem that they are addressing before they make a decision to concentrate on a particular mode and in the

01:12:58:29 - 01:13:31:20

submit, in the written form of our submission, we did question whether any appraisal had happened of alternatives to actually making a bigger motorway. The applicant responded to those comments and what I regard as a way that means they missed the point. Um, the applicant said, Of course we've done appraisal.

01:13:32:18 - 01:14:02:27

And we looked at the guidance in the design manual for roads and bridges and environmental assessment and monitoring for written by Highways England. They quoted in response to the suggestion that they had not considered other modes as a way of resolving the problem. Documents solely concerned with road transport.

01:14:03:06 - 01:14:35:29

And I think the major point we're making and the important manifestation of that point being freight from Southampton docks. But the major point we're making is the essential problem you're trying to solve, I suggest, is congestion at M3 Junction nine, and we are suggesting it would be cheaper, more effective and less likely to produce ever increasing levels of traffic.

01:14:36:08 - 01:15:19:06

If you solved it by looking into increasing the share of rail freight from the Midlands to the docks and in terms of distribution from the Midlands to the southeast, and also looked at the possibility of extra, an extra local train service along the railway line as well as additional buses. But in the response, I think the applicant demonstrated without any shred of doubt that alternative modes were not considered.

01:15:19:08 - 01:15:55:08

There is no reference to anywhere in the paperwork that gives even an inkling of considering other ways of resolving the problem and the key objectives apart from the initial one about removing congestion at the junction of M3 at Junction nine are all to do with building roads. So think the applicant has demonstrated that they haven't really followed the government guidance on this In terms of the specific questions, sir.

01:15:56:00 - 01:16:33:07

Um, the operator of Southampton docks and can refer to an interview in Rail magazine is intent on increasing the share from Southampton docks of rail freight from 30% to 40%. That's a 33% increase. They're so interested and intent on this that they're offering discounts to people who take their goods to and from the docks by rail.

01:16:33:17 - 01:17:17:11

And that should have a major impact on the level of freight transport through the junction and also the need to embark on this very expensive and rather ineffective proposal. Um, I should also say that a very simple infrastructure change, I think it was about a year ago, was brought into effect by Network Rail, which was to extend the length of the sidings at Southampton Western Docks as a result of this very simple expedient.

01:17:18:08 - 01:18:12:19

The maximum length of freight trains has increased by 33%. So that might be rather cheaper than building an elevated junction at M3 Junction nine, and it might be really cost effective to embark on that sort of infrastructure change. And it's not just me that's talking about Cross-modal investigation, it's Highways England and Network Rail that that, as I said in my written submission, cooperated in a

joint report on how we could address the problems in terms of accommodating traffic from the northwest, northeast and Midlands to Southampton docks.

01:18:12:24 - 01:18:27:11

And so I'm putting in a plea that we look again at this problem and find more effective, more cost effective, less environmentally destructive ways of addressing them. Thank you.

01:18:29:02 - 01:18:33:11

Thank you. I'll just ask Mr. McCoy to comment on your comment about alternatives.

01:18:33:13 - 01:18:51:03

Yeah, just in terms of modal alternatives, you may not have picked this up yet, but the draft gender for H3 was published yesterday, I believe, and that will be included on the agenda for three.

01:18:54:09 - 01:19:09:00

Um, so if you want to deal with this, if the applicant would like to deal with the specific point on this agenda here and perhaps park the general response on consideration of modal alternatives for next week.

01:19:10:15 - 01:19:20:07

Thank you. Is that a did you, Mr. Guy? Was that clear? About about the alternative to being covered next week in the next issue specific hearing.

01:19:21:04 - 01:19:22:03

Yes. Okay.

01:19:22:05 - 01:19:55:04

Thank you. So so I'd ask the applicant to to give a response about and it was a follow up question I had about the the how much what had been included in the traffic modeling in terms of rail freight, um, transfer. So, um, in general, I'd like to understand what in the traffic modeling has been taken into account in terms of um, particularly Southampton Dock, but any Solent ports, um, published.

01:19:55:25 - 01:20:23:14

Drives to reduce road transport. Off road freight transport. What has been included in the traffic modelling? And also think a bit of an understanding about how much of the traffic through Junction nine is from the Solent ports because I couldn't get that from the documentation immediately unless you could point me in that direction. So a few things to reply on if that's okay.

01:20:28:06 - 01:20:33:16

Is this a follow up to what I've just said, or is this a particularly different question? If you're happy for me? Just to take

01:20:35:02 - 01:20:38:10

the comment first from Councillor Porter.

01:20:39:00 - 01:21:11:07

Speaking as a Cabinet member for place at Winchester City Council. Um, I note that in the that you commented that it was to look at traffic modelling based on 2017, but actually in May 2023 um HGVs were allowed to be another two metres longer, which meant that the Road Haulage Association describes each vehicle as potentially carrying 9% more uh, goods, which means that they would need less lorries.

01:21:11:09 - 01:21:14:00



Has this been taken into account, into the modelling, please?

01:21:16:04 - 01:21:21:24

Thank you very much. And I will ask the applicant to, um, to pick up on that question as well. Thank you.

01:21:24:27 - 01:21:55:20

Kevin Lumsden on behalf of the applicant. And in terms of this phase of the design phase of modeling, there's no explicit modeling of of rail freight. It's inferred within the freight predicted forecasts that come from the Department of Transport. Their figures predominantly look at and it's driven by goods transfer and changes in population and goods demand across the country. It's regionalized, and that is included in terms of what the prediction of of freight is over time.

01:21:56:01 - 01:22:46:04

I couldn't confirm to you right now if those figures do include the extension of the two meters and that there may be less goods vehicles on the road network as a consequence of that, but that these are figures growth figures that provide and then we use those figures in our in our predictions. They provide the forecasts of freight by region. We then include them within the model and that that may include a model shift as well across the rail. And in terms of how we deal specifically with the Solent and their change over time and there's beyond what they do and specifically relating to the Solent, there's there are increases in freight predicted and in each of the forecast years of about 10%, 6%, 6% going from 2020, 27, 2042 and 2047.

01:22:46:13 - 01:22:51:20

They've also been included within the forecasts. That's for road freight transport.

01:22:53:11 - 01:23:33:06

Okay. Thank you very much. Um, I think it would be helpful to have a bit more of a considered understanding of the generation from the Solent ports. And, and I accept what you said about standard DFT. Um. Modeling requirements. Think we're we would like to have a little bit more of an understanding how in this particular case with the sole import so close um if that has any particular bearing on on on how the modeling would look through junction nine please if you could follow that up.

01:23:33:28 - 01:24:06:25

Um, you've suggested deadline for might be a bit too soon with the holidays but um, deadline five at the latest. But I think we'd like to information as soon as possible so that we can understand that better. A question hidden. All the questions I posed was, um, whether you could give a brief understanding of the how much the the traffic through junction nine is a direct result of, of traffic coming from the Solent ports, whether that's that's understood or not.

01:24:08:14 - 01:24:11:07

Ken Lumsden on behalf of the applicant. We can provide that information.

01:24:11:23 - 01:24:14:24

Okay. Thank you very much. And.

01:24:16:24 - 01:24:36:27

I'd just like to bearing in mind we have had a discussion with Hampshire County Council about their traffic modelling as well. Is your traffic modelling um, looking at that same question or is that something that you believe is within the strategic model? Or do you think that this is something you would be able to add value to?

01:24:38:01 - 01:25:20:23

So Ben Clifton, on behalf of Hampshire County Council. Um, I should clarify, we've, we've undertaken modelling on the car and horses junctions specifically, which will no doubt refer to later on in the agenda. We haven't undertaken any of our own modelling. When I, when I referred to in a previous answer to um, to traffic flows on, on Winchester streets and roads and that was just very much a validation exercise we undertook where we've, we've undertaken as part of our routine monitoring of traffic flows, we have traffic counts, um, undertaken either automatically using radar devices or specifically for particular schemes.

01:25:20:25 - 01:25:45:21

And we just referenced the outputs from the applicant's model against, against those, those junction counts that we'd undertaken. It was really just to, to satisfy ourselves if you like, that the, the, the outputs were broadly what we'd expect them to be with our own local knowledge of the road network. So, so no, we haven't been doing any work additionally in terms of this wider strategic modelling.

01:25:47:04 - 01:25:49:13

Thank you very much. Um.

01:25:53:07 - 01:26:25:10

I'm conscious that it's nearly 1:00. I'm going to ask one more question that's related to traffic modeling. And then we will we will take a break. Um, the, the last point in the agenda that we had under traffic modeling was regarding future growth modeling. Again, Winchester Action on the Climate Crisis stated in their written report that they consider the modeling predicts in probably low increase in traffic volumes and questions the induced suppressed demand likely to be seen again.

01:26:25:12 - 01:26:33:22

Would you be able to elaborate further on your concerns about what has been included and again, will ask the applicant then to respond afterwards?

01:26:35:09 - 01:27:21:22

Thank you, sir. Um. Again, I should emphasize this is a layperson's response to the data is provided. But think, however sophisticated black boxes you use are it are. Um, it should actually produce, um, something that is compatible with general expectations and common sense. And if it doesn't, there should in the application be some, um, commentary about why the results of your sophisticated modeling do not coincide with what you would expect and think.

01:27:21:24 - 01:27:59:00

The, the starting point is that this proposal, um, that, um. This proposal is effectively doubling the capacity through the junction. And there's been a wide variety of research which has demonstrated that by and large, with some exceptions, depending what happens before and after any road widening. Um, if you double the width of the road, you would expect as a starting point that traffic would double.

01:28:00:14 - 01:28:01:08

Uh, it.

01:28:01:10 - 01:28:42:17

Was with some surprise when I looked at the model figures that I saw that it was predicted. For example, the traffic from south of Winchester to Basingstoke would reduce by 2% by 2047. This runs counter to everyday experience over the last 20 years, but also it runs counter to a wide range of research that shows that traffic increases as roads are widened and that traffic is induced from alternative routes.

01:28:43:09 - 01:29:28:09

Um, so our intention was to ask the applicant to explain that their explain precisely why their models and predictions for two dates, the second of which was 2047 showed so little response to the widening of the carriageway. And I wonder if a number of secondary effects have been well observed and extensively written about, most recently in the government review of the idea that carriageway widening increases traffic, saying By and large, yes, but it's a bit unpredictable.

01:29:28:22 - 01:29:39:08

Um, I was wondering if the applicant could explain what would seem from a naive point of view to be counter-intuitive. Thank you.

01:29:40:28 - 01:29:46:02

Thank you very much. Mr. Guy with the applicant. Care to to comment, please?

01:29:47:24 - 01:30:18:27

Kevin Lumsden on behalf of the applicant. You're right. By and large, yes. And it's a bit unpredictable. But in this situation, what we're doing is predominantly the main aspect. The scheme is to relieve the bottleneck with A34 comes into that generator and reconnect that into M3 Junction nine, but there's no significant enhancements to M3 itself. And so a lot of the benefits are in and around the generator as opposed to much longer distance where you're still restricted by the capacity of the M3. There are no additional lanes on the M3.

01:30:26:02 - 01:30:26:22

Mr. Gang?

01:30:27:15 - 01:30:29:00

Yes. Can I just.

01:30:29:16 - 01:30:34:09

Sorry I missed the gag. Sorry. Not Mr. Gillen. Mr. Gag. Sorry. Uh.

01:30:35:00 - 01:31:28:05

Thank you, sir. Um, the majority of the studies I've read. All that where you widen carriageways that are between congested areas of traffic. Uh, or that are bottlenecks in themselves. Um, that you do get, uh, a result that's very close to the naive expectation that if you double the width of the carriageway, you double the traffic and think the justification for this scheme is that there are traffic queues coming down the a34 into Winchester, traffic queues coming up via the M3 from Southampton and traffic queues on the M3 coming down from Basingstoke.

01:31:28:07 - 01:32:00:00

And this scheme will relieve those traffic queues and ease the passage through the junction. That is a classic situation where road widening is going to is usually predicted to produce a proportionate doubling of traffic and yet and I hope it's true. The modelling shows actually in some cases a reduction in traffic.

01:32:00:11 - 01:32:11:22

I cannot understand how that can be and I would suggest that perhaps something in the black box is not working perfectly.

01:32:14:20 - 01:32:26:24

Thank you for your comments. If the applicant would would like to reply any further and then they can. If not, then any further written comments after this hearing we would be fine.

01:32:27:14 - 01:32:44:12

Katherine Tracy for the applicant think we'll pick up any additional points in writing. But but just to flag, this isn't a road widening scheme. It is relieving the flow or creating flow relieving bottlenecks. So I think that's probably something we can pick up when we respond in writing. Yeah.

01:32:44:16 - 01:32:56:17

And some commentary on, on, on induce suppressed demand would be very useful to cover the points that Mr. Greg has raised. Um, Mr. Gillam, you put your hand up if you have any further comment.

01:32:56:24 - 01:33:38:08

Chris Winchester Friends of the Earth. Um, in relation to induced traffic, the the model claims to be using a variable demand model that presumably is showing what the induced traffic is. So I haven't seen that reported anywhere. Um, a second factor related to this is I don't see anywhere in the appraisal document that suggests what the effect will be of the reduced predicted capacity of the M3 south of, uh, south of this junction as a result of the scrapping of the, the smart motorway.

01:33:38:10 - 01:33:52:20

So that presumably that didn't go into the original framing of the model. Um, so the, the potential for congestion south of Winchester does not, does not seem to have figured in the appraisal so far.

01:33:56:00 - 01:34:21:06

Thank you. Um. Unless the applicant would like to respond. Now, I do have a question about that coming up after lunch. So I'm happy to to to to take that answer tied up with the question. Have about the same thing after lunch in the next section of the agenda. So, um. Thank you very much for that. I'm now going to, um, say we will break for lunch.

01:34:27:23 - 01:34:34:14

Yeah. We've just agreed that we'll be back at 2:00, so enjoy your lunch and we will see you at 2:00. Thank you very much.