

M3 J9_ISH2_1st AUG_PT3

Created on: 2023-08-01 14:41:13

Project Length: 01:15:32

File Name: M3 J9_ISH2_1st AUG_PT3

File Length: 01:15:32

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:06 - 00:00:51:15

It's now 2:00 and we will resume the hearing and just confirm that the recording is happening. And. Okay. Thank you very much, Mrs. Norris. Welcome back. Hope you enjoyed the sunshine that's outside for a change. Um, so we will continue where we left off looking at traffic and transportation. Just wanted to clarify one thing that I might not have clarified with the applicant. When you're replying about the the commentary about the rail freight, um, question that we pose, please, can you also reference the joint study by Network Rail and um, department transport that has been referenced and how that may or may not be included in your, um, in your modeling, please.

00:00:51:17 - 00:01:05:26

I'm not sure whether I made that clear, but if you could do that, that would be great. Thank you. Um, so as said before, we'll go straight into journey time saving part of the agenda and then come back to road safety. Just swapping those two things around.

00:01:08:14 - 00:01:43:29

So in the in their local impact report, South Downs National Park Authority and also Winchester Action on the Climate crisis, it's stated that they believe journey time improvements are insignificant. I'll ask the applicant straight. Um, go to the applicant and ask if they can explain what they consider is significant in this context in terms of journey time savings and also, if possible, how this relates to other comparator schemes so we can get an understanding of of how the journey time savings relates to other similar schemes, please.

00:01:47:16 - 00:02:19:01

Kevin Lumsden on behalf of the applicant. I'm think the the definition of a significant bully has to be made, but significant will will vary depend on length and proximity to the scheme and the journey. Times are quantified. The predicted journey times are quantified in the comment section 4.5 and the Section 7.3, which notes that they're up to in and around the Territory itself. Journey time savings of about four minutes.

00:02:19:03 - 00:02:49:01

And obviously if that's for a the journey time route that is specified within those documents as you get to longer distance travel, for example, between um Solent in the Midlands, the proportion that four minutes is of that longer route, it will become less significant. But in and around the junction itself for the journey time routes, the four minutes on a ten minute route is a significant would say in terms of percentage wise of that that route length.

00:02:50:00 - 00:02:57:29

And and those journey time savings then equate to go into the user benefit analysis.

00:03:01:13 - 00:03:31:09

Thank you for that and your broader point that you picked up, which was actually going to ask you in a subsequent question about how the proportion of that journey time saving at Junction nine in comparison to the overall excellent to Midlands route strategy, Is that something that you have done

some analysis on and how does that the Junction nine fit in with potentially other improvement measures and other strategic modelling on the whole of the the route?

00:03:32:11 - 00:04:07:08

And Kevin Lumsden on behalf of the applicant. And we have analyzed each of the journey time routes that are noted within the documentation and all of the journey time savings are then contribute to economic appraisal. We don't look we have not looked explicitly at an example route from Solent of the 34 into the Midlands to note what percentage of that total journey time and is is well, it would be approximately four minutes if it was in relation to what the savings in 2027 are.

00:04:07:18 - 00:04:12:29

And but all of those journey time savings contribute to the user benefit package.

00:04:14:23 - 00:04:16:00

Okay. Thank you.

00:04:16:02 - 00:04:50:03

It's so sorry just to go in there, just in relation to other schemes and we've not directly compared them with other schemes. It's quite, quite sometimes quite challenging because most schemes have a unique characteristics of some sort, whether it's a motorway widening or it's a junction in another location. The travel behaviours of travel volumes tend to be quite different to draw direct comparisons, but it's not unreasonable that we're a delay of of 7 or 8 ten minutes within a due minimum that's alleviated by this scheme to to reduce it by four minutes seems a plausible outcome.

00:04:50:05 - 00:04:53:02

Thank you very much, Mr. Garg. You have your hand up.

00:04:54:11 - 00:05:37:15

Philip Winchester Action on Climate change. Perhaps we haven't seen the data you're using, but it is worth saying that the published. Uh, data. I've put it through my own black box called Microsoft Excel and the average journey time on each of the routes. Now, of course, I don't have the data on what the waiting of the journey time difference is between different traffic flows, but a naive average of the examples that are given in the proposal is journey time saving is 30s.

00:05:37:28 - 00:06:04:08

I put it to, you know, put it to this. I don't. I'm via the chair. I suggest that really is trivial because it's 7.9% of the actual full journey time across the area. So I mean, let let's be honest about this. It really is trivial. Thank you.

00:06:06:20 - 00:06:15:08

But just check. Mr. Garg, have you put those calculations of your own that you've referred to? Are they before the examination?

00:06:15:22 - 00:06:17:22

They're in the full written.

00:06:17:24 - 00:06:18:15

Submission.

00:06:18:17 - 00:06:31:28

Yes. And as I keep saying, it is a straightforward, naive, even average of the tables that are in the applicant's papers.

00:06:32:04 - 00:06:32:20

Thank you.

00:06:34:20 - 00:06:47:05

Thank you very much. Can I? As I've already referenced, the South Downs National Park Authority's local impact report. Is there anything you would wish to add in terms of your clear statement that you put in there about journey time savings?

00:06:48:20 - 00:06:51:15

Nick Grant For the National Park Authority. Um, yes.

00:06:51:17 - 00:07:30:16

There is parts of which you've already picked up on. Um, first there was a reference to the average savings or savings in around the junction being about four minutes. Um, I'll happily be corrected, but that's certainly not the, the, the operational assessment in tables seven five and think seven six of the transport assessment that's the ones that we see in this copied across into the case for the scheme. There are some up to about saving three minutes 50s on Eastern lane to the a31 but there a good number where there is an additional journey, time or savings of significantly less than that.

00:07:30:18 - 00:07:46:02

39 seconds, 41 seconds, 35 seconds, for example. So I'm not completely sure where that it is fair to characterize it even broadly as savings of around four minutes in and around the the tree. Um.

00:07:48:10 - 00:08:18:26

It's a hit on a very fair point, which is how does this compare to other schemes? Not least because at the moment we're discussing significance, which of course has its own meaning. But when we get to the actual decision making question is going to be the exceptionality of the scheme in terms. And this is, with respect, difficult to say. This scheme is exceptional if you have no idea what all what other schemes do or have any baseline to compare it to. I totally take the point that each scheme is unique and needs to be looked at on its face.

00:08:18:28 - 00:08:55:02

That's perfectly fair. But you can make the point that or you know, if it were the case that every other scheme that's been done up and down the country has resulted in ten minutes of savings and this one's only delivering four minutes, that at least raises a question that you, sir, and the secretary of state will have to grapple with. So don't accept that. No, having no comparison is a legitimate way forward. By all means, make the points about how comparable they are. But but we support the point that you seem to be making, sir, which is some context would help. And just pausing there, the same question arises when it comes to things like the economic analysis.

00:08:55:24 - 00:09:24:19

Um, in terms of. The specific savings themselves as a whole. As I've said, the national as you've pointed out. So the National Park Authority doesn't consider them significant. Even if you were to consider some of them significant, for example, the three minutes 50 saving three three minutes 50s saving that doesn't necessarily follow for the others. So with respect, it's it's a bit more subtle than

00:09:26:04 - 00:10:16:25

we say as a whole. It's significant. There's a range here and. How that gets cut in the eventual decision making process, whether, for example, you strip out the ones that are actually insignificant and just say, okay, well, there are significant journey time savings here out of 20 or whatever it is. Um, that's at least in my submission, a more accurate weighting of the significance when you get down to that level. Um, and the other thing that we would point out is if that approach is to be taken a route by route approach rather than a whole aggregate type approach, bearing in mind the purpose of this

scheme and looking at where these savings are arising, some of the biggest savings are on the eastern lane to the A31, but that is not the M3 to a 34 type junction.

00:10:16:27 - 00:10:36:22

That's a key driver of this scheme. So actually we're not seeing significant savings on the bit that's meant to be a key driver of this scheme and all of that needs to be weighed in the balance. So the key point is, do we accept that significant? No, still not. And that's what I've said has put some color on on that.

00:10:36:24 - 00:11:09:27

We thank you very much. Um, with the applicant, I'd like to respond to any of those points in particular. The one about about the four minute serving time potentially being the top end and not not necessarily seen across the whole piece. And also, um, probably would like to come back to the point about, about how we can potentially get some comparators, whether that's through the, the resource, um, one and two assessments and what schemes are included and whether that would be possible to do, um, to, to put some context into the journey time savings.

00:11:11:26 - 00:11:43:25

And Kevin lives in the bath with the applicant. Um, the, the same routes that are reported within their community are roots that were selected for their likely impact of the scheme going in place. They although they contribute to the economic appraisal, the user benefit analysis, it's the changes in journalism across the entire network that contribute to that. It's not selected a number of routes. We just select them to report within the within the command, the transport assessment.

00:11:43:27 - 00:12:14:18

So we're. And. Another factor of how those are included within that process is that they are weighted by the flow that that uses them. And so where the main focus of the scheme will be to relieve the territory and it's the amount of traffic going through that territory that's multiplied through by. The time savings there. And although there are other journey time routes which have smaller journey time benefits associated with them, the likelihood is they may be less traffic associated with them.

00:12:14:21 - 00:12:25:19

So when it's all contributed to the overall user benefits package, it's all aspects of time, savings of all links that will. Reduce the further you. Away you get from the scheme.

00:12:29:07 - 00:12:31:00

Thank you, Mr. Gilliam. You had your hand up.

00:12:32:00 - 00:13:10:00

Thank you, Chris. Chris Killen. Winchester, Friends of the Earth. Regardless of what the journey time savings amount to the the applicant appears appears to be saying two opposite things. This this morning the applicant was saying that there is a negligible, negligible induced traffic from this well induced traffic. Has a very direct relationship to reduction in journey time. And so it's either a significant journey time and lots of induction or it's an insignificant journey time and insignificant induction.

00:13:10:02 - 00:13:21:29

And I don't know what the the variable demand model must be telling us something, but none of that. Something appears in any of the reports that I can see. Thank you.

00:13:23:18 - 00:13:24:03

Mr. Gag

00:13:25:25 - 00:13:46:10

because suggest that it might be a red herring to ask for longer journey journey times. Because what we're looking at is the impact that the crossing of this junction is going to have on journey times. And and certainly it was.

00:13:47:16 - 00:13:48:01

You would.

00:13:48:03 - 00:14:28:21

They would say, wouldn't they? But the main traffic flow surely is something like, um, M3 south to A34. And in their own table it says the journey time saving of that is 23 seconds, not the 3.5 minutes. That is in the example it was just given. So there is the table that is published does not support the idea that the busier routes are going to have more journey time saving.

00:14:28:23 - 00:14:55:17

But if you've got a longer journey, part of that journey is the journey across the junction. So the saving is going to be the same unless you do something elsewhere. If you want to go from Oxford to Southampton, the journey time saving will still be 23 seconds. It won't be anything else unless you do another piece of work elsewhere on the network.

00:14:55:24 - 00:15:02:18

Think we've I've covered that in my previous question and I've asked the applicant to to cover that. Yes.

00:15:03:09 - 00:15:12:16

But just point out that the percentage time saving is going to be considerably less. It's going to be even more trivial. Thank you.

00:15:14:26 - 00:15:49:00

Um, one last question, this time to Hampshire County Council before just ask Applicant if they've got any final comments before I wrap up on the journey time savings. Um, bearing in mind our conversation this morning about strategic modeling versus local modeling. Are you accepting that you haven't done any assessment? You've already explained that. Are you comfortable that the strategic model will allow, in your view, the applicant to assess these journey times through through the junction, knowing your local modeling? Um, as well.

00:15:51:12 - 00:15:58:04

That bank. Clifton, Hampshire County Council. Yes, we are. We're satisfied that the strategic model is suitable to do that.

00:15:58:06 - 00:16:01:03

Thank you very much. That's for that confirmation.

00:16:03:24 - 00:16:12:06

Can ask the applicant if they've got any final points about journey time savings, please. There have been made.

00:16:15:11 - 00:16:17:05

Catherine Tracy for the applicant? No, sir, we don't.

00:16:17:14 - 00:16:18:24

Okay. Thank you very much indeed.

00:16:25:06 - 00:16:39:14

So drop back as I said would to road safety. So and thank you for allowing me to change the agenda ever so slightly. I hope it made a bit more sense doing journey time savings after the traffic modeling. Um.

00:16:42:15 - 00:17:14:23

So in their local impact report, Hampshire County Council raised the question of crash data that has been used, stating that given the age of the data, it would be beneficial if this was refreshed. And we also asked the same question in our examiner's questions. 16 .1. ten. The applicant explained that the last full set of data was pre 2019 due to a potential anomalies due to the Covid changes that could have been seen.

00:17:16:27 - 00:17:32:14

Can I ask Hampshire County Council first to explain if they still continue to have concerns about the age and relevance of the the observed crashed collision data that we've been seeing? Please.

00:17:33:26 - 00:17:50:18

Ben Clifton, Hampshire County Council. No, we're satisfied with the response and recognize the particular characteristics. Um, we will. We have done our own analysis at the car and also junction. But again, I'm sure we'll get to that in a moment. So yeah, we're satisfied with with the response.

00:17:52:01 - 00:17:53:29

Thank you very much. Um.

00:17:56:15 - 00:18:31:15

I accept this question directly, except that the five year period is the one that you feel is relevant. Have you? Have you got any further statistics, even whether they haven't been fully validated since 2019? We're now a number of years since the 2019 statistics. And also, have you got any data that pre-dates the 2015 so that we can potentially see what the changes in crash data have been over over a number of years? Or is the five year period the only one that you will be using for any sort of baseline assessments?

00:18:34:04 - 00:18:52:08

And the five years of 2015 to 19 inclusive was. Was the collision data used in our analysis and the 2022 data was not available at the time of publication. That's something that could be looked at to understand what's happened in a more representative year post lockdown.

00:18:53:00 - 00:19:07:26

Yes. Think think. It would be very helpful to have that information. Um, I think I think it would also be helpful to have a few preceding years as well, just so that we can see over a longer time period what the observed crash data is.

00:19:17:12 - 00:19:19:17

You're happy with that? Thank you.

00:19:25:08 - 00:19:30:21

So in. Table 8.3 of the combined.

00:19:33:21 - 00:19:50:22

Assessment. Sorry, Toby. The transport assessment shows the savings of collisions with further details shown in the combined assessment in tables 15 and 16 and in the appendices. The safety assessment area is significantly larger than the application area,

00:19:52:08 - 00:20:23:01

which I understand, but it also means it's difficult to compare the impact of the schemes in in its within the red line boundary compared to the saving the collision savings in the wider area that has been assessed. Um. Can you can you give us give me a little bit of a better understanding about how you derive the wider area for the assessment of collision savings, please? Because it's quite a substantial area compared to the application boundary.

00:20:25:02 - 00:20:56:20

Okay. Kevin Lumsden, on behalf of the applicant. And what we look at are changes in traffic flows over a wide area that can be more, say, between 5 or 10% variation between do minimum and do something. And that helps define an area of influence of the scheme. And within within that area, we look at either link based changes in in accidents that come from Stats 19 or link and junction based, which is even closer to the scheme. So that's basically our criteria that we look at is a change in flow.

00:20:58:18 - 00:21:38:01

Some of the some of those changes in flows over the wider area do result in significant savings. So it's actually quite difficult to compare the, you know, the five year period of savings which you've of observed crashes which you've shown with only only within the application boundary compared with the larger number of of potential savings that you're showing in the wider area. Um. It would be very helpful if you if you could give me a smaller view of what the savings are predicted to be within the application boundary.

00:21:38:03 - 00:21:50:27

Now, you may say that you might you don't have to do that, but it's very difficult at the moment to get a comparator, um, to understand the changes that are going to be seen from the observed data. If you, if you get where I'm coming from.

00:21:50:29 - 00:22:27:24

Yeah, yeah. Um, what we actually use that, that the observed accident information for us is to derive a rate and accident rate by a link type. And that's why we increase the sample size by using more years to then determine a local rate of accidents as opposed to the software that's used is developed by Department for Transport. Cobalt. And it comes with default rates that look at the whole of of United Kingdom in terms of the rate of accidents by a different link type. And in part of the guidance recommendation that can be that if you have good enough observed data in and around your area, you can use that to determine a local rate.

00:22:27:26 - 00:22:36:04

And that's what we've used to use that here. So there's a sphere of influence, but we've used local characteristics of accidents to determine a local, a local rate.

00:22:36:14 - 00:22:50:06

And, and that I'm sorry for continuing this thread, but that local application is that also seen in your wider area of influence in your assessment of crash collision savings? Yeah.

00:22:50:08 - 00:23:04:15

If we have accident rates that um, are are good enough for the, for the link types, the type of link classification that we have in that area, we would use it. We also run a test of using default rates as well. Yeah.

00:23:05:14 - 00:23:46:03

And that's why would welcome a view of what the savings would be in the application boundary. Because you've also said in another part of your application or the assessment that there are some areas where you don't have accident statistics to apply to the wider area, therefore you are using

default. So there's a combination of, of of observed plus default coming to one answer. So having a bit more granularity to the the assessment would be helpful to be able to compare what you're seeing in the observed data and how relevant that is in terms of what's happening in terms of safety improvements in the change of geometry.

00:23:46:26 - 00:23:56:23

Rather than what then being potentially balanced by flow rather than the absolute safety changes in geometry. Does that make sense?

00:23:56:25 - 00:23:57:15

Yep. Yep.

00:23:57:17 - 00:23:59:11

Thank you. Um.

00:24:09:08 - 00:24:38:07

And just just as a final thing in terms of request, in terms of additional information in those tables, you've summarized the the present value benefits by. Link area, but you haven't given us the summary of the value of the savings by casualty type. And if you could if you could do that at the same time, please, that would be helpful to to get that additional information, please.

00:24:47:08 - 00:24:57:02

I'm just going to dig a little bit more into A11 bit of that table. So table five 16in the, um.

00:24:58:21 - 00:25:22:14

Combined modeling and appraisal. If you are happy to reference that is suggesting that the immediate area of influence for junctions only, um is going to result in more collisions. Am I reading that correctly? And that's why I'm asking that question, because you've got negative savings.

00:25:25:27 - 00:25:28:02

Kevin loves in behalf of the applicant.

00:25:30:04 - 00:25:42:01

There's additional road carriageway and it would be a benefit. There's more road carriageway in place in the immediate vicinity of the of the scheme, more length of carriageway.

00:25:43:07 - 00:25:43:22

Okay.

00:25:43:24 - 00:25:53:12

So in comparison to the do minimum, sorry, which is what these are. They're all relative comparisons between a do minimum without the scheme in place and then with the scheme in place.

00:25:54:17 - 00:26:25:18

Yeah. With respect, I didn't ask about the carriage, the geometry, the table, as far as I can read, suggest there will be a, an increase in the number of accidents happening. And that's the clarification I'm asking for. Yes. Yes. And and again. Within. The immediate area of influence. Those is the. Is the directory seen as one junction or is there a number of nodes within the directory that are separate junctions?

00:26:25:20 - 00:26:27:29

There's a number of nodes that represent the junction.

00:26:28:01 - 00:26:49:25

Okay. Thank you. What I'm going to also ask just to clarify, just to summarize, this is, is if when you give me. The more granular view of the comparison between collisions within the application boundary, whether you can highlight where those nodes are and what the savings are at each of those junctions, please.

00:26:51:11 - 00:27:07:07

Um, and the final question request with that application is it would be very helpful to have a summary of the collisions that you're using, um, the observed collisions that are within the, the observed data. Thank you.

00:27:17:16 - 00:27:20:28

I don't have any more direct questions about safety. Um.

00:27:22:23 - 00:27:38:01

As this is also important for Hampshire County Council. We will come on to the Cartoon Horse Junction at the moment. Do you have any other comments about the safety information that's been given apart from the one I've already directly asked you? Please?

00:27:39:06 - 00:27:42:18

Yeah. Ben Clifton. Hampshire County Council. No, No further comments from us.

00:27:42:20 - 00:27:43:19

Thank you very much.

00:27:46:07 - 00:27:47:00

Mr. Gillum.

00:27:48:16 - 00:28:17:26

Yes. Chris Gillum, Friends of the Earth. I'm not quite sure if I've followed all the recent questioning and answering, but am I understanding that the actual accident rate that's on roads like sort of Andover Road down into Winchester or Bar End Road or Jezreel Street, that that is figuring within the the accident benefit calculation? Or are you using standard accident rates for that kind of road?

00:28:20:05 - 00:28:21:19

Kevin loves and on behalf of the.

00:28:21:24 - 00:28:23:06

Happy for the applicant to reply.

00:28:24:04 - 00:29:03:16

Was jumping the gun and Kevin loves on behalf of the applicant if there is 19 data that has been lodged within the state's 19 database and we would consider using that as observed rates of accidents, but we need for whichever link type that we are creating accidents rates for, we need a number of incidents in a period of time. If that information exists, then we would use it as observed accident rates. That's why we, rather than using a single year worth of data, we maybe use five years worth of data to build up a better picture of the accident rates.

00:29:05:20 - 00:29:06:07

Thank you.

00:29:07:13 - 00:29:25:10

And do understand that. What? What you are getting so out of the applicant is where where that. Which roads in the Winchester Street pattern off off the corridor, if you like. Which roads are they actually using accident rates for?

00:29:27:00 - 00:29:45:18

That's probably what I'm asking for. Some clarification on on on the the the extent of accident savings that have been included. Yes, that's what I've asked for. And there is some information already in the documentation you can reference, but just ask for a bit further. Thank you. Councillor Porter, you had your hand up?

00:29:46:00 - 00:30:19:11

Yes. Councillor Porter. Um, City Councillor and County Councillor. Um, from your questioning it seems to imply that you're looking specifically at the accident data within the red line area, but actually the congestion that's caused is all the way from Wellington Cross to three mates or Wellington Cross in the north and the A34 right down to Junction 13. And the congestion and the journey times is very much affected by any accident at any point along that route.

00:30:19:23 - 00:30:43:07

And so therefore the conversation about 30s or 23 seconds seems irrelevant when we're talking about a much longer distance over which that those accidents happen. And I wondered whether there is any responsibility within this scheme to improve the safety record of that whole journey, not just within this red line area.

00:30:44:17 - 00:31:15:03

Thank you very much. Um, just in terms of the question directly asked me was I was seeking some comparators between some of the information that was in the documentation rather than specifically asking about being interested only in the collisions that were in the red line area. And the applicant has, as we've already discussed, that the applicant has looked at the wider areas. I'll just ask the applicant to respond if they would be so kind about the final comment that you made about, um, additional responsibilities.

00:31:20:12 - 00:31:43:15

At Katherine Tracy for the applicant. We can only address as part of the scheme. Accidents might occur within the red line boundary. Um, we can't. We can't fix the wider highway network. Um, there may be instances where it extends slightly outside the red line boundary because the way the traffic moves around the network. But, but there is a point at which you, you end up with two remote.

00:31:45:26 - 00:31:46:21

Thank you very much.

00:31:48:15 - 00:32:22:29

Thank you. The next part of the agenda is about the wider transport network and other highway related issues. Um. So I believe that we don't have any representatives from the Cycle bus or 2020s for Hampshire. Um, that's fine. So, um, so in their written um, representation 2020s for Hampshire who accompanies on the a company site visit as well. They detailed concerns about the impact of the scheme on Twyford and the Be treble three five.

00:32:23:01 - 00:33:06:08

They detailed a number of proposed measures they would like to see implemented. Um, we did seek to understand the impact on Twyford within our examiner's questions and we and the response from the applicant was that there was projected to be less than 200 additional passenger units per day in the 2027 opening through Twyford. Um, in the absence of 2020s for Hampshire, can I ask Hampshire County Council if they have any views on the comments that 24 Hampshire um, put into their

application? And if there are any further comments on the traffic impact forecast for Twyford that has been mentioned, please.

00:33:08:12 - 00:33:37:25

Ben Clifton. Hampshire County Council. No, we have no specific comments on on on the application from the Twyford Group. And likewise, we are satisfied, as we said earlier, in terms of the strategic modelling, in terms of the outputs from that. In terms of the impact on Twyford, I believe in regard to Twyford, there is an item around the diversion routes later on in the agenda which which we may come back to, but not in terms of the completion of the scheme.

00:33:38:06 - 00:33:46:10

Thank you very much. That's fine. And just to the applicant, has any further comments that they would like to make on on that?

00:33:48:19 - 00:33:49:15

No, sir, we don't.

00:33:49:17 - 00:33:51:13

Thank you. Um.

00:33:55:08 - 00:34:01:18

So also in. I'm sorry. Beg your pardon, Mr. Gillham. I didn't see your hand there. Sorry.

00:34:01:20 - 00:34:43:25

Chris Gillham. Friends of the Earth. One thing when asked for the traffic validation on local roads. The validation data that was given did not include Twyford. So I'm doing what the validation, the fit and the fit is between the traffic model and the current traffic through Twyford because don't think that appears anywhere in the document. So we don't no idea how significant this 200 and whatever it is extra vehicles is because we don't know what the variance is of the or the the misfit between the model and the observed data.

00:34:47:18 - 00:34:48:29

I'm happy for the applicant to reply.

00:34:50:10 - 00:35:20:15

Yeah, I think that there probably isn't any specific modelling for Twyford. It's outside the red line boundary and the, the additional traffic movements at that junction or at junction 11, um, which are over, well they are the um, diversionary route for the closure for the M3 junction nine on slip where the traffic is being sent down to junction 11 around the roundabout there and back up the motorway.

00:35:20:17 - 00:35:29:05

It isn't that any of those um, vehicle movements go into Twyford. We're certainly not sending them off the Strategic Road network.

00:35:30:17 - 00:35:48:04

Thank you for that clarity. And I think our our question in the first written questions was very specific and was specifically answered and wasn't about the temporary movement. So I'm happy that that's been answered already. And thank you to Hampshire County Council for the confirmation. Um.

00:35:50:00 - 00:36:23:07

Again in the Hampshire County Council's local impact report. Paragraph 6.3.5. It relates to the Winchester movement strategy and that and stating that further city center improvements would become more beneficial due to junction nine improvements. I know we've just had this, this

discussion, so I think this is, um, in a similar vein. Can I just confirm with Hampshire County Council that they're not seeking any other direct improvements from the applicant outside of the application boundary based on those comments in your local impact report?

00:36:25:18 - 00:37:02:04

Ben Clifton, Hampshire County Council. Those comments are specifically in related relation to the city of Winchester. So it's just a recognition, a long standing recognition through the Winchester strategy that an improvement scheme at Junction nine would have beneficial impacts in terms of in terms of reduction in traffic flows and therefore enable Hampshire County Council to to work on delivering some of those complimentary measures around road space allocation, encouraging sustainable transport modes around the city.

00:37:02:17 - 00:37:10:27

So so in regards to that comment, then there is no specific additional requirements from us in terms of the city of Winchester.

00:37:12:15 - 00:37:14:20

You. Mr..

00:37:17:28 - 00:37:54:12

Thank you, sir. Phil Winchester. Action. Climate crisis. Um. I'm I think it needs to be noted that although there is a Winchester Movement strategy and a set of values and aims, there have so far been no proposals. So think it should not be assumed that the Winchester movement strategy is going to be helped until we know something just a little bit about what the Winchester movement strategy is going to do.

00:37:57:16 - 00:38:18:06

Thank you. And the issue specific hearing next week will include policy so it can be covered then. But thank you for your comments. So I'm just going to move now on to the next part of the agenda, which is about the cart and horse junction, the A33, the 3047 junction.

00:38:20:08 - 00:38:54:09

It's been highlighted variously by Winchester City Council, Hampshire County Council and South Down National Park Authority in their local impact reports. The Act has been engaged with Hampshire County Council regarding this and as local Highway Authority Hampshire County Council have stated, they consider the change to the highway layout will result in a reduction in safety. The applicant in their response detailed the reasons why they have not included the junction in the application and cited that conflicting movements would be reduced and that their modelling shows the scheme is not predicted to negatively impact the safety levels at the junction.

00:38:55:15 - 00:39:33:13

This position has been maintained by the applicant in the applicant's response to the local impact reports in D3. I hope it's been noted, as I've mentioned earlier, that we have accepted an additional submission from Hampshire County Council about their public consultation exercise which commenced on the 10th of July. Um, I appreciate that a lot of discussion has been happening behind the scenes and I think I'd just we would just welcome as the site being updated where the discussions are about this junction and any further information that you think that we should have in this regard? I'll start with the local authorities.

00:39:33:23 - 00:39:34:08

Um,

00:39:36:08 - 00:39:46:09

all three if you wish to comment and then I'll ask the applicant to summarize at the end. So Hampshire County Council, if you would like to. Start, please.

00:39:47:13 - 00:40:22:15

So. Ben Clifton. Hampshire County Council. Yes, it's a it's a point that we've consistently raised throughout the the and the reexamination period. Um, we're concerned, in short, that the, the impact of the scheme on the car and horse junction as it's colloquially known, known as would be, would be severe. Specifically around the impact on, on the safe operation of that junction. Um, we have identified six collisions that have taken place in the period 2018 to 2022, which includes a fatality.

00:40:22:27 - 00:40:55:06

Um, the junction has been subject to, to previous amendments that try to alleviate some of those accident statistics, including speed limit reductions. Um, just just for information, the accidents that occur at that junction from, from our records, which as well as the most recent five years, we do have records that extend a lot further back which we're very happy to, to share with the examining authority. Um, those accidents predominantly involve vehicles traveling north through the junction.

00:40:55:16 - 00:41:18:09

Um, and those actions also occur largely at the southern stagger of the junction, which is the, the London road arm of the Beast B3 407. Um, if I may, with your permission, I'd just like to draw attention to the tables that are set out on page 12 of Hampshire's Lear. And these. These.

00:41:20:13 - 00:42:11:05

The two diagrams that are there are reflective of the applicant strategic transport model. The top diagram is for the morning peak in the 2047 future year and the bottom diagram is for the evening peak. So same, same junction, just morning and evening. Um, the, the figures that you can see there are representative of passenger car units, which is a metric for measuring vehicles through the junctions. Um. You've got do, which stands for do minimum, which is the scenario where where the applicant, the scheme isn't implemented and do something which is when when you have the scheme implemented and then the differences that are highlighted there is, is the difference between the scheme being in place and not being in place.

00:42:11:21 - 00:42:44:07

And as you can see that that gives figures for each. Each of the arms are specific. Concern relates to northbound traffic and as you can see in both the morning, morning peak period, the increase there is of northbound through the junction of 91 vehicles and in the evening period it's 171. So we have a very specific concern there given the accident record about about the impact that will have on the on the safety of the junction.

00:42:45:01 - 00:42:50:01

Um, which, which is in essence why we are seeking mitigation through the

00:42:51:20 - 00:43:26:02

um as a reference, we have submitted additional information relating to an ongoing and live public consultation. Hampshire County Council are undertaking um, in, in kind of in response to this DCO looking at improvement options at that junction. Um, and just draw your attention to think it's slide titled number 14 comparison of the two proposed options. Um, this is where we've done the point I'd like to draw attention to is where we've done our own local modelling of the junction, looking at how it performs.

00:43:26:12 - 00:43:58:15

Um, the way we've done that is we've used our own baseline flows that we've taken at the junction, but we've applied the, the future growth rates and growth traffic inputs from the strategic model, from

the applicant into that model to, to see how the, how the proposed options would, would perform. Um, in terms of in terms of the impact of the scheme. And on, on Slide 14, it just referenced there that both options.

00:43:58:17 - 00:44:38:08

So there's two options. One is a roundabout form of improvement and the other is signals traffic signals to control traffic flows. But in both options there would still be some capacity issues. And so what we infer from that is that if there was no improvement at the junction, the junction itself would be operating at or very likely above capacity. Um, so, so that's the work that Hampshire currently has underway. We we consider there two advanced schemes that are available for promotion and we are very keen to continue engaging with national highways on, on, on how those might come forward.

00:44:38:21 - 00:44:51:06

Um. And. Essentially, we do still consider that improvement scheme is should be a requirement of the scheme to provide a safe and sufficient layout to accommodate the forecast demand.

00:44:54:17 - 00:44:55:09

Thank you.

00:44:56:17 - 00:45:07:21

Joseph. For Hampshire County Council. If I could just add two brief points. We've had a brief look at the statement of common ground between the applicant and.

00:45:09:21 - 00:45:12:00

Which is the cycle. Get up.

00:45:15:08 - 00:45:19:17

Does it confirm what you're doing that this is in relation to the Cotton? Horsley Junction. Yes. Okay. Thank you.

00:45:19:21 - 00:45:51:15

Sir. Absolutely. No worries. There's a comment there at paragraph 4.6 and think it seems to set out where if we could just get some clarity in terms of when the applicant's position is on in terms of securing this mitigation. And the statement there is that future changes to the highway at the Cotton Horse Junction are outside the scheme and we need to be brought forward by Hampshire County Council. That's a 4.4.6 only raise that because it seems to be the latest document we have where this this particular issue is discussed.

00:45:51:25 - 00:46:29:23

And then the question that was raised earlier, I think by Councillor Porter was where something lies outside of the red line boundary, Where does the responsibility lie in terms of it being secured as part of the and think. But the point raised by the applicant, quite rightly. There's not an expectation that they will necessarily improve all the way around around the scheme of way extends beyond the red line scheme. But the issue is if it's two, the question is one of remoteness. So and think just putting our case quite simply, we say there's a this scheme leads to a severe highways impact.

00:46:30:06 - 00:46:51:16

It's on a junction that we initially argued should have been included in the red line boundary but wasn't and is very close to that boundary. And we say that these works are required to make the proposals acceptable in highways planning terms, and that's our position as the Highways Authority.

00:46:52:12 - 00:47:04:05

Thank you very much. Um, if I could ask Winchester City Council and South Downs National Park Authority if they have any further comments to make on this. Um, at this point.

00:47:06:04 - 00:47:08:21

If I just take Mr. Grant first.

00:47:10:11 - 00:47:15:26

Sir Nick of the National Park Authority know we're tucking in behind Hampshire Council on this one. We've got nothing to add.

00:47:15:28 - 00:47:21:24

Thank you very much. Um, and Mr. Green or Mrs. Porter? Councillor Porter.

00:47:21:29 - 00:47:54:15

Thank you very much. Councillor Porter. Councillor for this area. And um, simply put, the design that the national highways have put forward. Stops at a point and doesn't join up. It's like having a road joining onto a pavement. It's as ridiculous as that. And until those two actually join together, then it's not a functioning road, not a functioning highway. So at the moment the two don't literally don't match up, um, as designed by national highways.

00:47:54:28 - 00:48:30:24

Also the current arrangement means that traffic flow stops briefly, albeit briefly, while the traffic lights change at junction nine. And this will change the flow will be continuous up to this junction, particularly at peak times, with if the figures that Mr. Clifton is describing and have been provided by national highways exist, there will be far less of a break in the traffic and also the cycling and walking would be more difficult as a result of across that junction because of the increase in traffic at peak times.

00:48:30:26 - 00:49:19:15

There was another accident even yesterday on Monday evening at 445. It's a pretty classic time. Between 430 and 530 is when they happen, which is the peak time when people are coming out across the junction because the significant amount of the traffic flows on what was the be 3 or 4 seven, which was continuous until the a33 was driven through it. So there is a cross route of traffic which happens and that will be interrupted. Um, the significant crossing across the width of the a33 is the challenge for all of those vehicles and they are now going to be faced if this prediction of national highways is correct, with over three more vehicles a minute to actually cross and negotiate across.

00:49:19:17 - 00:49:50:02

And so this problem actually gets much worse at peak times. And that's exactly when the accidents are happening at the moment. So the main problem, the two three main problems are, one, there's no break in the traffic because there are no traffic lights. Two, the amount of traffic that's going in generally in a cross direction, perpendicular direction to the general flow of the traffic. And the third one is the fact that the two roads don't two designs of the current road and the predicted road don't join up.

00:49:51:07 - 00:49:56:06

Thank you very much. I'll ask the applicant to summarize their position if they may.

00:50:00:28 - 00:50:37:29

Uh, yes. Katherine Tracy for the applicant. Um, in summary, while we are putting more more flow through that junction, um. At the a33 our our modelling suggests that we're reducing. It in interactions and therefore we're not actually having any negative impact on on that junction and accordingly that there's no need for us to provide any mitigation at that junction and it falls outside the scheme.

00:50:43:20 - 00:50:45:10
Thank you very much,

00:50:47:02 - 00:50:47:23
Mr. Qi.

00:50:49:15 - 00:50:50:03
Thank you.

00:50:50:17 - 00:50:52:06
Antique cycle, Winchester.

00:50:52:14 - 00:50:56:17
Since our. Statement of common ground has just been invoked.

00:50:58:13 - 00:51:37:25
Yeah, we. Have expressed a lot of concern about the integration with the Carton Horse Junction. I should point out that in the statement of Common Ground is labelled under discussion rather than agreed, and I'd like to think the discussion is continuing. But yeah, we do have this problem that we want to see a coherent scheme that includes Carton Horse Junction and explains how it's going to work. It's really not clear to us at all. What we can see at the moment is a Hampshire County Council scheme being progressed in isolation and a junction nine scheme being progressed in isolation and it's not clear how those will link together.

00:51:37:27 - 00:52:06:05
That is very worrying. It's particularly worrying as a cycling advocacy organization because the 347 is the major cycling route out of Winchester to the east cycle traffic through there. Easily in the hundreds of thousands of journeys through that junction a year. Several times the amount of traffic that currently goes through in through junction nine in season 23. So it's a major cycling route. It's bad enough as it is. We don't want to see it get worse.

00:52:08:17 - 00:52:43:22
Thank you very much. The only one thing I wanted to note in addition for the applicant is that I noticed from the stage one safety audit there was a discussion about potential higher speeds, which hasn't been mentioned in here. So I don't know whether the applicant has got any comments on on the potential for higher speeds or whether their response to the safety audit um, is, is what they still think is sufficient bearing in mind design development. And if you're happy, if you feel you should reply in writing, then please do.

00:52:46:18 - 00:52:48:25
Catherine Treacy for the applicant will take that one away and come back.

00:52:48:27 - 00:52:52:17
If you could do that would be great. Um. Mr. Gillam.

00:52:53:26 - 00:53:35:08
Let's get amongst friends there. If, as I understand the conversations, the both the county council and the city council see the need for the cart and horses cart and horses schemes as resulting, at least in part from from from, from the applicant scheme. And if that's the case, I do not understand how unless the applicant is actually disagreeing with the the County Council's and the City Council's assessment, how the applicant can decide that it's not part of their scheme or not a consequence of their scheme which they ought to pay for mitigation of.

00:53:40:07 - 00:53:41:10

We have to respond.

00:53:43:24 - 00:53:51:01

I think Katherine Tracy for the applicant think I've covered that in that our traffic modeling doesn't show that there's a need to mitigate that junction.

00:53:51:03 - 00:54:05:29

Thank you very much. Um. The only thing that we have noticed is that we haven't seen a draft statement of common ground. And I presume this is going to be part of that, that yeah, with Hampshire. So we look forward to that.

00:54:07:02 - 00:54:21:24

Yes. Kevin Tracy for the applicant know that it is progressing and it is evolving but I don't think it's quite in a. A stage to share it at the moment. But again, we would hope to bring that forward for D5 with everything else.

00:54:24:09 - 00:54:28:19

We should be in a sufficient place then to be able to. To help.

00:54:30:24 - 00:55:03:10

Thank you very much. Um, so the next item on the agenda is temporary traffic diversions during construction. We touched on this very briefly. Um, some of these questions might have been covered in the show this morning, so please, um, if they, they have please reference that, um, Hampshire County Council in your local impact report. Um, there was clear need for all work and diversions on the local highway network to be undertaken pursuant to the permit scheme, which we talked about this morning. But you also mentioned a Heads of terms agreement with the applicant that you had submitted.

00:55:03:12 - 00:55:08:20

Was that covered sufficiently in the show this morning or is there any further comments about that? Heads of Terms agreement?

00:55:17:21 - 00:55:21:18

Bank account cancelled. Sorry. Is that is that in regarding to 0.5?

00:55:23:05 - 00:55:24:15

10.5 on the agenda.

00:55:25:27 - 00:55:29:05

Temporary traffic diversions during construction. Yes. Yeah. Um.

00:55:31:24 - 00:55:57:12

I don't believe we've asked for heads of terms specifically covering that item. Think our comment there is that we recognize the outline traffic management plan that's been submitted and we're satisfied with the the principles contained within that, albeit we also note that it's a live document and we would expect that to be further detail to be provided during the detailed design phases. So that would be our comment on that item.

00:55:57:14 - 00:56:35:27

Yes. And and I think we covered a substantive part of that this morning in the discussion about the and the and the comments there. So I'm happy with that reply. Thank you. Unless the applicant has

anything they'd like to comment, I think I'll move on. Um. So we've, we've mentioned um, about the sow cycle. Winchester in the written representations talked about the concerns they had about traffic on diversion routes that was going to potentially increase, uh, conflicts with cyclists that also use those diversion routes.

00:56:35:29 - 00:56:46:19

Now I believe from a very quick look through the statement of common grounds that that is now something that has been agreed. Is that fair?

00:56:49:28 - 00:56:51:09

Yes. Okay.

00:56:51:15 - 00:57:21:07

Antiquing cycle. Winchester. Um, to. To an extent, yes. Think it's fair to say we agree that these will be taken into those issues will be taken into account with the detailed planning of those diversions. We still have some concerns with that, but we think we've accepted that these diversions will happen and that some thought will be given to mitigation and to monitoring, more importantly, the effect of them should.

00:57:23:00 - 00:57:34:26

Yeah, I should point out since the cycle bus people are not here. That issue around Junction 11 was to do with Junction 11 itself, not with traffic coming into Twyford.

00:57:34:28 - 00:57:37:21

Yes, there are two separate issues that we're covering. So we know.

00:57:37:23 - 00:57:54:08

It's. Yeah. Was earlier mentioned you mentioned it as if it was traffic intertwined but it is separate from that. But yeah, we probably accept these diversions will happen but we'll come on to the cycle route diversions in the effect those might have on that.

00:57:54:10 - 00:58:24:26

And I'll probably say this same thing a number of times because Hampshire County Council haven't seen enough notice the statement of Common Ground and a number of things that may be agreed are actually the responsibility of Hampshire County Council as well. I will be asking them if they do have any comments, but if not, they will be followed up. So just on that that point about diversion routes, adding to the potential for danger to cyclists on those diversion routes is there anything you'd like to add at this moment?

00:58:27:24 - 00:58:50:04

Bank of New Hampshire County Council. Only very briefly, that we would we would expect the sort of detailed mitigation measures, signage, notification of the works, etcetera. We'd expect to to have early sight of that and to agree any local mitigation measures that might alleviate some of those impacts caused by the diversion routes on particularly on vulnerable users.

00:58:50:18 - 00:58:56:06

Thank you very much. Um, any comments? No. Okay. Thank you. Um.

00:58:58:25 - 00:59:29:01

So we mentioned this. This this next point has come up once or twice. Um, Winchester City Council. I'll. I've seen your hand. Councillor Porter. I'll come to you in a second. Um, in their local impact report. Winchester City Council raised a number of questions regarding management of major incidents on the Trunk Road network during construction and the impact on the traffic in the city and

how inappropriate local diversions will be managed. And that could result from from wayward satnav directions.

00:59:29:10 - 00:59:36:26

Um, can I ask Winchester City Council if they are yet content that these are being addressed or whether they are still under discussion?

00:59:38:19 - 00:59:59:08

Thank you, sir. Robert Greenfield, Winchester City Council. This does tie in to the noise and air quality discussions that we'll have tomorrow as well, because they are related to the diversion route. So we may we may cover it again tomorrow. But I think we we heard the start of it there for Mr. Clifton about appropriate signage. So it's still under discussion, but we're willing to continue those discussions with the county and the applicant as well.

00:59:59:23 - 01:00:04:15

Okay. Thank you. And Councillor Porter, was there an additional comment you had about either of those items? I'm sorry.

01:00:04:17 - 01:00:07:08

I was jumping the gun to the next one about junction 11.

01:00:07:15 - 01:00:11:00

Okay. No worries. Um, thank you. Um.

01:00:12:21 - 01:00:33:27

It was just a small point that my last question on this again, in the local impact report, Hampshire County Council requested more detail for traffic management in the outline traffic management plan, and I am right to assume that those details are continually being discussed and are subject to further discussion with the applicant.

01:00:35:08 - 01:01:04:19

Thank Clifton Hampshire County Council. I think it's more that we expect that detail to be provided at a later stage, if you like. We're satisfied the outline framework, the construction traffic management plan provides the correct framework, but it was just to note that we'd expect as part of what's in that framework to to follow through in terms of more detailed construction traffic management plans and think that would be a point that would be covered in our statement of common ground that provide that extra bit of clarity.

01:01:05:12 - 01:01:07:08

Okay. Thank you. Um.

01:01:11:17 - 01:01:44:14

So just a few comments about the proposed temporary diversions and their impacts and their mitigation. Um, again, Hampshire County Council noted that you've requested that full road closures are only undertaken at night time and working times are discussed, were discussed this morning. Um, is this currently reflected in the outline traffic management plan still to your satisfaction? Are you and is this requirement sufficiently secured in the as far as you're concerned?

01:01:45:25 - 01:02:06:15

It's bankers in Hampshire County Council. Yes, it is. Broadly, yes. We would just reflect and we recognize that there be particular closures which will have a significant impact And to to to try and undertake those during night time would be our clear preference. And I'm sure that's reflected in the applicant's position as well.

01:02:08:06 - 01:02:11:04

As the applicant got any thing they would like to comment on that.

01:02:11:09 - 01:02:31:12

Katherine Tracy for the applicant? No, we're the it's a motorway network. We and Strategic Road Network predominantly. We are very keen to do closures at night and over weekends when there isn't commuter traffic and and other traffic and that that is what has been assessed in the. Yes. And is being taken forward.

01:02:32:09 - 01:02:43:02

And and sorry just to make sure I'm clear because I don't think it was actually part of the discussion with the that that requirement you fairly secured in the sufficiently through the

01:02:44:19 - 01:02:45:04

MP.

01:02:46:26 - 01:02:47:27

The traffic management plan.

01:02:51:06 - 01:03:26:06

A Katherine Tracy for the applicant. Yes, we say it is mean. We we cannot have an absolute prohibition on any daytime closures because we just. You don't know what might happen, um, during the course of construction. Um, but know that that is. We are not intending that we take down the directory during Monday morning peak. Um, that that is very much what we're intending to be, but we wouldn't want to be have an absolute prohibition on on that because you just don't know what's going to happen and satisfactory.

01:03:26:25 - 01:03:31:02

Ben Clifton Hampshire County Council. Yes, that's our our position. So all that satisfactory.

01:03:31:04 - 01:03:32:00

Thank you very much.

01:03:36:00 - 01:03:36:18

Mr. K.

01:03:38:20 - 01:03:56:19

And cycle. Winchester Just a note of caution on that, obviously, from our point of view. Weekends are peak time. If you're looking at somewhere like the 347 for cycle traffic. So doesn't weekend working doesn't necessarily solve problems for us. Overnight? Probably, yes.

01:03:58:15 - 01:04:38:21

Thank you for that that point. So just want to move on to the next part of the agenda, which is about the diverted traffic through Junction 11. Winchester City Council in their local employment report, detailed concern about the impact of the scheme on Junction 11 and have concerns about excessive traffic delays and impact on pedestrian movements. In their response to the local Impact report, the applicant stated that the diversion route referred to will effectively loop traffic underneath the M three Junction 11, utilising the existing southbound off slip and northbound on slips and will therefore not go on to any local roads towards Twyford.

01:04:38:28 - 01:04:48:08

Um, can I just confirm with Winchester City Council if that now removes their concern that they highlighted in the local impact report please.

01:04:49:03 - 01:05:28:23

Councillor Porter. Mr. Green might like to comment afterwards, but no, we don't believe that it does solve the problem to get the traffic off the motorway under the motorway and back on the motorway will need a significant increase in the amount of traffic light time for that journey and that will therefore reduce the amount of traffic light time on the the road coming from Twyford at peak times, those queues are are potentially significant and they would be increased even further, which leads to a much greater risk of driver impatience.

01:05:28:25 - 01:05:47:13

And also then when we come to the other side, to the west side of the motorway, again the same thing happens and it reduces the amount of time that is available to take vehicles onto the motorway from the southbound carriageway. So we don't believe that the response is satisfactory.

01:05:47:21 - 01:06:03:14

Thank you. Can ask the applicant to respond but can also ask at the same time whether the diversion that we're talking about is only going to be seen during nighttime closures or whether there's an understanding of whether whether that will be seen during daytime as well, Please.

01:06:07:11 - 01:06:34:12

Tom King on behalf of the applicant. So we're assuming we're referring to the northbound on slip closure, which is 17 months in phase two and into phase three. A Yes, That is, we will be sending traffic south to return north onto the M3 northbound. 24 over seven. 24 over seven. There are nighttime closures as well. That may send traffic around Winchester.

01:06:35:06 - 01:06:39:29

Okay. And 24 over seven. And the duration you mentioned was 17 months. 17 months.

01:06:44:09 - 01:06:52:18

Thank you. And can you comment further on on the issue that has been raised about about timings of signals and issues that that might cause?

01:06:54:00 - 01:06:55:06

So can you repeat the question?

01:06:55:08 - 01:07:13:05

Yes. Councillor Porter then subsequently raised concerns about the additional times for the traffic lights, for traffic coming out of Twyford and obviously the pedestrian crossings being affected. Can you comment on what you're looking at in terms of mitigating those issues, please?

01:07:13:22 - 01:07:32:01

During the 17 months the northbound on slip is not anticipated to have a high enough flows to deem further modelling is required and anticipates no traffic. Light changes will be required. This will be monitored throughout the scheme.

01:07:35:26 - 01:07:43:29

Thank you. Councillor Porter, you mentioned that Mr. Green may have additional comments, but it sounds like you do as well if you.

01:07:44:11 - 01:08:15:13

Are, that Mr. King raises the. Sorry, Councillor Porter. Mr. King raises the northbound slip, but not the southbound slip off the motorway. That also is traffic light controlled and that does control the traffic from Twyford to. And I'd like to know what the outcome for that section is because it would increase if the number of vehicles taking the journey south and then north again increases. That would surely increase the time needed at those traffic lights. I'm just going to pass on to Mr.

01:08:15:15 - 01:08:16:00

Green.

01:08:17:20 - 01:08:36:06

Thank you. Thank you, sir. Robert Green for city Council. I think the only thing I would add, we've discussed vehicle traffic, particularly into Twyford. We also mentioned the Non-motorised users as well, and that was in reference to the signal impact on the Hockley link because that is a common walking route to cross that road as well. So just to clarify that point and thank you.

01:08:36:08 - 01:08:41:11

And just before I come to the applicant, it has Hampshire County Council got anything to add as local highway authority?

01:08:44:05 - 01:09:16:02

The bank. Clifton Hampshire County Council. Nothing specific to add. I've probably repeat myself slightly in that we would expect. We're very aware of this particular diversion and the length that it will be in place for. And we recognize the the official diversion route, which I think has been described. But having said all that, we would still expect to be very closely involved in terms of agreeing mitigation and the monitoring of that impact in terms of the signals. But no, nothing further specific from me to say on that.

01:09:16:09 - 01:09:16:26

Thank you.

01:09:18:05 - 01:09:23:22

If the applicant could respond to any of the comments that have been made by Winchester City Council, please could.

01:09:23:24 - 01:09:40:06

I just ask when you do respond, if you could. Um. Comments further in relation to those pedestrian crossings that we did observe on the accompanied site inspection and the route that were taken along.

01:09:42:16 - 01:09:55:06

I heard what you said on You don't need mitigation in relation to the use of the northbound slip, but could you speak specifically in relation to any scope for mitigation for those pedestrian crossings?

01:09:59:11 - 01:10:13:19

Tom King on behalf of the applicant. Sorry, I'm might have to cancel the porter. Missed word of that. Well was referring to the northbound on slip was talking about the junction nine on slip so the traffic going down onto the junction.

01:10:15:05 - 01:10:44:16

That's the modeling for that is the is low enough to deem it not required to be modeled for down at junction 11 because that's where the traffic would be sent during the 17 month closure. With regards to the to the traffic lights, the traffic would be sent on come on the southbound off slip and come back on itself onto the northbound. The pedestrian crossing is on the Winchester side of Junction 11.

01:10:49:08 - 01:10:51:22
And will remain signalized.

01:10:56:26 - 01:11:10:23
So just final confirmation to make sure that everyone is on the same page. Um, has has has modelling of Junction 11 being undertaken for the 14 month temporary diversion?

01:11:13:00 - 01:11:13:27
No, it has not known.

01:11:14:09 - 01:11:15:14
Okay. Um.

01:11:17:23 - 01:11:53:27
Kevin Lumsden on behalf of the applicant, and we have modelled each of the construction phases that's in excess of of three months. And when it comes to the closure of the Norte M3 Junction nine northbound on slip, when we close that, we looked at the wider implications of the diversions of that traffic. We didn't mitigate it because it was fail. It wasn't required to mitigate. Think the average daily traffic using that link is about 3000, just around about 3000 in terms of counts pre and post Covid and and those that were used in the calibrated base.

01:11:53:29 - 01:12:05:18
So as they dissipate throughout the network, it's a relatively small amount of traffic and there may be issues at Twyford but both in the due minimum and the do something. But in terms of the diversions associated with that, they were.

01:12:06:04 - 01:12:23:17
I think think in that case think it would be helpful all around if we could have some modelling of what is going to happen at that junction. It's a long period to have the diversions through that junction without any modelling understanding of, of what, what the implication will be. Um.

01:12:28:13 - 01:12:30:10
No, that's okay. Please, please converse.

01:12:51:09 - 01:12:54:11
At Katherine Tracy for the applicant. Yes, we can provide that.

01:12:54:23 - 01:13:25:11
I think that'll be very helpful. Thank you very much. I think that would help Hampshire County Council understand what might happen and and enable people to see what might, um. Uh, fears that may be allayed at the pedestrian crossings. So thank you for that. Okay. Assuming that we've covered that. Oh, I just wanted to cover a couple of general highway matters, one of which I think has been substantively discussed this morning in terms of stopping up and trunking. Just want to give anyone the opportunity.

01:13:25:13 - 01:13:42:17
Well, Hampshire County Council, really the opportunity to discuss anything about stopping up or trunking that is outside of the DCO that you may wanted to comment on. But I know we had a discussion this morning, so I'm probably expecting not much more to be discussed.

01:13:46:09 - 01:13:51:17
Ben Clifton, Hampshire County Council. That's correct. There's nothing more that we wish to raise at this point that I thought you said earlier.

01:13:51:19 - 01:14:19:03

That's fine. No, thank you for that. The only other question I wanted to raise was about highway boundaries. And again, that was something that was being discussed this morning at Hampshire County Council and that you raised this in your local impact report as well. Um, are you sufficient with sufficiently content with the progress that's being made on understanding where the highway boundaries are and what that means in terms of your future maintenance liabilities in total?

01:14:20:24 - 01:14:45:10

A bank lift in Hampshire County Council. Yes, we are satisfied with the way the discussions are going. There's nothing particularly that that's an issue of principle between the parties think it's really just around that absolute clarity and definition. And and we're making arrangements to have further meetings to to pin that down and be able to update you at a future deadline.

01:14:46:10 - 01:15:02:29

Thank you very much. Any comments on from the applicant on either of those things? Okay. Thank you. Um, that concludes the agenda for traffic and transportation. I'll just ask Miss McCoy if you've got any last questions that you'd like to ask.

01:15:03:28 - 01:15:04:17

Thank you.

01:15:04:19 - 01:15:27:19

Okay. In which case, it's 3:15. And before we start the public rights of way section. Um, I'm going to propose that we have a 15 minute break now and come back just after 330, So I'm going to adjourn the hearing until 330. Thank you very much.