

M3 J9_ISH2_1st AUG_PT4

Created on: 2023-08-01 15:09:16

Project Length: 00:46:54

File Name: M3 J9_ISH2_1st AUG_PT4

File Length: 00:46:54

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:10 - 00:00:35:28

So it's 330 and we will resume issue specific here in to get my usual check with Mrs. Norris we okay. Thank you very much indeed. So the last part of the agenda that we're going to cover today is, um, public rights of way and non-motorized user routes. Um, so again, I will. Repeat that we've had the statement of common ground latterly, as in yesterday, come through with Winchester.

00:00:36:00 - 00:01:16:04

It will be referred to. But I am very conscious that Hampshire County Council in particular haven't had the full opportunity to review that. So any follow up comments and questions in writing will be gratefully received. If you feel you cannot comment to my questions at the time. Thank you. So I'm also conscious that some of my questions may have been covered in the statement of Common Ground as well. So if they are again, a reminder that statement of common grounds are still something that the examining authority can and will examine, even if items are agreed.

00:01:16:06 - 00:01:47:23

So we will assume that that is something that we're going to continue to do today, bearing in mind the late submission. So with that in mind, um. In their written representation cycle. Winchester stated that they felt some aspects of the proposed network were not clearly enough defined, especially in terms of legal status, which I know is something that is still outstanding on the statement of common Ground. This was also raised by the South Downs National Park Authority in their local impact report.

00:01:48:18 - 00:02:23:24

The applicant referenced this and basically and stated that the legal definition is in schedule three Part eight of the draft development consent order. Um, now the statement of Common Ground, which we received yesterday has updated this issue. And if I'm correct, this now relates to um, simply a say simply, but only now relates to the section across the directory not being a bridleway. Would I be correcting that assumption in terms of understanding the legal status or will would a clarification of the issue be worthwhile? Mr.

00:02:23:26 - 00:02:24:11

Kay.

00:02:25:23 - 00:02:34:09

Okay. Thank you very much. So, Mr. K, if you could clarify where your position is. Um, and again, I will, I will ask Hampshire County Council as.

00:02:36:20 - 00:02:45:12

The authority for public rights of way to comment and as well. But if you could give me your position in terms of the legal status as you see it, please.

00:02:46:17 - 00:03:17:23

Andy Cycle Winchester. Thank you. Um, I'll break it down into three main. The three main routes in effect. The easy one, if you like, is the proposed new bridle way up to long walk, running parallel to

the motorway. Um, I think we were all agreed that that be a public bridleway designated as such. I believe, uh, within the walking cycling horse riding consultative group. I'm pretty sure society would prefer it to be a a.

00:03:19:13 - 00:03:30:13

It's gonna be, like, restricted, By the way, is that word? Yes. Thank you. Um, because that would give more. More access rights to, um, horses with vehicles.

00:03:31:29 - 00:03:32:14

Um.

00:03:33:07 - 00:03:43:19

The second one is the proposed new route from Kings Worthy to Junction nine, both as a utility active travel cycle route.

00:03:44:20 - 00:03:45:05

Um.

00:03:45:27 - 00:04:03:08

In terms of legal status, that's proposed to be a cycle track. Read agree with that. With the caveat that the legal definition of cycle track provides for one either with or without pedestrian access. We're assuming that it would be with pedestrian access, but we think that should be clearly stated.

00:04:05:06 - 00:04:33:10

Think that's a big issue. Uh, we have a is not exactly a. Legal status. But again, from previous discussions with the project team, we thought we'd agreed that that would be designed in such a way that it would not preclude equestrian access in the future. Something again, we're keen to emphasize in that. But yeah, we accept that that particular route probably will be designated as a cycle track.

00:04:34:25 - 00:04:43:13

That brings us to 23, the route across from one side of east, one section of Eastern Lane to the other.

00:04:44:15 - 00:04:45:01

Um.

00:04:45:18 - 00:05:02:17

Which is currently a bridleway till you get halfway across, which stops the overbridge and is then a Footway is proposed that the bridleway should be replicated as far as the as far as the bridge. And within still as it does now.

00:05:03:18 - 00:05:04:11

Now.

00:05:04:22 - 00:05:20:15

We don't believe that's right. We believe that's frankly silly thing to do. We know what reasons why the Bridleway stops halfway across the junction. It was to do with a compromise and to do with the evidence that was or wasn't available as to the original intention of that route.

00:05:21:10 - 00:05:21:25

Um.

00:05:22:27 - 00:05:59:04

So we agree with British Law Society and the other members of the consultative group that that should be designated as a bridleway all the way across. That doesn't mean it should be. A an on surface path. It should still be a surface cycle route, but it should have that legal designation of bridleway. This is something, as far as we're concerned, it's always been a bridle way. I would say the official line of Hampshire County Council has decided by its regulatory committee was that the whole of it was a bridleway that was later overturned in the public inquiry.

00:05:59:11 - 00:06:06:24

So we think the logical thing to do there is to designate the whole. Look across as of right away.

00:06:07:07 - 00:06:21:20

Thank you. I would ask Hampshire County Council if they have any comments about that in particular about the the the existing designation, which obviously. You are aware of is responsible for public rights of way.

00:06:44:14 - 00:07:16:15

Philip Millard. Hampshire County Council. Sorry for the delay. That's absolutely fine. Just wanted to clarify our answers and those three questions. Firstly, refer to the new proposed, by the way, to to long walk. Um the countryside services as part of county council are happy and glad to gain the benefit of that new bridleway route sort of linking back round into South Downs National Park on the east side. Um, we are working towards it, seeking it to be designated as a public bridleway so that's equestrian, pedestrian and cycling.

00:07:16:26 - 00:07:48:26

Um, obviously if there is some feedback about it, seeking to be a restricted byway, um, by specification of the actual build is probably very similar, similar widths and similar things. So that is something we as the, you know, um, higher authority in regards to the rights of way network would not be opposed to, obviously that would be a matter of the applicant to propose or bring that forward based on feedback from from you know, other stakeholder groups. Um, but both those options are quite comparable to us.

00:07:49:01 - 00:08:06:21

They may have some different maintenance cost implications, but generally, you know, the rider way is going and that's advancing as a as a good benefit. In regards to question two. I'll defer to to Ben Clifton as that's a bound surface. And so outside of my remit. Thank you.

00:08:10:18 - 00:08:30:14

Yeah. Think this was just a comment about just clarifying that that the the route would have the cycle track would have pedestrian access. Um, it's probably for the applicant just to confirm it, but it's certainly in our discussions we've, we've always seen that as a what we call a shared use path for both pedestrians and cyclists to make use of. So that's very clearly our understanding.

00:08:33:24 - 00:09:05:26

In regards to the third question and the the bridleway within the junction nine, the definitive map, which is our standard of displaying what is a public right of way, does accord to the idea that that Bridleway bridleway Winchester five eight does stop in the middle of that artery. Um, the proposed scheme does pick up with a bound surface sort of cycle footpath to go out to the western side.

00:09:06:09 - 00:09:11:18

Um, obviously defer to the rest of the Hampshire County Council if they wish to make any further comments on that area.

00:09:14:09 - 00:09:23:09

A Joseph Mikula Hampshire County Council. Think at this point that's as far as we can take it, but we're happy to address that. Final question now, written summary.

00:09:25:19 - 00:09:52:05

Thank you very much. I think that would be very helpful. As said and I know I said I'd repeat myself, but as the the authority responsible for public rights away would be very it would be good to have your confirmation of anything that may or may not be said by cycle Winchester as a in support or otherwise. Um. Does the applicant have anything they would like to comment on that, please?

00:09:53:07 - 00:10:19:21

Yes. Katherine Tracy for the applicant. Just to pick up on a on a couple of things. Um, the Bridleway on the eastern side of the M3, um, we, we don't want to have that as a restricted byway. Um, we don't see any need for that for a recreational route that would then facilitate the driving of carriages and horses along that route. Um.

00:10:21:16 - 00:10:52:15

Of which we're just that's not what we are intending to turn it into as a restricted. Restricted by way the cycle track on the western side. It is a cycle track with the right of way on foot and that is already in the in the definition. So hopefully that's that's in the definition of cycle track. So that that hopefully has been addressed. And in relation to the the bridleway stopping in the Giro tree, that that's the applicant's position.

00:10:52:17 - 00:10:58:29

That's historically where it's been and we are replicating status quo rather than changing it.

00:11:02:17 - 00:11:05:08

Thank you very much. Councillor Porter, you had your hand up?

00:11:05:17 - 00:11:45:07

Yes, please. Councillor Porter. And I'm speaking here as a county councillor. I've been the county councillor for this area, including that junction for since two and 2005. And I think you'll find there's extensive correspondence taking place between Cycle Winchester and Hampshire County Council regarding and National highways or Highways England or whatever it happened to be called at the time. Regarding the the stopping of the Bridleway halfway across the junction, the the original road, the A33 and on the A34 used to be a straight line and the Bridleway came to the side of it.

00:11:45:09 - 00:12:15:26

And then people used to take their chance of crossing the road. And once that disappeared, that's when that's why traditionally the bridleway stops in the middle of the of the directory process. A widening of the path was built on the west side of the junction at Easton Lane and fully expecting the cycle path to continue. But because the bridges which were over the top of those routes were slightly low, they could accommodate shorter cyclists but not taller cyclists.

00:12:15:28 - 00:12:56:06

And so therefore it was considered to be unsafe by about 20cm. I think that's my figure. I can't remember the exact figure, but it's a approximately that. So this has been a subject of extensive conversation and bearing in mind that the request for a new junction at Junction nine was set up probably around 2008, 2009, all the way along, it's been said this can't be solved until we get to a new junction. And so the aspiration and expectation was that this would be solved to connect the West and the eastern side at the at the footpath and cycleway that's actually on the western side going down the eastern lane.

00:12:56:09 - 00:13:17:05

There's no reason why it stops in the middle except just history and a lower, slightly lower route, a ceiling to a one of the tunnels on the western side underneath the directory. I don't know if you're going to visit that as part of your tour, but it's it's not obvious when you walk through it, but when you cycle through it, it's a bit low to your head.

00:13:17:07 - 00:13:31:22

We have indeed already been through the. Thank you. Thank you very much. Um, I'll ask the applicant to come back in a moment, but just is there anything further from the South Downs National Park Authority on on the legal status of the proposed, um, amuse?

00:13:34:20 - 00:13:37:02

Kelly Porter from South Park around 30.

00:13:37:04 - 00:14:10:22

I'll only repeat, obviously what said this morning. We've actually requested from the applicant a single document schedule that sets out the minimum widths, the legal statuses of all the routes, because it is actually unclear between the documents and think in some instances there might be some inconsistency. So we just wanted that that clarity, but also to support what cycle Winchester and Councillor Porter has said obviously one of the purposes of the national park is recreation and enjoyment. And one of the key things is we want to get people from Winchester to and from into the national park.

00:14:10:24 - 00:14:20:10

So therefore this is the perfect opportunity to correct a wrong, if I can put it that way, for making sure that is a bridleway across the directory. Thank you.

00:14:22:29 - 00:14:23:28

Thank you. And.

00:14:25:23 - 00:14:27:03

Although subsequent to respond. But

00:14:28:27 - 00:14:46:16

correct me if I'm wrong, the comment that you gave earlier is you're replicating what's already there. Is there practical reasons why the the requests that have been made can't be undertaken? If you'd like to answer that and then wrap up any of the other points that have been made, please. Thank you.

00:14:53:07 - 00:15:09:23

Mr.. Filling them in on behalf of the applicant. We would need higher parapets on the bridge. The horses are new compared with cyclists, and the subways would need mounting blocks. To dismount horses either side of the underpass.

00:15:11:20 - 00:15:14:06

Not quite sure where the bridleway would end.

00:15:21:05 - 00:15:32:06

So. So the horses would have to go over the bridge around the ramp, circular ramp under the subway and then ask him stops. What would happen at that point?

00:15:33:03 - 00:15:33:28

Okay. Thank you.

00:15:40:21 - 00:15:41:18

I'm sure.

00:15:52:15 - 00:15:55:26

So I'm seeing some whisperings. I just didn't know whether you were going to come back on with anything else.

00:16:00:12 - 00:16:25:08

Catherine Tracy for the applicant, it's only it's a it's a point of practicality really in terms of where does the bridleway end. If you take it through the directory and depending on what you do, I'm being informed that. The horses may well need somewhere then to turn around to go back under the tree if you stop it. The other side of the tree. Or we send them off down Eastern Lane to Winchester.

00:16:27:03 - 00:16:48:00

But at that point they would be on the highway network riding a horse on the public highway as they're perfectly entitled to do. So it's a it's a point of practicality just in terms of where there's nothing recreational on the. Western side. That's the Tesco's and the winning industrial estate.

00:16:48:18 - 00:16:53:15

Thank you. We'll bring Councillor Porter back in very briefly if you've got a subsequent question.

00:16:53:17 - 00:17:02:26

I think the point is at the moment that we define it as a bridleway on one side and a footpath on the other side. I take the point, but nevertheless

00:17:04:25 - 00:17:35:23

horse riders are considered part of the Non-motorised users, but nevertheless at the moment it isn't actually a legal cycleway either. And bearing in mind the point we've made exactly about the national park and the ability to work in winter area without the need of using a car, which thus reduces the amount of congestion on that junction. We should be at least enabling bicycles and cyclists to use that junction legally, which at the moment they're doing having to do illegally.

00:17:37:04 - 00:17:56:21

Thank you. Any final comments? Yeah. And I'm sure that this will be part of the statement of common Ground with Hampshire County Council as well as the authority for public right of way. So, um, so before I go, Mr. Key, is this continue about the legal status, because we all do have other questions and I know you'll be contributing to other questions very quickly.

00:17:57:27 - 00:18:17:01

Andy Cycle Winchester Just to clarify, there's, I think there's agreement that that will certainly be a legal cycle route. At the end of all this, just to be clear about that, nobody's saying it will continue to be a footpath. The debate is more about whether equestrian access will be legal across that bit.

00:18:19:05 - 00:18:34:16

Thank you for that clarity. That's really useful all around. Um, so, um. Thank you for that. I believe that's all my questions about the legal status. I think we've covered that. Quite conclusively for now. Um.

00:18:37:07 - 00:18:56:21

Can I just. Can I just double check with Hampshire County Council in particular, whether out with the cycling provision and the Bridleway provision, we've talked about whether there are any other public rights of way which you feel haven't been looked at or addressed in a sufficient way.

00:19:07:22 - 00:19:14:23

Philip miller, Counsel. Um. In regards to that, it's predominantly to do with design standards which moves on to following questions.

00:19:15:05 - 00:19:27:03

Okay. Thank you very much. And the same question to the South Downs National Park Authority, please. Just to clarification of whether any other public rights of way, in your view, um, have not been considered sufficiently.

00:19:33:21 - 00:19:36:00

Um, turn it grant for the.

00:19:36:02 - 00:19:56:28

For the National Park Authority endeavoring not to go over old ground either from one or this morning. Um, you understand we have some concerns outstanding about the enhancements on biological planting type enhancements on on some of the public right of way, but don't understand that to be what you're asking about now. It's not it's more about things in public.

00:19:57:11 - 00:19:59:17

But yes and no further issues then?

00:19:59:19 - 00:20:07:22

No further issues on that. The only other point is we still request that we'd be consulted on any final diversions and stuff. But again, I think that's pretty tangential to what you're asking now.

00:20:07:24 - 00:20:08:21

So think so.

00:20:08:23 - 00:20:09:09

I'll leave that here.

00:20:09:11 - 00:20:40:24

Thank you very much. Um, so I'd like to just move on to design standards now. Um, so my first question is again, probably covered slightly in the statement of Common ground we received yesterday. In the recent representation cycle, Winchester has stated that it was felt that some parts of the proposed routes are suboptimal in their design within within distance on the shared use rather than segregated paths and built to minimum allowable dimensions under DMB.

00:20:41:06 - 00:21:12:28

They stated they'd also prefer to see the adoption of local traffic. Note 120. Um, Hampshire County Council also referenced local traffic note 120 in relation to effective widths and South Downs National Park also reference widths in the their local impact report. Um, can I have an update from Winchester and also Hampshire County Council and South Mountain National Park Authority about whether there are still remaining concerns about the design adopted.

00:21:13:00 - 00:21:13:15

Please.

00:21:16:15 - 00:21:27:18

Antiques. Antique Cycle. Winchester. Um. Yes, we still have concerns. That is a continuing discussion. Um.

00:21:29:27 - 00:22:02:00

National highways are technically correct in that they they conform to CD 143 120 is not binding on them. It's a manual for local authorities. We're keen on it because 120 goes into rather more depth about the rationale behind the design principles and how to apply them. Um, and we feel that in this case, let's say the project team is being very pessimistic about the growth in traffic, particularly along that main, um, 23 route.

00:22:02:20 - 00:22:09:24

I think it's, it's states elsewhere in the, um, in the environment statement that it doesn't expect.

00:22:10:21 - 00:22:11:06

Um.

00:22:11:17 - 00:22:51:00

Significance. Increase in the number of active travel journeys, for instance, as a result of these improvements. And then some. It talks about some moderate increase in recreational use. We think certainly when you take into account the new aam out to kings worthy which also comes through the same. Junction. We think there is substantial potential for increasing usage. We think there's substantial potential for increasing recreational usage. The best figures we can get on, as mentioned earlier, the 347 suggest that it has three times as much cycle traffic as the national cycle route path.

00:22:51:08 - 00:23:22:16

So we think it would be reasonable to hope for more. That also comes back to your earlier discussion about modelling and about figures. We don't seem to have any reliable figures for how much cycle traffic there is through that junction at the moment or how much that could be increased by if it were more cyclist friendly. All those factors combined suggest there could be a substantial increase in cycle traffic and that the team should be designing for that.

00:23:22:18 - 00:23:27:27

They should be designing for success and assuming that once they've done this, it will have a measurable effect.

00:23:28:24 - 00:23:29:09

Um.

00:23:29:28 - 00:23:46:15

And instead what we get repeatedly is going for the absolute minimum, whether it's um, 120 or 143, they're going for the absolute minimum width and minimum dimensions for a path going for a shared use path.

00:23:47:08 - 00:23:47:23

Um.

00:23:48:16 - 00:24:05:21

And yeah, don't think the same is true of the design work that they're doing for the highways themselves in this new program. It's only the non-motorized use elements. They're getting pared down to the absolute minimum as a starting point. And we don't think that's appropriate.

00:24:07:12 - 00:24:21:04

Thank you very much. I will ask Hampshire County Council if they will comment because I don't think design whips are purely an issue for yesterday's submission of this statement of common ground and whether you've had similar discussions with the applicants.

00:24:23:00 - 00:25:06:22

Excuse me. Ben Clifton. Hampshire County Council. That's right. This was discussed with the applicant, um, some time ago in terms of the design of that shared use path. And we, we are satisfied with the proposed nature of that path, which is a which is a three meter wide path with cycle and pedestrian access rights. Um, so, so we're not, when we're not seeking any additional changes to that, that route, we note that it's, it's segregated in terms of as away from the main the main traffic carriageways providing subway bridge crossings and controlled um signalized crossing as appropriate.

00:25:06:24 - 00:25:15:03

And we, we consider that that's a um, a satisfactory level of provision for cyclists and pedestrians through the scheme.

00:25:17:02 - 00:25:42:04

Thank you. Um, does. Forgive me for not reading the Winchester, um, traffic policy? Completely. Is cycling, uh, increase covered in in the movement strategy? And is there anything in there which gives any indication to support or otherwise what Mr. Key is saying in terms of cycle growth?

00:25:43:18 - 00:25:59:26

Ben Clifton Hampshire County Council It's probably a matter I'm very happy to come back over the next hearing next week or in written representations other than to say that the movement strategy itself will have one of its key objectives to to increase

00:26:01:12 - 00:26:06:24

increased provision for walking and cycling and to encourage the uptake of of walking and cycling. But I'm very happy to.

00:26:07:11 - 00:26:08:22

See if we can have that.

00:26:10:22 - 00:26:20:03

Give you a heads up for a reply next week. That would be really useful. Thank you very much. If I could ask the applicant to respond in terms of the points that have been made about design, which please.

00:26:24:06 - 00:26:54:15

All right, Mr. Billingham, on behalf of the applicant. Talk about uses of the proposed route and in terms of standards. These standards take up to 200 uses an hour. It's what the design codes allow for on a route that currently. The prediction is very hard to predict, but 200 users now is a very high number of people travelling through that route. Any peak, any time within an hour, it's not linked to a school.

00:26:54:27 - 00:27:10:27

School doesn't kick out at the same time. There's no cinema that will kick out at the same time. So, you know, it's just commute. So recreational use and 200 users an hour is deemed that suitable for the design that we've carried out.

00:27:12:03 - 00:27:13:00

Thank you very much,

00:27:14:18 - 00:27:15:09

Mr. Garg.

00:27:17:08 - 00:27:48:09

Phil Winchester action against the climate crisis could suggest. Suggest that. Uh, you also ask for some comments from Hampshire County Council about what is proposed under four because think that is more likely to be the policy that would apply here rather than the Winchester movement strategy, which generally is stranded on the one way system around Winchester Town Centre.

00:27:50:15 - 00:27:56:11

Thank you very much. We'll keep that in mind for next week. Thank you. Um, Mr. Grant, uh.

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

Thank you. So purely.

00:27:59:15 - 00:28:31:12

Coming on this. We welcome the applicants commitment to certain wits and those that are found in 120. If given a choice between looking at 120 and other lower standards, whilst we also the National Park Authority, completely understands the concern of the applicant about number of uses per hour, um, promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the national park is one of the key statutory objectives. We're concerned with increasing access to the national park.

00:28:31:14 - 00:28:38:00

So and of course you've got your general policy test of what they've got to do is exceptional. So if you've got a choice, go high.

00:28:40:02 - 00:29:16:09

Thank you very much. It's a lovely segue to one of my next questions, which is which is about the benefit, you know, the perceived benefits to the national park from the strategy that we have, because you clearly state this far better than I can about the you know, about the responsibilities of the national park and access to it. Do you feel that all opportunities, all reasonable opportunities to improve access to the national park, which is obviously one of your main aims under legislation, has been seen and considered regarding news?

00:29:22:28 - 00:29:53:29

Thank you. Kelly Porter from the South Bend National Park. Um, suppose. Suppose we put simply. No, it doesn't go far enough. I mean, obviously we welcome and we've been heavily involved in getting the new route on the eastern side, and we very much welcome that. But don't think enough is, as we've said in our local impact report and written rep. Don't think enough has been done on other aspects and potentially other enhancements to other routes. And we've already touched upon the Carlton Horses Junction, for example.

00:29:54:01 - 00:29:59:07

We would want to see pedestrian and cycle improvement links around there as well. Thank you.

00:29:59:27 - 00:30:29:08

Thank you. Um, just the final question on this to the applicant, really. Um. Is there a is there an enhancement strategy that you are undertaking at all in terms of access to the national park or um, uh, or are you, um, you know, is the limits of what we're seeing at the moment where you're, you're, you're expecting to end up with detailed design or are you installing in, in further discussions?

00:30:32:00 - 00:31:02:03

I'm Katherine Tracy on behalf of the applicant. And I think what you're seeing in the application is what is being offered. The Bridleway was included in the scheme at the request of South Downs National Park. The alignment of it has been discussed with them and amended as a direct result of consultation with them. Um, there's nothing further I believe that we're offering, um, specifically in terms of public rights of way users.

00:31:03:14 - 00:31:08:01

Thank you very much. Okay, So, um.

00:31:11:00 - 00:31:41:20

Just wanted to cover a few issues about future maintenance and um, really just a question to. Uh, for Hampshire County Council. In their local impact report, they request a public right of way management plan. And in doing and and with this, this might actually cover the next few points as well. Um, can Hampshire County Council explain what they would like to see in a public right away management plan and if they consider this will be sufficient to cover the areas that we've discussed and the and future maintenance issues.

00:31:43:09 - 00:32:23:06

Philip Millard, Hampshire County Council. As a starter, I'd just like to say Countryside services regards to the rights of way would support South Downs idea of a single document to define the public rights of way and I suppose the active travel part of the scheme that would make it a lot easier to engage with the public and to address stakeholders interests. And that, I suppose, forms the first part of a sort of management plan for that right away network because we can, you know, see what's proposed and how it develops. Um, another factor of this is related to the, uh, the working relationship of the rights of Way network with the construction during the construction phases.

00:32:23:08 - 00:32:54:02

So it's nice and clear for ourselves as the definitive map authority as well as the public users, what available routes are when they're due to be temporarily closed, when they're likely to open, you know, to give people the ability to to plan, plan journeys and to enjoy the routes. Um, further to that going forward, to have an understanding of when new parts will effectively come and be open.

00:32:54:04 - 00:33:24:12

So for example, the new proposed bridleway having a good understanding of when that's likely to be completed and able to be open for, for dedication as of right away. Um, so we can engage with the public there. Um, the, the other contact points with the right of way network relates to connection elements. So for example, along the part of the old existing a34 that's going to become the cycleway route. There's a number of points where it connects to existing footpaths.

00:33:24:14 - 00:34:06:06

So that's another area where we'd look at having some inclusion in that, that management document about saying this is the specification we're going to use here and these are the gradients. So we have a tool that we can understand that our design standards for public rights of way are going to be used and upheld. And I suppose we've established a good working relationship, how we sort of can engage on site to be able to do things such as, you know, I suppose complete, you know, except completion of certain parts or except taking over of the maintenance of them as well as moving on to things such as commuted sums and other mitigation and.

00:34:07:20 - 00:34:14:11

Thank you. Um, has the applicant got any comment on the the the prospects of a public management plan?

00:34:21:24 - 00:34:52:19

Katherine Tracy on behalf of the applicant, there will be a public rights of way management plan as part of the traffic management plan for construction. So that will clearly set out what. What will be closed and how it will be publicized and what alternative routes will be. And that's a document that will be consulted on. Um, through the fire, I believe it's controlled, um, in terms of the more granular level of detail of what comes forward when that is very much a question for detailed design.

00:34:52:21 - 00:35:00:23

And, and we're just not in a position to provide that level of detail at this stage, but it would come through as detailed design bullet milled.

00:35:01:07 - 00:35:09:15

So that's fine. Said If it's incorporated as a chapter, as part of the whole strategy, that just shows, you know, integrated design considerations.

00:35:10:14 - 00:35:18:12

It's sure, we might see something in the emerging segment of common ground, possibly soon to confirm that those discussions are concluding.

00:35:20:16 - 00:35:22:00

Okay. Thank you very much. So.

00:35:24:02 - 00:35:47:00

Is there any other remaining concerns about future maintenance, responsibility and cost? I know you've just mentioned about commuter times and other other things which will be happening in the background. Um, just ask Hampshire County Council first, Mister Key, and then I'll come to you. Any any residual. Concerns or comments about future maintenance responsibility or are you happy that's being.

00:35:49:13 - 00:35:51:17

Included in other discussions.

00:35:53:02 - 00:35:57:10

Ben Clifton, Hampshire County Council. Yes, we're satisfied that's included in the other discussions.

00:35:57:21 - 00:36:00:00

Many thanks. Mr.. You had your hand up.

00:36:01:20 - 00:36:32:04

And Akasaka. Winchester. Um. Yeah. Think our main concern is understanding who's going to be responsible for what. Which obviously is a matter for National Highways and Hampshire County Council to settle. But to ensure that the standard of maintenance is appropriate for the route, which means that those active travel cycle routes should be maintained to highway standards, not to public health standards, if I can put it that way. So that has implications for who's responsible for that.

00:36:32:25 - 00:36:34:03

It's important to get that right.

00:36:34:21 - 00:36:52:22

Thank you very much. And I'm sure you have dialogue with Hampshire County Council as well. So I'm sure those things will be covered in in your discussions as well as with with the applicant. Thank you very much. Um, and any residual comments from Winchester City Council or South Downs National Park Authority about future maintenance?

00:36:55:06 - 00:36:58:18

But no thank you. Said nothing from Winchester City Council. Thank you.

00:37:00:01 - 00:37:01:04

North from the south down to.

00:37:01:09 - 00:37:38:20

Thank you very much. So the last thing I'm going to cover is about the construction impact. We've already had a couple of references to this already. Um, so we've Winchester, Winchester Cycle, Winchester in their written representation and South Downs National Park Authority in their local impact report, commented on the issue of proposed diversion routes for the Muse and about the potential issue with legality and physical impossibility of the proposed routes. Um, have those discussions continued and concluded to any level of satisfaction? Um will take Mister Key first.

00:37:38:22 - 00:37:39:08

Thank you.

00:37:41:20 - 00:38:14:17

Yes, to the extent that it appears that in different places in the documents submitted, there were different proposals for cycle route diversions. We were looking at one set. They were referring to another set. I understand that there will be an update that will make that more consistent and that involves proposals that that diversion cycle route will effectively be on road. Yeah, that removes the issue over impossible and illegal diversion routes.

00:38:15:14 - 00:38:46:29

Whether those are suitable for diversion routes is another matter we won't go into. But yeah, it means we are looking at road diversion routes. You're aware that we tentatively suggested two obvious options on that. I think the proposal at the moment is to use the Orford road route and we do have some serious concerns about that. We don't think it's appropriate as a national cycle network diversion certainly doesn't meet Sustrans design guidelines, Guardians of the National Cycle Network.

00:38:47:08 - 00:39:11:17

So we think there's a lot more discussion to be had there. And what we're really looking for is a proper dialogue about that. It's something we say we mean walking Cycling and horse riding consultative group have been asking for for some time is to sit down and have a serious discussion about the pros and cons of those two diversion options and what could be done to mitigate the problems those would cause.

00:39:12:23 - 00:39:13:09

Okay.

00:39:15:04 - 00:39:17:27

Thank you very much. Can I ask the applicant to respond?

00:39:18:13 - 00:39:49:04

Katherine Tracy for the applicant. Just to clarify, the inconsistencies arisen between chapter two and Chapter 12 of the environmental statement. Chapter two clearly sets out where the diversions for and it's because pedestrians go right and cyclists go left. Um, however, chapter 12 I don't think is as clear as it could be. So we're going and suggest that they all go right. Um, so we'll, we'll update that. But the assessment was carried out actually on the basis that they went right and left.

00:39:49:06 - 00:40:17:29

So, um, so they, the assessment is correct, but the expression in chapter 12 isn't clear. So we will be updating that for Hope deadline for actually, um, because that's something that's been picked up. Um. And in terms of the alternative routes. Actually, we've had correspondence with Sustrans who support the diversion route, um, along Aylesford Road. Um.

00:40:19:20 - 00:40:39:07

And just on a practical level, that there are. Very limited, almost no alternative options, um, other than taking people off. The route much earlier and offering a significantly longer diversionary route.

00:40:41:04 - 00:40:42:08

Thank you very much. And.

00:40:43:25 - 00:40:50:11

Hampshire County Council. Do you have anything further to add in terms of the diversions of those public rights of way and amuse?

00:40:52:16 - 00:41:18:21

In regard to the public rights of way. Philip Millard Council. We acknowledge the applicant highlighting the challenges of, I suppose, convenient diversion routes. It's quite a substantial piece of structure, the M3 and its cuttings. Um, our approach very much. We want to ensure that use of the right way network are informed about what the routes are and they're safe along along the the journey on them.

00:41:20:17 - 00:41:38:25

Thank you. Um, and a similar question for Winchester City Council and South Downs National Park Authority in terms of um, the diversion of routes and construction impact that whether you have any remaining concerns or whether you're comfortable that it's been covered by the comments we've already had.

00:41:42:21 - 00:41:47:28

Well, after chatting, I'd ask her. No, it's all right, Councillor Porter. I'd go to.

00:41:48:00 - 00:42:03:25

Her. I'm just going to say, think. The City Council are very supportive of Winchester's aims and reflect the comments that have been made by Psycho Winchester. We do understand that they are the experts because they're the ones that cycle all the time. Thank you.

00:42:07:17 - 00:42:25:18

Thank you. Kelly Porter from National Park Authority. No, the only additional point I want to raise is obviously linked to our discussions during the first hearing about the location of the construction compound and eastern lane and the potential conflicts with construction traffics and users of that lane.

00:42:26:06 - 00:42:27:17

Okay. Thank you very much.

00:42:29:18 - 00:42:35:28

Which I think we covered, we did cover last time. So thank you for reiterating, but won't ask the applicant to respond unless they really would like to.

00:42:38:13 - 00:42:54:12

It's okay. No, that's fine. It was just a comment about. About the construction compound and the impact on the news. But think we have suggested we covered that last week. And unless you had anything particularly you wanted to mention, um. Regarding those two things.

00:42:57:02 - 00:43:12:08

Mr. Feeling on behalf of the applicant. So the site compound is closed. The week 23 we closed because we'd be building the bridges and therefore you won't have cyclists going past that element of the site compound.

00:43:13:00 - 00:43:13:18

Thank you.

00:43:15:25 - 00:43:53:22

Okay. I've just wanted to just wonder. We talked about the usage points and I didn't close that off completely to to my satisfaction. We talked about the the surveys and the 2016 surveys being what was being used in the 200 per hour. I just wanted to close out with Hampshire County Council. Whether you're you feel that the additional usage surveys would be useful or whether you concur with what the applicant is saying in terms of the understanding we have at the moment is sufficient for for the application.

00:43:56:03 - 00:44:10:00

So Ben Clifton. Hampshire County Council. Yes. Think would reflect that. Our position is that we're satisfied with the assessment that's been undertaken. So we're not specifically looking for any additional survey work at this point.

00:44:10:12 - 00:44:11:07

Thank you very much.

00:44:18:09 - 00:45:04:00

So my very last question for today, I think has been covered already, but will nevertheless make sure. Um, it's just concluded. Most of the local impact reports in a number of the written representations highlight the need for good communication, in particular with public rights of way during construction and advanced information about public rights of way and route closures. Can I just get a secondary confirmation from Hampshire Council Council that this is something that you are going to be in communication with, with the applicants and all the things that have been mentioned in terms of good advance communication for use will be part of what you're looking to secure within your agreements with the applicant, please.

00:45:04:26 - 00:45:32:24

Philip Miller Hampshire County Council Agreed. Yeah. Wish to communicate well in regards to the Public Rights of Way network. We have a team that's based around the definitive map review team who managed the sort of temporary closures and that they required legislation procedures and we have our access countryside management who do the practical side of things that will sort of do the site things. And so we will engage fully to protect, enhance and ensure the safety of the public.

00:45:33:08 - 00:45:36:13

Thank you. And the applicant, they support that.

00:45:37:12 - 00:45:42:00

Catherine Treacy For the applicant, we do indeed. It's something that we're in keen to ensure.

00:45:42:17 - 00:46:14:26

Thank you very much. Think as that is my last question for today, I will just ask again Hampshire County Council to review the the latest submission of the statement of common ground with Winchester and the applicant and and take some time to respond to that as it's your legal um position for public rights of way. That would be something we would be looking for you to respond on. Um, but I would just ask my colleague, Mr. Mackay, if there's any further points or questions for today.

00:46:15:11 - 00:46:16:15

No, thank you.

00:46:18:20 - 00:46:47:10

In which case, um. Thank you very much. I will with no other matters for today. I will adjourn the hearing. We will continue tomorrow with the next issues which we have listed on the agenda. Thank you very much for your participation today and we will see some of you tomorrow and those of you who won't see tomorrow. Thank you very much and have a good evening. Thank you.