

6. Climate Change and Resilience

Q6.2.3	Carbon Plan(s) Winchester City Council, Hampshire County Council, South Downs National Park Authority	Please comment on the applicants proposed 'Carbon Budget Delivery Plan' shown in their response to Deadline 4, in Appendix A of the Applicant Comments on Deadline 3 submissions [REP4-037].
--------	---	--

Hampshire County Council has no comments to make on the Carbon Delivery Budget Plan which has been produced to provide the contextualisation of the forecast carbon outputs of the scheme against the UK carbon budget.

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

9. Draft Development Consent Order		
Q9.2.2	Article 3 – Disapplication of legislative provisions Hampshire County Council	<p>In response to ExA Q 9.1.9 [REP2-066], HCC indicated that it did not consider that s.23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 should be disappplied. HCC’s ISH2 post hearing submissions [REP4-044] confirm that it does not consent to such disapplication and instead considers that the HCC consent scheme should remain in place to govern any interference with watercourses required under the DCO. The Applicant written summaries of oral case for Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) [REP4-035] states that it has agreed with HCC that it will no longer seek to disapply s.23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991, and this change will be reflected in the next iteration of the draft DCO (Rev 3) to be submitted at Deadline 5.</p> <p>(i) Please confirm that the HCC concerns in relation to this article have now been resolved and that no further changes to Article 3 or Protective Provisions are sought in this respect.</p>
<p>The Applicant has confirmed that it will not seek to disapply s.23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991, and the County Council can confirm that its concerns in relation to this article have now been resolved. No further changes or Protective Provisions are sought.</p>		
Q9.2.5	Article 8 - Limits of deviation (LoD) Hampshire County Council	<p>In response to ExQ 9.1.14 [REP2-067], HCC indicated that whilst the principle was accepted, the LoD from points E to F as shown on Works Plan Sheet 3 only provide for 0.5m vertical deviation. HCC requested that this is kept under review pending agreement on the Cart and Horses junction which would tie-in to this section of the works. This matter was discussed at ISH2 and HCC in its post hearing submissions [REP4-044] requests that this is kept under review pending agreement on the Cart and Horses junction which would tie-in to this section of the works. Please provide an update on any progress in discussions with the Applicant on this topic. If this matter is not agreed by Deadline 5, please provide an alternative drafting of LoD for the draft DCO in this location</p>
<p>There has not been an update on progress following the representations made at ISH 2 and in post hearing representations. Whilst the County Council maintains its position on the need for mitigation at the Cart and Horses junction, and that this would need to tie into the works set out on Works Plan Sheet 3, the County Council does recognise that mitigation may be agreed outside of the DCO and that the works as showing on Works Plan Sheet 3 would therefore be generally acceptable as a tie in with the existing junction layout. However, the County Council has questioned the layout of the access to the private business park and the junction arrangement with the A33 (Work No 1(d) and Work No 1 (e)) which may require amendment beyond the limits set in the LoD. The County Council therefore requests that this item is kept open to allow further discussion with the applicant on this point.</p>		

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

Q9.2.7	Part 3 Streets Article 11 Street Works, Article 12 Power to alter layout etc of streets, Article 14 Construction and maintenance of new, altered or diverted streets and other structures, Article 15 Classification of Roads, Article 16 – Temporary Stopping up and restriction of use of streets The Applicant, Hampshire County Council	The HCC LIR [REP2-066] raised various concerns and suggested amendments in relation to the draft DCO [REP3-005] Part 3 Streets articles. These matters were also discussed at ISH2. The parties hoped that these matters would be resolved through negotiation and that an update to the Examination would be provided at Deadline 5. The Applicant written summaries of oral case for ISH2 [REP4-035] confirms that to be the case. However, if matters remain unresolved by Deadline 5, please provide full and detailed reasoning either in support of the articles as drafted or in support of changes sought to the draft DCO together including any related draft requirements.
--------	--	---

Hampshire County Council have now received a draft 'side agreement' from the Applicant, the purpose of which is to address the issues that the County Council have raised in regard to these Articles including the role of the County Council in safeguarding its interests in terms of resourcing and agreeing to the detailed proposals.

The County Council is currently considering the terms of the side agreement and will be negotiating the terms with the Applicant. Provided that the terms of the same can be agreed and the document completed then the County Council will not require its proposed amendments to the draft DCO.

However whilst the intention is that the above matters will be dealt with under the side agreement and this is now in progress, as of Deadline 5 the matters referred to ExaQ 9.2.7 are subject to concluding agreed drafting of the side agreement.

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

Q9.2.8	Part 5 Powers of Acquisition Article 28 Public rights of way The Applicant, Hampshire County Council	This article is referred to in HCC LIR 10.23 [REP2-066] which states that in order to administer its responsibility in respect of any extinguishment under the draft DCO it requires notice of any extinguishment and proposes a new Article 28(4). The Applicant has responded to this in comments on HCC LIR at Deadline 3 [REP3-023] and propose an amendment to allow for giving 28 days' notice of extinguishment of a right of way to the local Highway Authority. This matter was discussed at ISH2 and the HCC post hearing submissions [REP4-044] confirms that it is content with the amended article except that it requests 42 days (6 weeks) notice rather than the 28 days' notice proposed by the Applicant's amendment. Please indicate whether this matter has been resolved through negotiation and if not, please provide full justification for either the retention of the 28 day notice period in the case of the Applicant or the 42 day notice period proposed by HCC.
<p>The County Council requires a 42-day notice period to ensure that there is sufficient time to administer and prepare the public notices that are required. A 28 day notice period is equal to the 28 day statutory public notice period, and therefore would not allow the County Council to properly administer this process. The County Council is concerned that this could lead to issues around the statutory notice period itself and possible complaints from the public.</p>		
Q9.2.11	Part 6 Operations Article 39 - Felling and Lopping of trees The Applicant, Hampshire County Council	HCC's LIR [REP2-066] raises concerns in relation to this Article to the effect that it would require compensation for any highway trees that are removed pursuant to the authorised development and would seek appropriate terms in this Article. The Applicant's comments on HCC LIR [REP3-023] indicate that it does not consider that compensation in accordance with a CAVAT valuation is appropriate. This matter was discussed at ISH2. The Applicant's written summaries of oral case for ISH2 [REP4-035] confirms that the proposed disapplication of section 58 of New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 is required to be disapplied to allow the Applicant to go back onto the highway during the relevant maintenance period Hampshire County Council : Please indicate whether your objection to this article is maintained and provide and justify any alternative drafting amendments that are sought Applicant : Please provide an update in relation to your position in relation to this article and indicate whether it is agreed that the drafting should include provision for the payment of compensation

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

The County Council and the applicant have discussed the removal of highway trees following the hearings. It can be confirmed that the applicant has identified the highway trees to be removed and that replacement planting will be provided. The County Council is satisfied with this approach in relation to this scheme and will not be seeking compensation for the loss of highway trees.

In relation to the disapplication of Section 58 of New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (Article 11), the County Council is satisfied with the Applicant's clarification regarding the circumstances for disapplying Section 58, namely to enable the Applicant to go back onto the highway during the relevant maintenance period. The County Council is therefore not maintaining an objection this Article.

Q9.2.20	Requirement 12 – Detailed Design The Applicant, Hampshire County Council	The HCC LIR at 10.25 [REP2-066] suggests an additional sub-paragraph to Requirement 12(2) to avoid negative impact on HCC's responsibility as local highway authority. HCC's post Hearing submissions [REP4-044] indicates that it is confident that this issue can be resolved with an update provided to the ExA at Deadline 5. The Applicant's written summaries of oral case for ISH2 [REP4-035] confirms that its position is unchanged from its Deadline 3 comments. If this matter is not agreed by Deadline 5, please provide further justification for the need for or rejection of this addition, including a consideration of the practical consequences for HCC of a failure to include it given its responsibilities for long term maintenance for those parts of the authorised development that are on highway (other than trunk road or special road).
The County Council appreciates that it must be consulted on the detailed design in order for the Applicant to seek approval from the Secretary of State. The Applicant has satisfied the County Council that its comments will be given significant weight, to be secured through a separate side agreement, in this process and subject to completion of the side agreement, the County Council can confirm that it will no longer require any additional requirements.		

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

Q9.2.21	Requirement 13 – Surface Water Drainage The Applicant, Hampshire County Council	HCC LIR at 10.25 [REP2-066] expresses concern that the requirement as drafted does not provide sufficient clarity in terms of what constitute an acceptable level of detail for the surface water drainage system and seeks an amendment to the Requirement 13 (1) and (3) and new sub-paragraph (2). This matter was discussed at ISH2 and HCC post hearing submissions [REP4-044] indicate that HCC is confident that this issue can be resolved with an update provided to the ExA at Deadline 5. If this matter is not agreed by Deadline 5, please provide further justification for the need for these amendments or the reasons for opposing them, including consideration of the practical consequences for HCC of a failure to include them.
<p>The Applicant’s submitted drainage strategy (included as an appendix to Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement referenced in the requirement) is reliant on infiltration rates which have not been substantiated through detailed infiltration testing. This testing has been undertaken recently but has not been submitted to the County Council. In a recent meeting with the Applicant’s consultant, the Applicant has indicated that the rates found through the testing are different in some areas to that within the design which will require amendments. Options have been discussed and depending on the detail submitted there is potential for changes to the design such that it may not be possible to deliver it in accordance with the submitted documentation. At present, the requested additional wording would be required but if the testing and updates to the calculations and drawings are submitted and agreed through the examination process then the previously submitted wording would be acceptable.</p> <p>Therefore, at present the County Council would retain its position on this amendment to the requirement but feel confident that with the provision of the additional information prior to deadline 6 and any updates to the design included, the original wording would be retained.</p>		
Q9.2.22	Requirement 14(1) – Noise Mitigation The Applicant, Hampshire County Council	Please confirm that this amendment is agreed and will be actioned in the next revision of the Draft DCO? If not please provide additional supporting reasons to support the rejection of the suggested amendment. SDNPA: The SoCG between the Applicant and WCC [REP4-030] sets out the proposed changes to accommodate the concerns as follows: “14.—(1) <i>No part of the authorised development is to commence until written details of proposed noise mitigation in respect of the use and operation of that part of the authorised development, including low noise surfacing, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation with Winchester City Council, and if required, any additional relevant planning authority.</i> ” Please provide any specific further drafting changes that you seek.

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

The County Council would request that the drafting is changed as follows“*14.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until written details of proposed noise mitigation in respect of the use and operation of that part of the authorised development, including low noise surfacing, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation with Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council as the local highway authority in respect of low noise surfacing , and if required, any additional relevant planning authority.*”

Please see response to Question 13.2.2. for additional information on the County Council’s position with regard to low noise surfacing.

Q9.2.25	Additional Requirements The Applicant, Hampshire County Council	At ISH2, the draft requirement proposed by HCC LIR 10.11 [REP2-066] to secure the provision of a Local Highway Legal Agreement to govern the performance and transfer of maintenance responsibility of the Local Highway Works. HCC post hearing submissions [REP4-044] indicates that HCC is confident that this issue can be resolved with an update provided to the ExA at Deadline 5. The Applicant’s written summaries of oral case for ISH2 [REP4-035] confirms that they were still in discussion with HCC as to the prospect and need of a separate legal agreement. If this matter is not agreed by Deadline 5, please ensure that the update provided sets out full and detailed justification either for the need for this addition to secure the provision of a Local Highway Legal Agreement or, in the case of the Applicant, its rejection.
<p>The County Council and the Applicant have met to discuss and agreed high level principles for the governance arrangements regarding the performance and transfer of maintenance responsibilities. The Applicant has prepared a draft side agreement and forwarded this to the County Council. The County Council is reviewing the terms of this and will be negotiating the same with the Applicant. Provided that the terms of the side agreement can be agreed and the document completed then the County Council will not require its proposed amendments to the draft DCO.</p>		

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

Q9.2.27	Section 106 Planning Obligations and any Other Agreements The Applicant, Hampshire County Council, South Downs National Park Authority	<p>The prospect of s.106 Planning Obligations or other agreements to secure mitigation measures and other matters was discussed at ISH2. The SDNPA post hearing submission [REP4-047] lists a number of projects which they submit could go some way to further mitigate or ameliorate the harm that will arise from the Proposed Development. The Applicant's written summaries of oral case for ISH2 [REP4035] confirms its position that no s.106 obligation is required to secure payment for further contribution measures proposed by the SDNPA as it does not consider there is further harm which requires mitigation.</p> <p>SDNPA: Please set out in full your position in relation to any harm to the SDNP that would require mitigation. Please confirm that the provision of this funding would overcome your concerns in relation to any adverse impact upon the SDNP to the extent that your objection could be withdrawn? If not, for the avoidance of doubt, please list any other measures that would be required to enable you to achieve that position?</p> <p>HCC/Applicant: The HCC post hearing submissions [REP4-044] confirms that it has forwarded heads of terms in respect of the legal agreements and s.106 planning obligations that are being sought to the Applicant and that it is confident that this issue can be resolved. The Applicant's written summaries of oral case for ISH2 [REP4-035] confirms its position that no section 106 is required to secure payment for commuted sums for HCC taking possession of highway as this can be discussed in more detail in relevant side agreements. Please provide an update on this matter by Deadline 5. If this matter has not been resolved by then, please provide further justification either for the need for a s.106 obligation, or why such provision is not regarded as being necessary.</p>
<p>In regard to securing payment of commuted sums for the County Council taking possession of new highway and highway assets into the County Council's network, the County Council is satisfied with the proposed approach of dealing with payment of commuted sums through a side agreement.</p> <p>The County Council does maintain that a S106 agreement would be necessary to secure mitigation at the Cart and Horses junction. As per the County Council submission [LIR, exq1, and oral submission at ISH2] if improvements to the Cart and Horses junction are not included within the DCO project, then the DCO will have a negative impact on the safety of traffic using the Cart and Horses junction.</p>		

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

10. Flood Risk, Groundwater and Surface Water		
Q10.2.1	Infiltration Rates Hampshire County Council	In paragraph 8.6 of their LIR [REP2-066] and in response to ExQ Q10.1.2 [REP2-067], HCC as Lead Local Flood Authority state that they require details to ensure discharge rates are adequate to confirm if drainage basins are suitably sized. In response to Q10.1.2 [REP2-051] the applicant suggested that these would be provided during detailed design and the issue would be secured through Requirement 12 and 13 of the DCO. Please confirm if this is acceptable and if not, why the information should be provided during the examination and what impact this would have on the DCO.
<p>The submitted drainage strategy is reliant on infiltration rates which have not been substantiated through detailed infiltration testing. This testing has been undertaken recently but has not been submitted to the County Council. In a recent meeting with the Applicant, it was indicated that the rates are different in some areas to that within the submitted design which will require amendments. Options have been discussed and depending on the detail submitted there is potential for changes to the design such that it may not be possible to deliver it in accordance with the submitted documentation.</p>		

13. Noise and Vibration		
Q13.2.1	Mitigation Hampshire County Council	HCC in their LIR paragraph 9.5.1 [REP2-066] have stated that they encourage the applicant to mitigate operational noise of the completed scheme as far as possible, however the applicant has stated in ES Chap 11 para 11.8.7 [APP-052] that no essential mitigation is required. Can HCC confirm that they accept this approach based on the information in the ES, or if they have a different assessment.
<p>The County Council is satisfied with the approach to assessment of operational noise and notes the noise mitigation measures that will come forward within the scheme.</p>		

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

Q13.2.2	Mitigation Hampshire County Council	The applicant has confirmed that all carriageway surfaces within the application boundary will be subject to low noise surfacing, including on those maintained by the local highway authority. Please confirm how this surfacing will be maintained in the future to ensure the mitigation remains in place through future maintenance cycles.
The County Council notes that the Applicant will provide low noise surfacing on all carriageway within the red line boundary, including those that will be maintained by the local highway authority (both existing and new carriageway). The County Council can only maintain this type of surfacing with a commuted sum to cover full replacement costs over a 120 year lifecycle. The lifecycle of this surfacing is lower than standard HRA surfacing and will need replacing more frequently and therefore additional cost to the County Council above its core maintenance budgets.		

14. Policy and Need		
Q14.2.4	Case for the Scheme Hampshire County Council	The Case for the Scheme [REP1-019] and other documents detail the improvements that will be provided to NCR23 through the gyratory. From the point of view of the PROW authority, please detail the practical issues with the existing route and how this restricts the use and accessibility of NCN23 for users, please also detail if it is considered possible to mitigate these issues without the proposed application. Please also provide a summary of the correspondence/complaints that these issues generate.
<p>Practical issues restricting use and accessibility for existing NCN23:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clear height for path under highway (2.3 metres)• Width of path surface (varies) preferred standard is 3 metres.• The end of cycling and equestrian provision to the west of the gyratory – bridleway 502 ends within the gyratory, and footways extend from there to the west – it is not therefore legal to ride a bicycle or horse on the footways that proceed westward from this point. This follows from the decision of the Secretary of State that bridleway rights had not been accrued beyond the current terminus of Bridleway 502 on account of such use being unlawful (ie cycling on a footway), and therefore not capable of giving rise to the acquisition of prescriptive rights. As a consequence, the current terminus of BW 502 is somewhat arbitrary, and results from an interpretation of relevant law as opposed to having been positively identified as a preferred termination point for the bridleway.• Determination of PINs report FPS/Q1770/7/85M (attached) <p>Possibility to mitigate issues without the proposed application.</p>		

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

- Clear height for path under highway – the proposed application does not seek to mitigate this issue. The issue would be mitigated by raising the highway or lowering the PROW NCR23 to gain sufficient height to meet current practice for equestrian access. This would not be possible given the costs involved.
- Width of path surface. Some possibility for widening some stretches – but unlikely to be viable in terms of cost and limited impact.
- The discontinuing of cycling and equestrian provision to the west of the gyratory. The proposed application adds to cycling routes to the west of the gyratory (the previous A34 route), as well as a new Bridleway to the east of the gyratory to complement the existing BW502. Improving active travel routes would be achievable without this application – but would require external funding.

Summary of correspondence/complaints that these issues generate:

- FPS/Q1770/7/85M is a PINs decision report for an order to modify route NCN23 – defining in 2015 what part of the route was Bridleway (502), and which was footway. Refer to the Map in the report for visual reference.
- There is notable correspondence from cycling and equestrian organisations regarding the cycling and bridle rights around the gyratory. The British Horse Society seek no reduction of the existing BW route in the proposed scheme. Winchester Cycling have raised issues relating to cycling rights and concern over the proposed diversions to be in place during the construction phases of the scheme.

Q14.2.14	NPSNN The Applicant, South Downs National Park Authority, Winchester City Council, Hampshire County Council	The NPSNN para 5.153 states that: <i>“Where consent is given in these areas, the Secretary of State should be satisfied that the applicant has ensured that the project will be carried out to high environmental standards and where possible includes measures to enhance other aspects of the environment”</i> . (i) Please summarise your position as to whether the SoS could be satisfied that high environmental standards would be achieved and comment on the inclusion of measures to enhance <i>other</i> aspects of the environment.
The County Council is content for other parties to advise on the environmental standards of the scheme and has no comments that it wishes to make on this.		

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

Q14.2.22	Climate Hampshire County Council	The Climate Emergency Planning and Policy Post Hearing submissions [REP4-042] Section 4 includes criticism of the HCC's position as stated at ISH3 that the scheme is consistent with the policies in the current local transport plan and the emerging local transport plan. Please respond to that criticism and confirm and explain your position in relation to the consistency of the scheme with HCC's local transport policies.
<p>The County Council, in its written summary of ISH 3 (REP4-045), sets out the following explanation of the consistency of the scheme with HCC local transport policies:</p> <p>The County Council confirmed that it considered the scheme to be consistent with both the current Local Transport Plan (LTP3) which was adopted in 2011, and the emerging Draft Local Transport Plan (LTP4).</p> <p><i>Chapter 1: The Transport Vision</i> of Part A (Long-Term Strategy 2011-2031) of LTP3 acknowledges that the private car is expected to be the dominant form of transport over the 20-year period of the strategy element of the Plan, and therefore the priorities reflect this expectation. At the time that the Plan was written, traffic congestion was forecast to increase substantially, beyond the official peak capacity of busy road corridors such as the M3. The County Council therefore states that it would '<i>continue a lobbying and influencing role with the Highways Agency [now National Highways], to explore ways of managing congestion on the strategic road network.</i>'</p> <p><i>Chapter 6: Transport Strategy for Central Hampshire and the New Forest</i> of Part A of LTP 3 states that: '<i>The junction of the A34(T) and M3 at Winnall (Winchester), which acts as a gateway to the South Hampshire sub-region, presents particular difficulties. As well as capacity problems at this key intersection, there are also significant difficulties for local traffic wishing to join the strategic network at this point, particularly from nearby employment areas. Further increases in traffic may necessitate changes to the layout of the junction to offer increased capacity to reduce congestion at this location</i>'.</p> <p>Consequently, LTP3 identifies the need to explore options to address congestion at Junction 9 of the M3 as a potential option that could be considered for delivery in support of the highway network.</p> <p>The emerging Draft Local Transport Plan 4 (April 2022), has been subject to public consultation but has not yet been adopted as the County Council is awaiting guidance from the Department for Transport.</p> <p>The supporting text for <i>Policy C2: Efficient and sustainable movement of goods</i> of the Draft LTP4 states that '<i>Our transport network is vital for the movement of goods as well as people. Good and reliable road and rail transport links are critical for the Hampshire economy, in terms of enabling business supply chains to operate efficiently and getting goods to customers quickly and on time.</i>' Consequently, the Policy C2 sets out that the County Council will:</p> <p><i>b) support measures that improve journey time reliability on strategic lorry and rail freight routes, including those which improve access to international ports and airports (see Section 7.8, Strategic Infrastructure, Policy SI1); and</i></p>		

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

e) encourage freight to use the strategic road network (SRN) and major road network (MRN), where this is the most appropriate route.
Policy S11: Work with partners to deliver targeted improvements to Hampshire’s strategic rail, road and digital infrastructure states that the County Council will:

c) support targeted improvements to the wider strategic road network (SRN) and major road network (MRN) where there is a clear safety, economic, health or wider social case.

The implementation of the policy will be supported by ‘working closely with National Highways and Network Rail/Great British Railways to inform their delivery plans with robust evidence-led transport assessments to secure improvements to the strategic road network (SRN) and the rail network that runs through the county.’

The strategic transport infrastructure priorities for Hampshire, as identified in the policy, currently include improvements to Junction 9 of M3 as an International Gateway.

15. Population and Human Health

Q15.2.1	Health Impact Report Hampshire County Council	The HCC LIR [REP2-066] stated that a full health impact report would be beneficial. The applicant in their response to the LIR [REP3-023] and at ISH2, stated that it is best practice to consolidate all health considerations and therefore all matters have been assessed. Please confirm that this is acceptable and if not how this matter should be taken forward.
---------	---	--

HCC sought clarification that the consolidated approach meets the same wide assessment criteria as carried out within a full Health Impact Assessment. HCC is reassured that the Applicant has assessed all matters and is satisfied that this is acceptable.

Q15.2.2	Wider Public Health Impacts Hampshire County Council	The HCC LIR [REP2-066] stated that considerations beyond the red line will also be important for the scheme in relation to public health impacts and outcomes. Please detail what these may be and how it is suggested the applicant incorporates these into the ES.
---------	--	--

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

HCC note that the applicant has assessed community assets beyond the red line within a 500m radius and therefore public health impacts will already have been picked up beyond the red line of the scheme. The statement in the LIR was intended to be more observational rather than seeking additional assessment.

Q15.2.3

Key Community Assets
Hampshire County Council

HCC in their LIR report para 9.2.3 [REP2-066] state that the inclusion of connectivity, active travel routes, PROW, landscape areas and tree planting are not recognised as key community assets within table 12.8 of the document and the County Council would consider these routes to be community assets. Please provide further information as to why this is considered to be required and also comment on the likely impact of this change would have on the overall application.

These routes form vital elements of community infrastructure both as links and the access to the routes themselves for activities such as walking/wheeling/cycling. It is noted that assets such as PROWs and active travel routes are considered elsewhere in the assessment and the County Council in its LIR was seeking only to highlight the importance of these features and provide comment on their ongoing importance both during construction and operational phases. In regard to this matter, the County Council is not seeking any additional assessment or amendment to the application.

16. Traffic and Transport (Including Public Rights of Way)

Q16.2.20	<p>Traffic Model Hampshire County Council, Winchester City Council</p>	<p>In the Applicant Written Summaries of Oral Case for Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Appendix A, paragraph 1.5.3 [REP4-035], the applicant has provided traffic data to show the change in traffic flow on the Hockley Link. Please comment on how you see this affecting the local highway network and impact on pedestrian crossings.</p>
<p>The County Council notes that the Hockley Link will be affected by the diversion plan required for the closure of J9 northbound, and that there will be some impact on local traffic as a result. The modelling provided by NH shows a maximum impact of 150 vehicles during the AM peak in the westbound direction, with minimal vehicles at the other peak hours/directions. This is not considered to represent a significant impact in terms of network capacity. The Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (7.10, Rev 1) suggests that the impact would be slight due to localised re-routing, which would place some additional pressure on other local routes but the impact is likely to be spread across the wider network. With regard to the impact on pedestrian crossings directly affected by the diversion route, the signalised junction at the Hockley Link does provide pedestrian phases on one arm of this junction. This facility will still be in operation during the works and there will be no or limited impact on pedestrian movement through this arm. Any alterations to the signal timings will be agreed through the relevant Construction Management Plan. With regard to crossings in other locations, the detail of this will be agreed with the submission of Construction Management Plan relevant to this diversion, which will provide comprehensive information for each phase of works. Should it be considered necessary to provide additional, temporary crossing points as a result of the diversion route this will be agreed prior to commencement of works.</p>		
Q16.2.21	<p>Traffic Model Hampshire County Council</p>	<p>At ISH2, HCC confirmed that they had validated the Junction 9 traffic model used by the applicant for assessment of the proposed improvements. Can HCC please provide details of how this validation was undertaken and what results were produced that confirmed it was acceptable to them.</p>
<p>The County Council reviewed the outputs of the traffic model as set out in APP-163 Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report and APP-166 Transport Assessment Report. This was principally undertaken by agreeing that the model choice was appropriate and that any variable factors such as committed development and infrastructure was correctly accounted for. The County Council was provided with early sight of traffic flow diagrams for each of the modelled scenarios. The County Council reviewed traffic flow output at individual locations to verify that the modelled flows accorded with recorded flows and that these reflected the County Council’s operational understanding of the local network (and in light of its own modelling carried out for the Winchester Movement Strategy). For example, concerns were raised that modelled flows on Romsey Road were less than those recorded on Andover</p>		

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

Road which is unusual as the County Council's recorded information shows Romsey Road to carry higher flows than Andover Road. The Applicant provided further detail on the exact location of the modelled flows and from this the County Council was able to satisfy itself that the location was downstream from a major junction on Romsey Road which when checked with our own records confirmed that flows were lighter.

A similar exercise is being carried out for Easton Lane where the County Council is seeking confirmation of the exact location of the modelled flows on that part of the network.

Q16.2.23

Other improvement schemes
The Applicant and Hampshire County Council

Please give details and dates of all improvement schemes, in addition to the detailed Pinch Point Scheme in Q16.2.22, that have been undertaken within the application boundary since the project was included in the Road Investment Strategy in April 2015. Please detail the objectives and outcomes for each implemented scheme.

The A33 Basingstoke Road at its junction with the B3047 London Road King's Worthy (known locally as the A33 'Cart and Horses') has been subject to three casualty reduction schemes since 2015. The primary reason for the implementation of all schemes has been to reduce injury actions alongside reducing public and political concern for safety and more recently confusion regards layout.

May 2016 – Current layout and road marking regime introduced alongside pedestrian accessibility improvements and new Vehicle Activated Sign (staggered crossroads) for northbound A33 approach.

- Primary reason for install casualty reduction alongside wider pedestrian access issues.
- In the five-year period prior to the initial 2016 scheme there were sixteen personal injury collisions at the junction, three of which were recorded as serious in severity. Of the sixteen, twelve were associated with the southern arm and four with the northern arm of the junction.

October 2016 - Remedial Measures - Cut back vegetation to improve visibility of/for pedestrians, reflective bollards at new ped crossing points, reposition give way markings in central reserve and realign central island to prevent vehicles over-running it.

- Introduced following recommendations made within Safety Audit
- In the interim period between the initial scheme completion and the remedial measures in October 2016 there were a further four personal injury collisions recorded. Of these, one involved a motorcyclist losing control on gravel when turning left from the Abbotts Worthy arm, another a left turning vehicle in collision with a northbound motorcyclist. Neither of these involved motorists negotiating the revised junction layout. However,

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

further collisions involved a right turning vehicle failing to give way in the central reserve to southbound traffic and right turning vehicle from London Road being struck by a northbound motorcycle.

23 November 2016 there was a fatal accident at the junction. The collision involved a car and a 21-year-old pedestrian who was crossing the road at the junction through a line of traffic waiting to turn right not at a crossing point.

- No immediate measures

September 2017 Junction submitted for Executive Member review following Political and public concern - [Appendix 1 \(hants.gov.uk\)](https://www.hants.gov.uk)

July 2018 – 40mph Speed Limit introduced November 2018 - Junction is street lit (following adoption of above report).

- In the five-year period prior to the installation of the 40mph Speed limit there were twenty reported injury accidents (06/07/13 to 05/07/18), one fatality (Nov 2016) and three serious. The twenty collisions consist of sixteen at the southern junction, three at the northern junction and the fatal pedestrian incident between the two junctions.
- In the four years and five months since the implementation of the speed limit there have been four collisions, one fatal and three slight. The fatality is believed to have involved circumstances which are not related to the highway layout and one of the slight collisions involved a left turning vehicle from Kings Worthy moving away from the junction but driving slowly the driver was inexperienced (Age 19). No further collisions involving injury have been reported since 25th October 2022.

July 2023 Give Way changed to Stop on B3047 King's Worthy approach only

- This was not casualty related but to respond to local concern about confusion and safety at the junction

Q16.2.24	Legal Status of NMU Route The Applicant, Hampshire County Council	In their Deadline 4 post hearing submissions following ISH2 [REP4-045], HCC stated that they expected the new NMU route between The Cart and Horse Junction and Easton Lane to be an adopted footway/cycleway. Please confirm if this is agreed and confirm that the dDCO will be updated accordingly.
----------	---	--

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September 2023

The County Council notes that the NMU route will be designated as a Cycle Track under section 329 of the Highways Act 1980 and will have right of way on foot. This is agreed and HCC will adopt the route.

Q16.2.26	Winchester Movement Strategy Hampshire County Council, Winchester City Council	The Winchester Movement Strategy has been highlighted in LIRs and at the ISHs. Can HCC and WCC explain what traffic modelling has been undertaken to assess the changes that the strategy could deliver on traffic volumes, travel times across the city, road safety and air quality.
----------	--	--

The Winchester Movement Strategy (WMS) has been informed through extensive public consultation and traffic modelling. The public consultation resulted in 3,000 people sharing their views on traffic and travel in Winchester. Traffic and travel data was also collated as summarised in the following table:

Fig.3 - Evidence base sources and data

Census 2011, Office for National Statistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population • Travel to work - mode share, flows
School Census 2017, Hampshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mode share • Location
Traffic counts, Hampshire County Council and Department for Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time-series • Peak hours and directional
TrafficMaster, Department for Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average link journey time • Average link speed
Parking and park and ride data, Winchester City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative parking occupancy • Park & Ride parking ticket sales
Telephone survey, Hampshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents' views on transport issues, challenges and opportunities
Real Time Passenger Information System, Hampshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus journey times between stop per journey and average per day

ExQ2: 25 August 2023

**Responses due by Deadline 5: 22 September
2023**

The WMS made use of a strategic transport model (Sub Regional Transport Model – SRTM) to test proposed measures, and in addition VISSIM modelling was undertaken to test feasibility options for alterations to the city centre movement layout which considered the potential to make changes to traffic movement and release space for public realm improvements. The VISSIM model included the proposed changes to J9 in the Do Minimum Scenario.

A review of the most recent five year personal injury accident information was also incorporated into the WMS and used to inform the development of strategies such as overcoming barriers to walking and cycling.

The WMS is supported by two detailed feasibility reports which assessed a number of options to deliver on the three strategic priorities of the WMS. This included expansion of Park and Ride services and associated bus priority measures, walking and cycling measures, public realm improvements linked to changes to the one way system and city centre car parking capacity changes. The WMS and supporting feasibility studies can be accessed via the following link: [Strategic transport - plans and policies | Hampshire County Council \(hants.gov.uk\)](https://www.hants.gov.uk/strategic-transport-plans-and-policies)