

M3 Junction 9 Improvement Project

Christopher Gillham

Winchester Friends of the Earth

Unique Reference: 20034384

██████████@btinternet.com; ██████████

Comments re NH ISH23 Summary

<p>Item 2(i) – fourth bullet</p>	<p><i>Report (7.10, Rev 1) details how the wider economic benefits were quantified and where the geographic focus of the agglomeration calculations reflects where Winchester is one of the primary employment locations in the Enterprise M3 area and the Scheme is expected to boost productivity by removing congestion. Therefore, all of the £34.7M of quantified productivity benefits are from the Winchester area.</i></p> <p><i>Applicant's post hearing note: A response to Winchester Friends of the Earth query relating to the treatment of Scheme costs and optimism bias is provided as part of the Applicant's response in Section 3.1 in Applicant Comments on Deadline 3 Submissions (Document Reference 8.16) submitted at Deadline 4.</i></p>	<p>No new evidence has been brought to show any credibility for the wider economic benefits of this scheme (see my comments on the Applicant's rebuttal of my D3 submission). There is no plausible narrative to justify agglomeration benefits or that the assumed benefits are not displaced from elsewhere (perhaps contrary to the levelling up agenda) or that these benefits, if they exist, are not double counted (i.e are separate from the user benefits which are deemed to result from congestion removal).</p> <p>I have responded to this in my cD5 submission: <i>Comments on 8.16 Applicant Comments on Deadline 3 Submissions</i></p>
<p>Appendix A – Further information regarding alternatives</p>	<p><i>1.2.3 The above cases that Justice Holgate chose to bring to the fore in his judgment of Stonehenge were clearly relevant to the issues of Stonehenge where the alternatives being considered were two different alignments / lengths of tunnels of the A303.</i></p> <p><i>In the discussions had between relevant interested parties and local planning authorities, the Applicant understands that the micro-siting of the Scheme or the alternatives assessment of the Scheme in the context of a road based scheme has not been challenged to date and has been considered adequate by the local planning authorities.</i></p> <p><i>The challenge that some interested parties have made is whether there has been an assessment of modal alternatives. As such, the relevance of the Stonehenge judgment to the discussions had to date regarding modal alternatives is of limited relevance. There is, however, relevance in the cases given above, and how they might be applied to the modal assessment and options carried out by the Applicant.</i></p>	<p>This is an erroneous interpretation of the Holgate judgment. There is nothing in the judgment that says that the alternatives that should have been considered should be confined to alternative road schemes. It is true that NH has responded, in the "redetermination" stage, only with road schemes, whereas interested parties have certainly asked for non-road alternatives. Since the SoS approval of the scheme despite the DCO inquiry's rejection of it and the subsequent ICOMOS response that it will likely put the area into its <i>World Heritage in Danger</i> list, there is a further legal case going forward which will test again whether alternatives have been properly considered. Stonehenge is still very much relevant to the issue of modal alternatives.</p>
	<p><i>1.3.1 As stated above, the Applicant is required under paragraph 4.27 to carry out an options approach which is to consider viable modal alternatives. ... Where projects have had a full options appraisal in achieving their status in RIS, option testing is not needed to be considered by the ExA; For road schemes, proportionate option consideration of alternatives will have been undertaken as part of the investment decision making process and it is not necessary for the ExA to reconsider this, but they should be satisfied that this assessed has been undertaken.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant again confirms that the Department for Transport would have considered alternative modes of transport before including the Scheme within RIS. RIS 1 was informed by a robust body of evidence including the Route Based Strategy (RBS) studies and was underpinned by the DfT's National Transport Model (NTM).</i></p>	<p>If this is true, then the Applicant will be able to deposit documents to show how the decision was arrived at. We cannot take for granted that any real multi-modal analysis has been done in defining the RIS programmes. We certainly know that the Infrastructure Commission has never done any such analysis or looked at any such analysis carried out by the DfT, or they would not have stated that such analysis should be done at some time in the future.</p>
	<p>Route Based Strategy: <i>The assessment determined that</i></p>	<p>Again the report of this assessment should be</p>

	<p><i>existing congestion at M3 Junction 9 required a highway intervention, as opposed to any other modal intervention, and specifically the provision of free flow links between the M3 and A34. In drawing this conclusion, the capacity at the Port of Southampton and expected growth in rail and road freight was taken into consideration. A key finding from the M25 to Solent RBS study was that congestion at M3 Junction 9 was hindering freight movements and could block further economic growth at the Port of Southampton.</i></p> <p><i>This assessment has subsequently been validated in the 2021 Solent to Midlands Multi-Modal Freight Strategy which highlights congestion at Junction 9 as a problem and supports its improvement.</i></p> <p><i>1.3.5 The Applicant had also considered modal alternatives post RIS at PCF Stage</i></p> <p>Hampshire County Council: <i>1.3.8 It was explicitly stated that rail as an alternative modal option would not be able to address either the additional freight traffic demand expected from the growth of the Port of Southampton or the existing safety issues that are likely to worsen.</i></p>	<p>deposited at this Inquiry.</p> <p>This does not answer the point that WinACC made that multi-modal freight strategy anticipated achieving a modal shift. Yet the modelling of this scheme and its economic analysis have not included such a strategic transfer.</p> <p>This report should also be deposited.</p> <p>Is the Applicant saying that HCC argues that no freight can be shifted to rail? If so we should see how HCC makes this argument.</p>
--	---	--