

M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme

Scheme Number: TR010055

7.12.7 Statement of Common Ground with Cycle Winchester (Rev 1)

APFP Regulations 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

**Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

Volume 7

10 November 2023

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

M3 Junction 9 Improvement
Development Consent Order 202[x]

**7.12.7 STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND WITH CYCLE
WINCHESTER**

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR010055
Application Document Reference:	7.12.7
BIM Document Reference:	HE551511-VFK-LSI-XXXX_XX-RP-ZL-40007
Author:	M3 Junction 9 Improvement Project Team, National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	31 July 2023	Additional Submission
Rev 1	10 November 2023	Deadline 8 Submission

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) National Highways Company Limited and (2) Cycle Winchester

Signed..........
Thomas Beasley
Senior Project Manager
on behalf of National Highways
Date: 9 November 2023

Signed......
Sue Coles
Member
on behalf of Cycle Winchester
Date: 9 November 2023

Signed.........
Andy Key
Member
on behalf of Cycle Winchester
Date: 10 November 2023

Contents

- 1 Introduction..... 1**
 - 1.1 Purpose of this document 1
 - 1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground 1
 - 1.3 Terminology..... 1
- 2 Record of Engagement..... 3**
- 3 Issues..... 6**

Tables

- Table 2.1: Record of Engagement..... 3
- Table 3.1: Issues Table 6

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared in respect of the proposed M3 Junction 9 Scheme (the Scheme) made by National Highways Company Limited (National Highways) to the Secretary of State for Transport (Secretary of State) for a Development Consent Order (DCO) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended).
- 1.1.2 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the DCO application documents. All DCO application documents are available on the Planning Inspectorate's website.
- 1.1.3 The SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the parties to it, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) National Highways as the Applicant and (2) Cycle Winchester.
- 1.2.2 National Highways became the Government-owned Strategic Highways Company on 1 April 2015. It is the highway authority in England for the strategic road network and has the necessary powers and duties to operate, manage, maintain and enhance the network. Regulatory powers remain with the Secretary of State. The legislation establishing National Highways made provision for all legal rights and obligations, including in respect of the Scheme, to be conferred upon or assumed by National Highways.
- 1.2.3 Cycle Winchester is a local action group which aims to encourage cycling and campaigns on issues relevant to cycling and cyclists in the Winchester area. The group was founded in November 2017 and is supported by many other local community groups including: Bespoke Biking, City of Winchester Trust, Friends of the Earth Winchester, Winchester CTC (Cycling UK) and Winchester Action on the Climate Crisis.
- 1.2.4 Consultation with Cycle Winchester began in January 2018 as part of a non-statutory consultation. Representatives from Cycle Winchester have since then attended meetings as part of a group of representatives from other local walking, cycling and horse-riding community groups. Cycle Winchester continued to be consulted as a member of this group.

1.3 Terminology

- 1.3.1 In the **Table 3.1** in **Section 3** of this SoCG:

- “*Agreed*” indicates area(s) of agreement
- “*Not agreed*” indicates a final position for area(s) of disagreement where the resolution of divergent positions will not be possible, and parties agree on this point

1.3.2 It can be assumed that any matters not specifically referred to in **Table 3.1** in **Section 3** of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to Cycle Winchester, and therefore have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters can be read as agreed, only to the extent that they are either not of material interest or relevance to the Cycle Winchester.

2 Record of Engagement

2.1.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between National Highways and Cycle Winchester in relation to the Application is outlined in **Table 2.1** below.

Table 2.1: Record of Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
January 2018	Letter from National Highways to Cycle Winchester	Sharing details of the upcoming 2018 non-statutory consultation.
11 January 2018	Meeting with Cycle Winchester	Briefing as part of the 2018 non-statutory consultation.
6 March 2019	Meeting with Cycle Winchester	Topics included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scheme update ▪ 2018 non-statutory consultation ▪ Concerns / suggestions
3 July 2019	Briefing with Cycle Winchester	2019 statutory consultation briefing.
23 August 2019	Email from Cycle Winchester to National Highways	Submission of a formal response as part of the 2019 statutory consultation.
27 May 2021	Letter from National Highways to Cycle Winchester	Sharing details of the upcoming 2021 statutory consultation and inviting to attend webinars.
27 May 2021	Briefing with Cycle Winchester	2021 statutory consultation briefing. Topics included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scheme update ▪ 2019 statutory consultation ▪ 2021 statutory consultation
2 July 2021	Meeting with Cycle Winchester	Discussion regarding all walking, cycling and horse-riding routes.
8 July 2021	Email from Cycle Winchester to National Highways	Submission of a formal response as part of the 2021 statutory consultation.
17 July 2021	Meeting with Cycle Winchester	Discussion on the proposed route from Easton Lane to Long Walk.
3 September 2021	Meeting with Cycle Winchester	Walker, Cyclist and Horse-riding stakeholder group meeting. Topics included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scheme update

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public Rights of Way (PRoW), revised proposal ▪ Links to other PRoWs
8 October 2021	Meeting with Cycle Winchester	Walker, Cyclist and Horse Rider stakeholder group meeting. Topics included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scheme overview ▪ Funding
5 November 2021	Meeting with Cycle Winchester	Walker, Cyclist and Horse-riding stakeholder group meeting. Topics included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scheme update ▪ Consultation summary ▪ Hampshire County Council and Winchester City Council engagement ▪ South Downs National Park Authority site visit
7 September 2022	Meeting with Cycle Winchester	Topics included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scheme update ▪ Changes in response to the 2021 statutory consultation. ▪ All Lane Running pause
20 February 2023	Meeting with Cycle Winchester	Walker, Cyclist and Horse-rider stakeholder group meeting. Topics included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project update ▪ DCO application documents ▪ WCH routes design standards
21 February 2023	Email from National Highways to Cycle Winchester	Section 56 notice
2 June 2023	Meeting with Cycle Winchester	Walker, Cyclist and Horse-rider stakeholder group site visit. Walked the proposed National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 diversion route. Discussed route design and maintenance.
6 July 2023	Meeting with Cycle Winchester	Meeting to discuss the SoCG
19 September 2023	Meeting with Cycle Winchester	Walker, Cyclist and Horse-riding stakeholder group meeting.

2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and other forms of consultation and engagement undertaken between (1) National Highways and (2) Cycle Winchester in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

3 Issues

Table 3.1: Issues Table

Reference	Issue	Document References (if relevant)	Cycle Winchester's Position	National Highways' Position	Status	Date
1. Draft Development Consent Order						
1.1	Schedule 3, Part 8 Legal status of the Easton Lane connection and NCN Route 23	Draft Development Consent Order (3.1, Rev 3), Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, Rev 1) and Work Plans (2.3, Rev 2)	<p>The split designation replicates the historic failure to record the legal status of the original cycle route. The route should be given a legal designation that ensures the continuing right of cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians to use it and resolves the current "half-a-bridleway" anomaly.</p> <p>Cycle Winchester maintains that the full route across Junction 9 was originally intended as a bridleway, compensating for the loss of a previously existing bridleway nearby that was stopped-up when the motorway was built. The failure to record it as such was an oversight and should be corrected. Cycle Winchester supports the position of the British Horse Society (BHS) that the equestrian right of way across the <i>entire</i> junction should be preserved and clarified. While Cycle Winchester would like to consider this matter to be "under discussion", the reality is that National Highways has given no reasons for its decision except that it partly replicates the current anomaly and is not currently willing to discuss the matter further with us and our colleagues on the walking, cycling and horse-riding consultative group. Cycle Winchester therefore has to conclude that it is not agreed.</p> <p>The maintenance of the route will be split between NH (subways) and Hampshire County Council. This is inefficient and is likely to result in inconsistent maintenance and possibly debates between NH and HCC.</p> <p>Cycle Winchester notes that the draft DCO includes a definition stating that "cycle track" will include a right of way on foot wherever mentioned in the DCO. CW agrees with this principle, but notes that this should not be</p>	<p>The legal status is defined in Schedule 3, Part 8 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, Rev 3). The realignment of the pre-existing bridleway from underneath the gyratory to Easton Lane between points 3 and 4 on sheets 6 and 7 of Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, Rev 1) will remain a bridleway. The route between points 4 and 15 will be a cycle track. The Scheme maintains the existing legal status. It is not considered that a change of designation to a bridleway would grant any additional rights for cyclists.</p> <p>The Work Plans (2.3, Rev 2) have been updated at Deadline 3 to correct an error in relation to the length of the bridleway at the gyratory.</p> <p>Regarding confirming that the cycle track has a pedestrian access, the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, Rev 3) confirms at Article 2, that reference to cycle track includes a right of way on foot.</p> <p>Appendix C (Single Public Rights of Way and Access Plan – ExA WQ2 16.2.25) of Applicant Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) Appendices (8.17.1, Rev 1) lists the proposed maintaining authority for the Easton Lane connection and realigned NCN Route 23. This plan was updated at Deadline 7 to correct an error to the proposed maintaining authority within the proposed rights of way schedule included in the plan.</p>	Not agreed	8 November 2023

Reference	Issue	Document References (if relevant)	Cycle Winchester's Position	National Highways' Position	Status	Date
			interpreted as an endorsement of shared-use paths in detailed design.			
1.2	Schedule 3, Part 8 Legal status of the cycle provision between Winnall and Kings Worthy	Draft Development Consent Order (3.1, Rev 5), Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, Rev 1) and Work Plans (2.3, Rev 2)	<p>The intended legal status of the route is disputed. In meetings of the WCH consultative group with the National Highways project team, it was agreed that although the primary purpose of this route is as a utility cycling route, its design and implementation should not preclude its use by equestrians. The project team indicated that the physical design would allow for this. The draft DCO proposes that this route's legal status will be purely as a 'cycle track', which does not guarantee equestrian access. Though this is less important than the Easton Lane/NCN23 route, it is still a significant missed opportunity.</p> <p>Cycle Winchester notes that the draft DCO includes a definition stating that "cycle track" will include a right of way on foot wherever mentioned in the DCO. CW agrees with this principle, but notes that this should not be interpreted as an endorsement of shared-use paths in detailed design.</p>	<p>The legal status is defined in Schedule 3, Part 8 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, Rev 3). The route from Winnall to Kings Worthy is proposed as a cycle track, as outlined in Work No. 2 in Schedule 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, Rev 5).</p> <p>The route to the west of the M3 mainline between points 15 and 16 on sheets 3, 5, 6 and 7 of Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, Rev 1) will be a cycle track. The bridleway from Long Walk to Easton Lane ends at the gyratory, point 4.</p> <p>Regarding confirming that the cycle track has a pedestrian access, the draft Development Consent Order (3.1, Rev 5) confirms at Article 2, that reference to cycle track includes a right of way on foot.</p>	Not agreed	8 November 2023
2. Principle of development						
2.1	The need for the Scheme is comprehensively set out in the Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1)	Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1)	Cycle Winchester agree that the proposed plans are an improvement and a good objective for the Scheme.	Section 3.5 of the Case for the Scheme (7.1, Rev 1) outlines the five strategic objectives of the Scheme, one of which is improvements for walkers and cyclists including connecting the NCN Route 23 which is severed by the current junction layout.	Agreed	6 July 2023
Environmental Statement (ES)						
3. Chapter 12 Population and Human Health						
3.1	Mitigation Easton Lane connection and NCN Route 23	Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-053) and Rights	<p>The Scheme should provide an improved non-motorised route across Junction 9 which reconnects the truncated Easton Lane for cyclists, walkers and equestrians.</p> <p>This route was provided in 1985 as part of the construction of this section of the M3. It is also</p>	A combined user path through the junction gyratory is proposed to connect NCN Route 23 which is currently severed by the current junction layout.	Agreed	21 June 2023

Reference	Issue	Document References (if relevant)	Cycle Winchester's Position	National Highways' Position	Status	Date
		of Way and Access Plans (2.4, Rev 1)	part of NCN Route 23 and provides a direct link between the city of Winchester and the South Downs National Park, as well as to the villages of the Itchen Valley and the market town of Alresford. The present crossing is woefully inadequate and unsafe and is under-used as a result.			
3.2	Mitigation Cycle provision between Winnall and Kings Worthy	Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-053) and Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, Rev 1)	The Scheme should provide a new non-motorised route between Junction 9 and the Cart & Horses junction in Kings Worthy. This would link Kings Worthy (a large and growing satellite settlement of Winchester) with the employment and retail areas of Winnall and beyond that to the city itself and the new sports and leisure centre, providing an opportunity for increased commuting, utility and leisure journeys by bike and e-bike.	The Scheme includes provision for a walking and cycling route between Kings Worthy and Winnall adjacent to the A33. This will connect in with existing PRoW and local routes, including Kings Worthy Footpath 9 and Headbourne Worthy Footpath 749.	Agreed	21 June 2023
3.3	Mitigation Easton Lane to Long Walk walking, cycling and horse-riding route	Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-053) and Rights of Way and Access Plans (2.4, Rev 1)	The Scheme should provide a new bridleway between Long Walk and Easton Lane. This would provide increased opportunities for recreational offroad riding, accessible from Winchester without the need for a car journey, including linkage to existing rights of way that would allow for a circular route for non-motorised users.	An additional footpath, cycle path and bridleway is proposed on the eastern side of the Scheme to link Easton Lane with Long Walk.	Agreed	21 June 2023
Traffic and Transport						
4. Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding routes design						
4.1	NCN Route 23 Surfacing and subway heights	General Arrangement Plans (2.4, APP-009) and Structures Plans and Sections (2.7, APP-011)	The Easton Lane route would have a sealed surface and have subways of adequate height and be suitable for utility use.	A combined (walking and cycling) user path through the junction gyratory is proposed to connect the National Cycle Network Route 23 which is currently severed by the current junction layout. The shared use footway and cycleway is proposed to be 3m wide and 4m wide at the gyratory subways with a bound asphalt surface. The subways at the gyratory are proposed to be 2.7m clear height. The bridleway element will terminate within the gyratory itself and demounting / mounting	Agreed	21 June 2023

Reference	Issue	Document References (if relevant)	Cycle Winchester's Position	National Highways' Position	Status	Date
				blocks and a turning area is proposed for horses to turn around. This mirrors the current existing arrangement.		
4.2	<p>NCN Route 23 Route width, layout and design standards</p>	<p>General Arrangement Plans (2.4, APP-009)</p>	<p>The design of this route is sub-optimal. National Highways insists on designing to the absolute minimum allowable: a shared-use path rather than a segregated path, built to minimum allowable dimensions in terms of width under National Highways Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) CD 143 – Designing for walking, cycling and horse riders. Shared-use paths are only allowed in DMRB CD143 in situations where space precludes anything better.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.1.1 of CD143 states: <i>'2.1.1 Where absolute and desirable minimum values are provided within this document, the desirable minimum value should be used unless an existing physical constraint prevents the use of this.'</i></p> <p>That is not the case here and the route should be built to better than the absolute minimum, partly to future-proof the route as retrospective improvements are usually impossible. A shared use path should be used when you can't do better.</p> <p>Inappropriate design standards are still being used. The current design standard for cycle routes is LTN 1/20, as approved by DfT. While it's true that (unlike local highway authorities) National Highways is not required to follow these, they represent best practice in the industry and are more up to date than the DMRB equivalent.</p> <p>It is difficult to predict usage of this route, but Cycle Winchester would like to see it futureproofed. The route is also used for commuting. Cycle Winchester expect a substantial increase in usage if a high-quality facility is provided.</p> <p>For comparison, cycle traffic on the B3047 through the Cart & Horses junction (the other</p>	<p>The proposed walking and cycling elements are designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) document CD143 – Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding (Highways England, 2021). DMRB CD143 provides requirements and advice for the design of walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities on and/or adjacent to the motorway and all-purpose trunk road network. It does not limit the provision of a shared use path to when "you can't do better". Paragraph E/3.5 of CD143 states: <i>'Widths of unsegregated shared use routes shall be a minimum of:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 3.0 metres where there are 200 users an hour or more; or 2. 2.0 metres where there are less than 200 users per hour' <p>The standards in LTN 1/20 are more suited to areas where high pedestrian and cyclist flows are anticipated. Please refer to National Highways response to ExQ1 16.1.32 within the Applicant Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) (8.5, REP2-051) on the decision-making process and reasoning of the proposed NCN Route 23 design.</p> <p>However, the five overarching design principles and twenty-two summary principles within LTN 1/20 have been considered. Table 6-3 of LTN 1/20 states recommended widths for shared use routes carrying up to 300 cyclists per hour as 3m, which is the width as proposed for the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme. Please refer to National Highways response to ExQ1 15.1.4 within the Applicant Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) (8.5, REP2-051) on the frequency of use of NCN Route 23. It is not</p>	<p>Not agreed</p>	<p>30 October 2023</p>

Reference	Issue	Document References (if relevant)	Cycle Winchester's Position	National Highways' Position	Status	Date
			<p>main cycle access point between Winchester and the Itchen valley) is currently more than 3 times higher than at Junction 9. [Information from Strava Metro data for commuter and leisure cycle traffic, calendar year 2022.] With improved facilities, we think it is reasonable to expect traffic on NCN Route 23 through Junction 9 to increase to at least this level, if not more.</p> <p>The new cycle-commuting route from Kings Worthy will also converge with NCN 23 at the Junction 9, further boosting cycling figures through the western half of the junction (between points 15 and 8 on sheet 7 of the Rights of Way & access Plan, plus the underpass adjacent to point 8).</p> <p>When building roads, National Highways allows for predicted future expansion. If it has any confidence in the quality of its non-motorised facilities, it should be doing the same for non-motorised traffic.</p> <p>The whole of this route should have a sealed surface and be built to utility cycle route standards.</p> <p>National Highways is being somewhat selective in its reference to table 6-3 of LTN 1/20. The accompanying text for that table reads:</p> <p><i>“6.5.7 Recommended minimum widths of shared use routes carrying up to 300 pedestrians per hour are given in Table 6-3. Wherever possible, and where pedestrian flows are higher, greater widths should be used to reduce conflict.</i></p> <p><i>“6.5.8 Designers should be realistic about cyclists wanting to make adequate progress. The preferred approach for shared use routes is therefore to provide sufficient space so that cyclists can comfortably overtake groups of pedestrians and slower cyclists.”</i></p> <p>In this case, as the path does not yet exist, it would certainly be possible to make it wider.</p>	<p>expected that the proposed volumes of pedestrians and cyclists using the NCN Route 23 proposed route will be of a level to justify increased widths.</p> <p>The route is proposed to have a bound asphalt surface to DMRB CD143.</p> <p>At Deadline 5, National Highways submitted Design Principles Report (8.18, REP5-028) which outlines user experience design principles in table 3.3. The development of the detailed design of the Scheme will be in accordance with the Design Principles Report (8.18, Rev 1).</p>		

Reference	Issue	Document References (if relevant)	Cycle Winchester's Position	National Highways' Position	Status	Date
4.3	Winnall to Kings Worthy walking and cycling route Surfacing	General Arrangement Plans (2.4, APP-009) and Structures Plans and Sections (2.7, APP-011)	The Kings Worthy route would have a sealed surface and be built to utility cycle route standards.	The route is proposed to have a bound asphalt surface to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) CD143 – Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding (Highways England, 2021).	Agreed	21 June 2023
4.4	Winnall to Kings Worthy walking and cycling route Route width and design standards	General Arrangement Plans (2.4, APP-009)	See comments in reference 4.2 above. These apply equally to the Kings Worthy route. This route is proposed as a utility cycle route to encourage residents to commute via cycle/e-bike from Kings Worthy, reducing the amount of local car traffic that currently uses the A33 - A34 - Junction 9 highway route. If it is successful it will be a well-used cycle route and will have some impact on motor traffic levels. National Highways should be designing for success.	<p>The proposed walking and cycling elements are designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) CD143 – Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding (Highways England, 2021). This standard is used for the design of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes on and/or adjacent to the motorway and all-purpose trunk roads. In accordance with DMRB CD143, the widths of unsegregated shared use routes shall be a minimum of 3.0 metres where there are 200 users an hour or more.</p> <p>The proposed walking and cycling routes as part of the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme are within a rural area. LTN 1/20 is more suited to areas where high pedestrian and cyclist flows are anticipated. Please refer to National Highways response to ExQ1 16.1.32 within the Applicant Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) (8.5, REP2-051) on the decision-making process and reasoning of the proposed walking and cycling route design.</p> <p>However, the five overarching design principles and twenty-two summary principles within LTN 1/20 have been considered. Table 6-3 of LTN/120 states recommended widths for shared use routes carrying up to 300 cyclists per hour as 3.0 metres, which is the width as proposed for the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme. It is not expected that the proposed volumes of pedestrians and cyclists using the proposed Winnall to Kings Worthy walking and cycling route will be of a level to justify increased widths.</p> <p>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) document CD143 – Designing for walking,</p>	Not agreed	30 October 2023

Reference	Issue	Document References (if relevant)	Cycle Winchester's Position	National Highways' Position	Status	Date
				<p>cycling and horse-riding (Highways England, 2021) was updated in March 2021, LTN1/20 was updated in July 2020 so the most up to date standards are being used.</p> <p>The proposed alignment of the walking and cycling route has been determined based upon spatial constraints. The route has been chosen to limit the impact upon existing adjacent SSSI and SAC designated areas and to avoid areas of existing flood plain. The route therefore in part, runs between the proposed realigned and existing A34 carriageways. As previously stated, the route has been designed to a width to accommodate up to 300 users per hour (typically 5 users per minute). It is not envisaged that the number of users will be above 300 per hour, which is more suited to town centre routes with high pedestrian and cyclist demand. Please refer to National Highways response to ExQ1 15.1.4 within the Applicant Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) (8.5, REP2-051) on the frequency of use of the proposed walking and cycling route.</p>		
4.5	<p>Winnall to Kings Worthy walking and cycling route</p> <p>Design of the crossing on the A33, adjacent to the National Highways depot</p>	<p>General Arrangement Plans (2.4, APP-009)</p>	<p>The route includes an at-grade crossing of the new M3-A33 link road. This will be a busy road with fast moving traffic. Cycle Winchester thinks the crossing is avoidable through more creative design.</p> <p>Cycle Winchester would have liked to see the crossing on the A33 avoided, but National Highways' position on this matter is acknowledged given the explanation.</p>	<p>National Highways considered keeping the proposed footpath / cycle path on the western side of the realigned A33 leading to Easton Lane and Tesco during the preliminary design. However, the western verge in this area is constrained by existing utilities. The verge also becomes constrained in terms of width as it runs closer to Homebase car park and additional land take would be required to achieve a shared footway / cycle path. In addition, the existing traffic splitter island leading to Homebase is currently an unsuitable width (in terms of design standards) for pedestrians and cyclists to cross. Increasing the width of this island would impact upon vehicular movements into and out of Homebase (HGV swept path modelling has demonstrated that this island cannot be increased in width). A formal crossing would then be required across</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>6 July 2023</p>

Reference	Issue	Document References (if relevant)	Cycle Winchester's Position	National Highways' Position	Status	Date
				Easton Lane to link the proposed footpath / cycle path to the existing NCN Route 23. Traffic volumes using the realigned A33 are expected to be significantly lower than the existing A34.		
4.6	Winnall to Kings Worthy walking and cycling route Layout at the Cart and Horses junction	Sheet 3 of General Arrangement Plans (2.4, APP-009)	Cycle Winchester considers the linkage at the Kings Worthy end into the Hampshire County Council Road network to be unsatisfactory. In particular, this means the connection into the Cart and Horses junction between the A33 and B3047. Hampshire County Council is proposing to improve this junction; the new route should link safely and conveniently into the proposals for the junction. At present it's not clear to us how this would happen. If Hampshire County Council comes up with a technically viable position then National Highways should contribute to the funding using designated funds.	The proposed walking and cycling route ties into the existing footway / cycleway at the Cart and Horses (Kings Worthy) end of the scheme, which is existing Hampshire County Council provision. Future changes to the highway at the Cart and Horses junction are outside the Scheme and will need to be brought forward by Hampshire County Council.	Not agreed	30 October 2023
4.7	Easton Lane to Long Walk walking, cycling and horse-riding route Surfacing	General Arrangement Plans (2.4, APP-009)	The route to Long Walk, being a recreational route, does not have to meet utility route standards. Cycle Winchester would expect it to meet the quality guidance provided by Hampshire County Council and the British Horse Society.	The route is proposed to have an unbound surface. National Highways are engaging with Hampshire County Council Countryside Team on the detailed design of the new walking, cycling and horse-riding link.	Agreed	21 June 2023
4.8	Easton Lane to Long Walk walking, cycling and horse-riding route Width and fencing	Typical Carriageway Sections of Engineering Plans and Sections (2.6, Rev 1)	It's not clear what the width of this bridleway will be, and to what extent (being mostly across open grassland) it will be fenced in. To minimise conflict between users and reduce erosion, Cycle Winchester would like to see it specified as being as wide as possible and unfenced where feasible.	The proposed width of the bridleway is 3m, as per Typical Carriageway Sections of Engineering Plans and Sections (2.6, Rev 1) . Fencing is not proposed directly adjacent to the new walking, cycling and horse-riding route.	Agreed	6 July 2023
Construction						
5. Traffic Management Plan						
5.1	NCN Route 23 Diversions during construction	Figure 2.6 (Temporary diversion of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes) of	Although the NCN23 route is not used to its full potential, it is heavily used by local cyclists and alternative routes will be needed and mitigation measures required. The diversion route	Figure 2.6 (Temporary diversion of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes) of Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings – Figures (Part 3 of 4)) of the ES (6.2, APP-063) shows	Not agreed	8 November 2023

Reference	Issue	Document References (if relevant)	Cycle Winchester's Position	National Highways' Position	Status	Date
		<p>Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings – Figures (Part 3 of 4)) of the ES (6.2, APP-063) and Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, Rev 1)</p>	<p>proposed in the DCO submission (Table 12.25 of Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-053)), although legal, is unsuitable for cyclists and equestrians to use. Despite many opportunities (and many requests), the National Highways project team failed to discuss it with the WCH consultative group before submitting the proposal. There's no way Cycle Winchester can agree to it.</p> <p>Two possible diversion routes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Long Walk, Fair Lane and Alresford Road (B3404), and ▪ Easton Lane and Martyr Worthy Road (B3047). <p>Alresford Road is busy and hostile to cyclists and so National Highways should be looking at funding mitigation measures to make it more suitable as an alternative cycle route. Cycle Winchester note that the project team considers Alresford Road to be a safe diversion route without further mitigation. Based on real-world experience, we disagree. It is a busy road with fast-moving traffic, relatively narrow vehicle lanes and no cycle facility. While it is true that some short sections of NCN Route 23 use national speed limit roads, these are all quiet country lanes with very low traffic levels and physical characteristics that make high driving speeds impossible in practice.</p> <p>Cycle Winchester would like to see an open discussion of diversion routes and agreement on appropriate routes, projected timescales, diversion management, and mitigation needed to make those diversions practical for the wide range of cyclists who currently use the route.</p>	<p>two temporary diversion routes for NCN Route 23.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.8.11 and table 12.25 in Chapter 12 (Population and Human Health) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (6.1, APP-053) was updated at Deadline 4 to make the diversion routes clearer.</p> <p>The route for cyclists diverted from the eastern side of the gyratory during construction phases 1 and 2 would be along Long Walk, Fair Lane and then west on Alresford Road as per the first suggested option in the comment. Neither of the diversion routes are illegal or impossible for cyclists and equestrians to use and National Highways does not consider it necessary to undertake any works before they can be used.</p> <p>The diversion route on Alresford Road contains an approximately 100m stretch at national speed limit before the limit decreases to 40mph. The diversion route for NCN Route 23 will be clearly signposted and monitored and checked during its implementation. Further mitigation is not needed for this diversion on the basis that the NCN Route 23 contains sections of national speed limit roads throughout its route already. Mitigation will be reviewed during construction and implementation of the diversion route.</p> <p>As outlined in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, Rev 2), updated at Deadline 5, National Highways commit to producing a PRow Management Plan during detailed design. National Highways will have regard to Cycle Winchester's views during the development of the PRow Management Plan during detailed design. This will include controls to manage the crossing of the haulage route and NCN Route 23 and on Long Walk.</p>		
5.2	<p>Diversion routes Impact of traffic diversion on cyclists</p>	<p>Outline Traffic Management Plan (7.8, Rev 1), Figure 2.5 of Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its</p>	<p>Cycle Winchester has the impression that the project team has not yet considered the impact that traffic diversions during construction will have on cyclists. Examples of areas where the diverted traffic might have an impact on cycling</p>	<p>Diversion routes via the B3047, the B3420 Andover Road and road east of the junction (A31) will be implemented at various stages of the Scheme. The works are planned to be undertaken during overnight off-peak closures</p>	<p>Not agreed</p>	<p>8 November 2023</p>

Reference	Issue	Document References (if relevant)	Cycle Winchester's Position	National Highways' Position	Status	Date
		<p>Surroundings – Figures (Part 3 of 4) of the ES (6.2, APP-063)</p>	<p>include many of the major routes in and out of Winchester, as a Junction 9 closure or complete M3 closure would force more traffic onto these roads. Some examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B3047 Worthy Road/Martyr Worthy Road ▪ B3335 St Cross Rd and Twyford Road ▪ B3420 Andover Road ▪ B3330 Bar End Road ▪ Minor roads, especially in the upper Itchen valley east of the junction <p>In addition, the location of the site offices and parking immediately to the east of the junction suggests that the likely travel-to-work route of staff working on the project would clash with the proposed cycling diversion routes as well as impacting walkers, cyclists and horse riders on the section of NCN23 near Easton village. (See 6.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 2 The Scheme and its Surroundings - Figures Part 1 of 4).</p> <p>Again, we would like to see a clear consultation process that will ensure that consultation happens, that the effects on non-motorised road users are accounted for, and appropriate measures are taken.</p>	<p>(when there is less traffic on the network) and several extended weekend closures.</p> <p>The B3335 St Cross and Twyford Road and B3330 Bar End Road have been referenced as secondary diversion routes and should only be used by non-motorway traffic, or for those accessing the residential area at Bar-End.</p> <p>There are mitigation measures for rat-running and this will be monitored throughout construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>National Highways commit to producing a PRoW Management Plan during detailed design. National Highways will have regard to Cycle Winchester's views during the development of the PRoW Management Plan during detailed design. This will include controls to manage the crossing of the haulage route and NCN Route 23 and on Long Walk.</p>		