

Winchester City Council

Examination of Joint Core Strategy

Day 3 – Thursday 1 November [PM]: North Whiteley – Policy SH3, Session/Issue 6

Highways Agency (00085) Written Statement October 2012

- i) **Are the policies and proposals for growth and change in this area appropriate and justified, including in relation to the NPPF, and in terms of environmental, economic and social impact?**

No comment.

- ii) **Are they clear and deliverable, including in respect of the associated infrastructure requirements?**

Role of the HA

1. The Highways Agency's (HA) interest relates to the motorway and all-purpose trunk road network that we manage on behalf of the Secretary of State. In spatial planning and development control terms the HA has a duty to manage and operate the Strategic Road Network (SRN, i.e. motorway and trunk road network) as laid down in the DfT Circular 02/2007: 'Planning and the Strategic Road Network', and the March 2007 Communities and Local Government: 'Guidance on Transport Assessment' (ISBN 978-0-11-552856-9, also available from the CLG website).

Current Status of the SRN in and around North Whiteley

2. The principal concern of the HA is the safe and efficient operation of the SRN in England. Maintaining a safe and efficient SRN is important to the viability of existing and proposed development and to the local and national economy (PPG13). In the case of Winchester, this relates directly to sections of the M3, M27, A34 (T) and A303 (T). It should be noted that development in Winchester has the potential to impact sections of the SRN outside its boundaries, such as the M27 Junction 7, and sections of the A3(M). Significant network stress levels have been recorded at M3 Junctions 8-14 and also at M27 Junctions 3-4 and 5-9.
3. In the case of North Whiteley our interest primarily relates to the M27 Junction 9, which would provide the main access/egress to and from the development. This junction currently experiences heavy congestion in the AM and PM peak periods. Whilst, the proximity of M27 Junction 9 makes it our primary concern, it should be stated that the HA also has concerns regarding the impact of the development at the M27 Junctions 7 and 8.

This could be exacerbated by the nearby development proposals contained in the Eastleigh Borough Draft Local Plan.

4. The HA has no planned SRN improvements works on the M27 in the vicinity of the North Whiteley development.

HA Position on the North Whiteley Development

5. Land to the North of Whiteley is allocated for the development of about 3,000 dwellings together with supporting uses. Whilst the site land owners are proposing 3,500 dwellings together with supporting uses. The HA has been working with consultants PBA, on behalf of the North Whiteley landowners, to develop the transport proposals for the development since 2009.
6. We have some general concerns over the large volume of dwellings (3500) proposed at the site given that road access is limited to M27 Junction 9 / A27 at Segensworth, which experiences severe congestion at peak times.
7. Severe impacts (prior to mitigation) are expected to be shown at M27 Junction 9 and potentially also Junction 7. We also have concerns regarding the ability of the M27 link capacity to accommodate the additional traffic.
8. This view is supported by the Winchester District LDF Transport Assessment (Stage 1) (WSP 2008) which states that with respect to the North Whiteley site 'unless transport problems are addressed, the site will exacerbate traffic problems at M27 Junction 9 even with the completion of Whiteley Way to the north.
9. Transport modelling work is in progress to demonstrate the potential impacts of the development on the SRN. We are supporting PBA through this process but to date the modelling work of the M27 link and junctions is not yet complete.

Impacts on the SRN

10. At this stage the full impacts of the North Whiteley development on the SRN are currently unknown.
11. Mitigation measures have been put forward in associated with the development, but they have yet to be tested as part of the transport modelling to see if they are appropriate to mitigate the impacts of the development. Therefore it is not known if the transport measures proposed for the development fully mitigate the development in line with National Policy.
12. The HA has additional concerns regarding the affordability and deliverability of the required mitigation measures.

Core Strategy Soundness concerns

13. At present it is unclear as to whether the necessary mitigation measures required to manage down the impact of development on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN are deliverable and affordable.
14. We therefore consider that policy SH3 is not sound in accordance with National Policy as this significant development is not yet 'Justified' or can be considered 'Effective' in terms of delivery.

How can the Core Strategy be made sound?

15. As noted above, at this stage there are question marks surrounding the affordability and deliverability of the highway infrastructure requirements required to support the North Whiteley development, which may compromise the soundness of Policy SH3.
16. Whilst the HA is committed to working together with the North Whiteley developers to develop a strategy to mitigate impacts on the SRN as far as possible, unfortunately the analysis has not been completed to date. It is not clear to the HA if the initial mitigation measures put forward in association with the development are currently 'fit-for-purpose' for mitigating the likely impacts of development on the SRN.
17. The HA considers that the best way to resolve remaining issues is to continue working with the North Whiteley developers to develop their transport assessment and associated transport mitigation strategy. It is proposed that this evidence work will take place ahead of the Development Management and Allocations DPD, after the adoption of the Core Strategy.

What is the precise change/wording being sought?

18. If a transport strategy to mitigate the impacts of the development on the SRN is to be delivered through lower level DPDs, a framework for this would need to be set out in the Core Strategy, as per the recommendations outlined below:
 - A North Whiteley transport mitigation strategy will be developed as part of the Development Management and Allocations DPD and will therefore be subject to public examination. This mitigation strategy will include:
 - A full package of mitigation measures to demonstrate how the impact of the development on the strategic road network will be managed and mitigated
 - The delivery mechanisms of the mitigation works including cost, funding, the delivery vehicle, and timing (including phasing)
 - How the development will achieve proposed levels of self containment by providing a wide range of employment,

education, community, recreation & sport, and retail uses as an integral part of the new development;

- How the development will achieve a justifiable reduction in vehicular trips, and reduce reliance on the car, with the emphasis on smarter choices, in particular walking, cycling, public transport, car sharing, and home working;
- How the development will encourage walking and cycling and the use of public transport through the creation of walkable neighbourhoods, and an internal movement network focussed upon sustainable modes, viable and attractive district and local centres, safe and direct routes for walking;
- The car parking strategy which provides restraint in areas of high accessibility, and encourages trips by non car means;
- How the actual travel impacts of the development will be monitored.
- A public transport strategy and Framework Travel Plan

19. This will help to provide assurance that further work will be conducted through the Local Plan process to mitigate the impacts on the SRN. The HA considers the above measures to represent a pragmatic way forward.

iii) Are the mitigation proposals for European designated sites appropriate and deliverable?

No comment.

Winchester City Council

Examination of Joint Core Strategy

**Day 7 – Thursday 8 November [AM]: Transport – Policy CP10,
Session/Issue 11**

Highways Agency (00085) Written Statement October 2012

- i) Is the overall transport strategy and policy consistent with the NPPF and the Local Transport Plan and, if not, what needs to be changed and why?**

No comment

- ii) Is the policy suitable and appropriate to deliver the necessary transport infrastructure improvements with new developments, including in terms of rail and bus services, park and ride, cycling and walking and, if not, what else needs to be done and why?**

Please see paragraphs 1 to 19 of the HA's written statement provided for the North Whiteley session.

- iii) Is the policy JCS suitable and appropriate to encourage increased use of public transport, cycling and walking and, if not, what needs to be changed?**

No comment

Winchester City Council

Examination of Joint Core Strategy

**Day 7– Thursday 8 November [AM]:
Infrastructure/Delivery/Flexibility/Monitoring and Implementation –
Policy CP21,
Session/Issue 12**

Highways Agency (00085) Written Statement October 2012

- i) [Infrastructure] - Bearing in mind the funding required, is the overall strategy economically viable and practically achievable in the timescales envisaged and in the forms proposed and, if not, what should be changed to enhance delivery prospects?**
- ii) [Delivery] - Is the necessary public and private sector funding likely to be available to deliver development on the strategic sites and elsewhere in the district, including via the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy?**
- iii) [Flexibility] - Is the CS reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances and, if not, what changes/contingencies would improve the ability to respond to new issues arising during the plan period, such as a lack of investment in major projects?**
- iv) [Monitoring] - Will the monitoring proposed throughout the CS, be sufficiently comprehensive and informative to achieve its objectives and if not, why not, and what needs to be changed?**
- v) [Implementation] - Are the implementation mechanisms identified sufficient and suitable to achieve their objectives, for example in relation to delivering the strategic housing allocations and, if not, why not, and what needs to be changed?**

Please see paragraphs 1 to 19 of the HA's written statement provided for the North Whiteley session.