



Land and Development Advisory

Ageas Bowl Masterplan

Transport Assessment Addendum





Land and Development Advisory

Ageas Bowl Masterplan

Transport Assessment Addendum

Public

Project no. 70073579

Our Ref. No. TAA-001

Date: April 2023

WSP


Grosvenor House
2 Grosvenor Square
Southampton, Hampshire
SO15 2BE

Phone: +44 238 030 2529

Fax: +44 238 030 2001

WSP.com

Quality control

Issue/revision	First issue	Revision 1	Revision 2	Revision 3
Remarks	First Issue			
Date	04/04/2023			
Prepared by	Milly Bagshaw Stacey Gander Philip Moss			
Signature				
Checked by	Chris Williams			
Signature				
Authorised by	Chris Williams			
Signature				
Project number	70073579			
Report number	TAA001			
File reference	\\uk.wspgroup.com\central data\Projects\700735xx\70073579 - Ageas Bowl Masterplan\03 WIP\TP Transport Planning\05 Reports\Post App\Transport Assessment Addendum Mar23.docx			

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.2	Report Structure	2
2	WCHAR	3
2.1	Hampshire County Council Comment	3
2.2	WSP Response	3
3	Accident Data Refresh	4
3.1	Hampshire County Council Comment	4
3.2	WSP Response	4
4	Car Park Access Design	7
4.1	Hampshire County Council Comment	7
4.2	WSP Response	7
5	Pavilion Access Ramp	9
5.1	Hampshire County Council Comment	9
5.2	WSP Response	9
6	Internal Layout	10
6.1	Hampshire County Council Comment	10
6.2	WSP Response	10
7	Footpath Links through Telegraph Woods	11
7.1	Hampshire County Council Comment	11
7.2	WSP Response	11

8	Committed Developments	12
8.1	Hampshire County Council Comment	12
8.2	WSP Response	12
9	Botley Road / Marshall Drive Traffic Signal Junction	13
9.1	Hampshire County Council Comment	13
9.2	WSP Response	13
10	Event Day Junction Capacity Assessment	15
10.1	Hampshire County Council Comment	15
10.2	WSP Response	15
10.3	One-Day Internationals	15
10.4	Twenty20 Cricket Matches	17
10.5	Evidence Base from Thorneydown TA	17
11	Traffic Management	18
11.1	Hampshire County Council Comment	18
11.2	WSP Response	18
12	Residential and Workplace Travel Plan	19
12.1	Hampshire County Council Comment	19
12.2	WSP Response	24
13	Junction 7, M27	25
13.1	National Highways Comment	25
13.2	WSP Response	25
14	A334 Charles Watts Way	29
14.1	National Highways Comment	29
14.2	WSP Response	29

Tables

Table 1-1 – Breakdown of Development Proposals	1
Table 9-1 – 2027 Base modelling results	14
Table 9-2 – 2027 Base + Development flows modelling results	14
Table 10-1 – Summary of ODI arrivals in the AM peak	16
Table 10-2 - B3035 Botley Road/ Event Day Car Park Access Junction Modelling Results	16
Table 13-1 – TemPRO growth factors 2021-2032	25
Table 13-2 – M27, Junction 7 (2032 Baseline)	27
Table 13-3 - M27, Junction 7 (2032 with Development)	27
Table 14-1 – Summary of event day use of Charles Watts Way	29

Figures

Figure 3-1 - Accident Data	5
Figure 10-1 - Profile arrivals (T20 England Vs. India)	17

Appendices

Appendix A
Hampshire County Council Comments
Appendix B
National Highways Comments
Appendix C
WCHAR
Appendix D
Event Day Car Park Access
Appendix E
Road Safety Audit and Road Safety Response
Appendix F
Swept Path Analysis



Appendix G

Botley Road, Marshall Drive Modelling Results

Appendix H

Event Day Car Park Junction Model Outputs

Appendix I

Thorneydown TA Assumptions

Appendix J

Residential and Workplace Travel Plans

Appendix K

M27 Signal Specification

Appendix L

M27 Junction 7 Traffic Flow Diagrams

Appendix M

M27 Junction 7 Modelling Results

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1. WSP has been commissioned by Land & Development Advisory Ltd to provide transport planning support for a detailed planning application at the Ageas Bowl, Eastleigh. This document provides a Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA) to the Transport Assessment (TA) (Report No.3579-TA-001) submitted in support of planning application F/22/93194.
- 1.1.2. Following submission, Hampshire County Council (HCC) and National Highways (NH) in their role as the local and strategic Highway Authority raised formal comments regarding the proposals for the Ageas Bowl from a highways and transport perspective. The comments raised have been included within **Appendix A** and **Appendix B** for HCC and NH respectively.
- 1.1.3. This revision of the TAA provides responses available at the time of publication, reflecting on-going work by the Applicant in response to consultee comments on planning application F/22/93194. Further iterations of the TAA will be submitted once all information becomes available to form a full response to comments raised by each highway authority.
- 1.1.4. As outlined from the Transport Assessment the development proposals from the Ageas Bowl masterplan will comprise of the following:

'The erection of 185 new homes, a 71-bedroom care home (Use Class C2), a 142-bedroom hotel (Use Class C1), a well-being centre (Use Class E / F2), a new pavilion building and improvements to existing stadium, new vehicular access, car parking, pedestrian circulation and processional ramp, together with tree planting, landscaping, SuDs and biodiversity enhancements.'

- 1.1.5. The Table 1-1 below summarises the development proposals at The Ageas Bowl site, these have been broken down into Character Areas.

Table 1-1 – Breakdown of Development Proposals

Character Area	Land Use	Land-Use Quantum/ Quantity
1 (North of site)	Car Park Spectator Ramp and Merchandise shop	717 Event Day parking spaces 25sqm
2 (Centre/ east of site)	Budget Hotel Hotel Car Park	142 bedrooms 213 parking spaces (Combined with existing Hotel Car Park)
3 (Centre/ east of site)	Pavilion and Maintenance	3,640sqm
4 (South of site)	Care Home	71 bedrooms (+Concierge)
5 (West of site)	Residential	103 houses and 82 flats

	Well-Being Centre	1,237sqm
--	-------------------	----------

1.2 Report Structure

- 1.2.1. The layout of this Transport Assessment Addendum sets out the queries raised by HCC/ NH and will be followed by response by WSP.

2 WCHAR

2.1 Hampshire County Council Comment

- 2.1.1. The HCC Highways response raised a query regarding the application not including a Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment Report (WCHAR). The full details of the comment are presented below.

It is noted that a WCHAR assessment has not been undertaken and it is requested that an assessment is provided in accordance with HCC's Technical Guidance Note TG19. This should focus on routes to local schools, and local amenities such as convenience stores, as well as assessing the pedestrian and cycling infrastructure in the vicinity of the site.

2.2 WSP Response

- 2.2.1. WSP have undertaken a WCHAR following the request from HCC Highways, the WCHAR report is included within **Appendix C** of this document.

3 Accident Data Refresh

3.1 Hampshire County Council Comment

- 3.1.1. The HCC Highways response raised a query regarding the accident data presented as part of the application Transport Assessment (TA) being out of date. The full details of the comment are presented below.
- 3.1.2. *A PIA (Personal Injury Accident) data has been provided, from 1st May 2015 to 30th April 2020, obtained from Hampshire constabulary. The TA states that in November 2021 more recent accident data was requested, however Hampshire Constabulary confirmed that the data provided is the most recent dataset. However, this request is almost a year old, and the applicant should confirm if there is more recent data available.*


3.2 WSP Response

- 3.2.1. WSP have received updated Collision Data from Hampshire Constabulary, with a review of the Collision Data detailed below.

Collision Data

- 3.2.2. Based upon the analysis of Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data received from Hampshire Constabulary for the latest available 5-year period (01/10/2017 – 30/09/2022) a total of 194 PIAs occurred with 37 being classified as 'Serious' (19%) and 157 classified as 'Slight' (81%). No fatal accidents were recorded within the study period or area, for which a 1km buffer was used around the Site which incorporated all of the key local junctions identified. Approximately 11% of the recorded incidents involved at least one pedal cycle.
- 3.2.3. Figure 3-1 shows the location of the accidents that occurred in the study area during the most recent five year period.

Figure 3-1 - Accident Data



- 3.2.4. Five cluster sites of accidents were identified at the following locations with a review of the data identifying the majority of the recorded accidents as being 'Slight':

- M27 – Junction 7;
- A27 – Kanes Hill Roundabout;
- A27 Church Hill/West End Road junction;
- A334 Charles Watts Way/B3342 Tollbar Way/Turnpike Way Roundabout; and
- Botley Road/B3035 Mini-Roundabouts.

- 3.2.5. A review of the causation factors at these cluster sites identified that the PIAs were caused by human error, with factors such as ‘failing to see’ and ‘careless/reckless/in a hurry’ being listed as opposed to issues within the operation/design of the highway network.
- 3.2.6. One slight PIA was recorded within proximity of the proposed site access junction near the signalised B3035 Botley Road/Marshall Drive junction. The causation factor for this accident was listed ‘loss of control’ and ‘failed to judge other persons path or speed’. No vulnerable road users were recorded as being involved.
- 3.2.7. Another incident occurred on Marshall Drive; however this was attributed to a medical episode of a cyclist and did not involve any other road users.
- 3.2.8. In conclusion, it can be determined that there are no operational issues within the local highway network within proximity of the proposed development, with previous PIAs occurring due to human/driver error. Given the limited level of traffic associated with the development proposals in comparison with existing traffic flows, it can be determined that the operation of the proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon active modes of transport from the highway safety perspective.

4 Car Park Access Design

4.1 Hampshire County Council Comment

- 4.1.1. The HCC Highways response raised the issues noted below regarding the proposed Event Day Car Park junction which will be accessed via Botley Road. The details of the query are outlined below:

A new event day car park is proposed, via an existing gated access off Botley Road. Visibility splays for the access have not been provided, and these should be included as part of this submission. The precise location of this access should be confirmed, which highlights the existing details/context of the surrounding area of the access, along with the Highway Boundary, to confirm ownership that is affected by this proposal

Furthermore, the geometry and the type of access that is being proposed to serve the new event day car park should be made clear. Arguably, two sets of dropped kerb vehicle crossovers could be utilised, meaning that pedestrians will not have to negotiate two bellmouth junctions when, for the vast majority of the year when events are not taking place, there will be no vehicle movements through this access. This is the Highway Authority's preference as it provides pedestrian priority. Also, the alternative dropped kerb access option can be processed via a S184 license instead of a S278 Agreement. However, if the bellmouth/priority junction arrangement is progressed then an RSA1 (Road Safety Audit) would be required at this stage for any planning application future submission.

It is however noted that localised traffic management would be required on match days to manage pedestrian/vehicle conflict for either access design proposals.

Finally, and regardless of the ultimate junction form, updated vehicle tracking should be provided. Whilst tracking has been provided identifying a vehicle entering and existing the new site access arrangement, the dimension of this tracked vehicle should be provided along with the tracking speed.

4.2 WSP Response

- 4.2.1. WSP have updated the Drawing 3579-SK-101, which was included within Appendix F of the Transport Assessment. Further details are included on the drawing (provided in **Appendix D** of this document) to confirm its location, including the HCC highway boundary and location of the existing site access.
- 4.2.2. The Event Day Car Park access junction has undergone a redesign to reduce the overall footprint of the junction. This includes narrowing the access/ egress widths into the car park from 4m to 3.5m to encourage slow vehicle speeds. The design will maintain the two sets of dropped kerbs, but the width of the pedestrian crossing has reduced from between 4-5m to approximately 3.75m and the refuge island width from 12m to 3m. Given that vehicles will not be using the junction on non-event days, this revised approach provides the appropriate balance between maintaining the existing pedestrian route and catering for high volumes of

traffic and traffic management arrangements on event days. On non-event days, the junction will be gated which will prevent vehicles from using and therefore maintain pedestrian priority across the access junction.

- 4.2.3. WSP have provided a separate drawing 3579-SK-102 presenting the localised traffic management on the arrival into the Car Park. The drawing presents the traffic cones to be located on Botley Road which will maintain the existing 2-way movement on Botley Road for vehicles as well as providing the space for vehicles to turn into the Event Day Car park.

Road Safety Audit and Response Report

- 4.2.4. The Access has undergone a Road Safety Audit Stage 1. This will be shared with HCC once complete, along with the Designers Response and Draft Decision Log. These documents will be included within **Appendix E** of this document when complete.

5 Pavilion Access Ramp

5.1 Hampshire County Council Comment

- 5.1.1. The HCC Highways response raised an issues regarding the lack of information given around the new access ramp into grounds from the new event day car park. The details of the query are outlined below:

A new access ramp is being proposed, which leads from the new event day car park into the grounds. However, no information regarding the structure type or form has been provided. The Highway Authority request that further information surrounding this new proposed structure are provided for review, especially as this structure goes over an internal access road.

5.2 WSP Response

- 5.2.1. Further details of the access ramp will be provided in due course.

6 Internal Layout

6.1 Hampshire County Council Comment

- 6.1.1. The HCC Highways review of the Transportation documentation raised concerns about the swept path undertaken as part of the application for the servicing and delivery vehicles. The comment is as follows:

Swept path analysis has been undertaken demonstrating that a large refuse vehicle is able to enter and exist both the internal of the residential area and care home. However, tracking speeds should be provided and resubmitted if necessary; the Highway Authority require a minimum tracking speed of 10mph. The tracking provided to date overruns kerbs in some locations, which is not acceptable.

6.2 WSP Response

- 6.2.1. Updated swept path analysis of the masterplan will be provided in due course. These drawings will be included in **Appendix F** of this document.

7 Footpath Links through Telegraph Woods

7.1 Hampshire County Council Comment

- 7.1.1. The HCC Highways response raised a query focused around the pedestrian and cyclist footpath link between the site and Telegraph Woods connecting to Telegraph Road and beyond. The full details of the comment are presented below.

An additional pedestrian and cycle path is being proposed through Telegraph Woods connecting to Telegraph Road, tying into the existing footpaths. However, further information regarding the design of the footpath link should be provided, with any design adhering to LTN 1/20.

Furthermore, confirmation on the ownership/status of the existing footpaths should also be provided and how this to be secured for public use and maintained in perpetuity. Additionally, details surrounding the surfacing materials and lightning proposals of this footpath should be provided. Furthermore, it should be explored how this footpath links to Telegraph Road and whether any additional mitigation/strategies are required here.

Any impact on the existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network required separate consultation with HCC Countryside Service Team.

7.2 WSP Response

- 7.2.1. Further details of the access ramp will be provided in due course. However, it is no longer proposed that the route through Telegraph Woods will be provided as a formal route and will instead consist only of a leisure route which is signed from the Proposed Development. This will therefore be provided as a “Permissive Path” rather than a designated Right of Way.

8 Committed Developments

8.1 Hampshire County Council Comment

- 8.1.1. The following comment was received from the HCC Highways regarding committed development inclusion in the original Transport Assessment:

“Land west and South of Horton Heath –proposed allocation for 950 dwellings”, that is stated in the TA is outdated and has been replaced by a more recent application, application number O/20/89498. The Highway Authority request that this application is therefore included as part of any committed developments.”

8.2 WSP Response

- 8.2.1. The application material associated with O/20/89498 has been reviewed. Appendix L of the Transport Assessment submitted alongside the planning application contains anticipated future trip generation for proposed development. The traffic flow diagram entitled ‘*Scenario: Total Development Trip Generation*’ which is contained within this appendix shows no vehicles travelling on Botley Road in either direction, in either the AM or PM peak. This is the same level of traffic flow assumed to be generated by this committed development within the original Transport Assessment, which also assumed no additional traffic flow would be generated on Botley Road as a result of the Land west and south of Horton Heath development. As such, the previously assessed committed development remains valid and robust for the local highway network.
- 8.2.2. With respect to traffic flows generated by this committed development at Junction 7 of the M27, these have been included in the junction capacity assessment of this junction which is summarised in Chapter 13 in this Transport Assessment Addendum. These committed development flows have been taken from the Transport Assessment that accompanied planning application O/20/89498.

9 Botley Road / Marshall Drive Traffic Signal Junction

9.1 Hampshire County Council Comment

- 9.1.1. The following comment was received from the HCC Highways regarding the Botley Road/ Marshall Drive Signal Junction traffic modelling:

Traffic modelling has been undertaken for the Botley Road/Marshall drive junction. Baseline conditions have been informed by a manual classified count and queue length survey undertaken the 2nd December 2021. Linsig has been used to review the current operation of the Botley Road/Marshall Drive junction and the impact of the development traffic on this junction.

The Highway Authority have reviewed the modelling provided and note the below issues with this:

- *the minimum green times for some phases (e.g. pedestrians and left turn filter) differ from those on street*
- *the use of infinitely long lanes throughout is incorrect. There are short, flared lanes on all approaches*
- *lane widths differ for some links, which affect the saturation flows*

However, in light of the above the Highway Authority have run a revised version of the model which includes correction of the errors mentioned above. The result from this revised model shows that for all years, both with and without development traffic, the junction will operate satisfactorily, including a good level of spare capacity in the AM and PM peaks. In conclusion the signal junction can accommodate the development flows and no capacity changes would be necessary.

No modelling has been carried out for any events at the Ageas Bowl when traffic flows would be far higher. However, as the HA operate the signals manually during these events this is considered unnecessary.

9.2 WSP Response

- 9.2.1. For completeness WSP have updated the site access modelling based on the comments received by HCC. As outlined by HCC the changes do not impact the overall operation of the junction, which will operate within capacity with and without the development across both peak periods. Table 9-1 and Table 9-2 present the 2027 baseline and 2027 baseline with development modelling results. The full outputs of the modelling results are included within **Appendix G**.

Table 9-1 – 2027 Base modelling results

		AM Peak (07:45-08:45)			PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)		
Arm	Movement	Degree of Saturation (%)	Mean Max Queue	Delay (s)	Degree of Saturation (%)	Mean Max Queue	Delay (s)
2027 Base							
1/1 + 1/2	Botley Road WB Left Turn + Ahead	80	25	26	81	26	28
2/1 + 2/2	Marshall Drive Right + Left Turn	61	3	66	79	6	75
3/1 + 3/2	Botley Road EB Ahead Right Turn	74	15	19	69	9	22
Overall Junction		Overall PRC: 13.8% Cycle Time: 120 seconds			Overall PRC: 11.3% Cycle Time: 120 seconds		

Table 9-2 – 2027 Base + Development flows modelling results

		AM Peak (07:45-08:45)			PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)		
Arm	Movement	Degree of Saturation (%)	Mean Max Queue	Delay (s)	Degree of Saturation (%)	Mean Max Queue	Delay (s)
2027 Base + Development Flows Results							
1/1 + 1/2	Botley Road WB Left Turn + Ahead	89	32	37	90	32	38
2/1 + 2/2	Marshall Drive Right Left Turn	82	6	75	89	8	87
3/1 + 3/2	Botley Road EB Ahead + Right Turn	79	18	24	84	12	84
Overall Junction		Overall PRC: 1.2% Cycle Time: 120 seconds			Overall PRC: 0.6% Cycle Time: 120 seconds		

10 Event Day Junction Capacity Assessment

10.1 Hampshire County Council Comment

10.1.1. The following comment was received from the HCC Highways regarding the assumptions made in the original Transport Assessment:

“An event-day capacity assessment has been undertaken for the new access junction on B3035 Botley Road, using Junction 9 modelling. The result show that during event day, the new event day car parking access will operate within capacity. However, this assumption is based on assuming that:

- *For One-Day International Matches occurring on a weekday up to 46.8% of event spectators are assumed to arrive in the AM peak period, and*
- *For Concerts or Twenty Twenty Cricket Matches up to 41% of event spectators are assumed to arrive in the PM peak period.*

Assuming the maximum car park capacity is 700, would result in 328 arrivals in the AM peak and 288 arrivals in the PM peak, with a 50/50 split of direction of travel. However, this is just an assumption, and the applicant should confirm if this is the worst-case scenario that has been used.”

10.2 WSP Response

10.2.1. In order for WSP to be able to respond to this query from HCC, further information has been obtained from Hampshire Cricket Club. This includes the profile of spectator arrivals for both One Day Internationals and Twenty20 Cricket Matches between 2019 – 2022 and utilising the approach from the Thorneydown TA to ensure a robust assessment has been undertaken. This information is set out below together with a consideration of the implications.

10.3 One-Day Internationals

10.3.1. The profile of arrivals for the following One Day Internationals were assessed:

- England vs. Pakistan One Day International (11/05/19);
- CWC South Africa vs. India (05/06/19);
- CWC South Africa vs. West Indies (10/06/19);
- CWC England vs. West Indies (14/06/19);
- CWC India vs. Afghanistan (22/06/19); and
- CWC Bangladesh vs. Afghanistan (24/06/19).

10.3.2. The arrivals at these matches within the AM peak arrivals are set out in the table below.

Table 10-1 – Summary of ODI arrivals in the AM peak

	No. of arrivals (10:00 – 11:00)	Total Daily Arrivals	Percentage of arrivals in AM peak (%)
England vs. Pakistan One Day International (11/05/19)	5,271	10,931	48.2%
CWC South Africa vs. India (05/06/19)	3,843	8,210	46.8%
CWC South Africa vs. West Indies (10/06/19)	2,708	7,284	37.2%
CWC England vs. West Indies (14/06/19)	5,266	9,839	53.5%
CWC India vs. Afghanistan (22/06/19)	4,296	9,752	44.1%
CWC Bangladesh vs. Afghanistan (24/06/19)	2,901	8,403	34.5%
Average percentage of arrivals in AM peak			44.1%

- 10.3.3. As can be seen above, the highest recorded percentage of arrivals in the AM peak was 53.5%, which is higher than the previously assessed 46.8%. For a 700-space car park and increase in peak hour arrivals from 46.8% to 53.5% equates to an additional 47 vehicles. The implications of these additional vehicles are now considered.
- 10.3.4. Table 10-2 below replicates the junction assessment carried out in Table 8-5 in the Transport Assessment, assessing the Event Day Car Park access. This updated version of the assessment includes the additional 47 vehicles, taking account of the increase presented in paragraph 10.3.3. The full junction modelling outputs are included in **Appendix H**.

Table 10-2 - B3035 Botley Road/ Event Day Car Park Access Junction Modelling Results

Arm	AM Peak			PM Peak		
	Queue (PCU)	Delay	RFC	Queue (PCU)	Delay	RFC
A3035 Botley Road (Right turn in)	3	9	0.51	1	9	0.32

- 10.3.5. These additional vehicles make little difference to the junctions' operation. In both peaks, the RFC is well below 1, meaning that the junction is operating well within capacity. A small

queue of three vehicles is forecast in the AM peak and just a single vehicle in the PM peak. The delay in each period is less than nine seconds.


10.4 Twenty20 Cricket Matches

10.4.1. The profile of arrivals for the following additional matches was assessed:

- Twenty20 England vs. Sri Lanka (Saturday 26/6/21);
- Twenty20 England vs. India (Thursday 7/7/22); and
- Twenty20 England vs. South Africa (Sunday 31/7/22).

10.4.2. As the only assessed scenario which took place on a weekday was the England vs. India match on 7/7/22. The full profile arrivals for this match are set out in table Figure 10-1.

Figure 10-1 - Profile arrivals (T20 England Vs. India)



10.4.3. As can be seen above, 43.5% of total arrivals occurred between the 17:00 and 18:00. This is marginally higher than 41% of event spectators which was assumed within the Transport Assessment for Twenty20 Cricket Matches. However, it is still lower than the assessed arrivals for One Day International matches. As such, the assessment undertaken within the Transport Assessment can be seen as robust and as representing a worst-case scenario.

10.5 Evidence Base from Thorneydown TA

10.5.1. The evidence base from the Thorneydown TA is included in **Appendix H** for reference

11 Traffic Management

11.1 Hampshire County Council Comment

11.1.1. The Local Highway Authority have provided the following comments in respect to traffic management:

“Details of this should be provided now to identify any additional mitigation methods that may be required to prevent event day traffic from parking within the new proposed areas, and how this will be managed.

Currently it is not clear how access to the residential/hotel/care home element of this proposal will be maintained during event days, with the TA stating that there is to be a temporary closure of B3035 Botley Road between the roundabout junction with B3342 Tollbar Way and the mini-roundabout junction with Moorgreen Road during the period of peak demand after events at the Ageas Bowl.

Confirmation should be provided on how the new proposed residential development/ Care home/ hotel access will be retained if there is to be a temporary road closure to help mitigate with the event traffic.”

And

“The Highway Authority note that with the reconfiguration on site, and inclusion of the new parking facilities at Thorneydown Farm (once constructed), will result in an increase in 85 parking spaces. However, whilst there is an increase in parking spaces being provided there is a loss of parking spaces within close proximity to Ageas Bowls venue, with the relocated spaces resulting in a longer distance to walk to the venue.

This could potentially worsen the event day on-street parking situation, which is already resulting in ad hoc parking on residential streets/drives and occasional abandonment of vehicles in the carriageway. Therefore, it is requested that further consideration is given to the loss of parking due to these proposals and a revised event day management plan submitted, which includes mitigation of the existing parking issue on the local network.”

11.2 WSP Response

11.2.1. WSP are liaising with Hampshire Cricket Club with regards to the provision of an updated event day Traffic Management Plan which provides further details of how access will be facilitated for residents and visitors of the residential development and care home. Further information on this will be provided in due course.

12 Residential and Workplace Travel Plan

12.1 Hampshire County Council Comment

12.1.1. The Local Highway Authority have provided the following comments in respect to the Residential and Workplace Travel Plan:

Residential Travel Plan:

Introduction

This travel plan has been assessed using Hampshire County Council's (HCC's) evaluation criteria for the assessment of travel plans – A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans. Whilst the quality of this travel plan is generally good, some amendments are required before it can be approved.

Title page, document control, and introduction

The title page, document control sheet and introduction should contain the following additional information among them:

- *The planning reference (F/22/93194)*
- *The developers view on travel planning, or a statement from the developer supporting the contents of the travel plan.*

Guidance and policy

- *Additional references should be made to national, regional, and local policy documents and guidelines. These may include, but are not limited to:*
- *Planning Practice Guidance 'Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements' (2014)*
- *IHT's 'Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot' (2000)*
- *CIHT's 'Buses in Urban Developments' (2018)*
- *Hampshire County Council's 'A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans' (2019)*
- *Hampshire County Council's Parking Standards*
- *LPA local plan*
- *LPA parking SPD*
- *Neighbourhood Plans*

Existing site conditions / site audit

The following information regarding the existing site should be included in the travel plan:

- *Class use of the existing site (specific to the appropriate character area)*
- *Bus route maps*
- *Full bus timetables (can be included as an appendix)*
- *Details regarding car parking, cycle parking, waiting areas, and accessibility at the nearest station.*

- *Description of the journey to the station*
- *Full rail timetables (can be included as appendix if necessary)*
- *Details of car parking, cycle parking, waiting areas, and accessibility at the nearest station*
- *Description of the journey to the nearest station*

Site Audit – proposed layout

The following information regarding the proposed residential development should be included in the travel plan:

- *Details regarding the proposed access from the existing highway to the new residential development (including any allowance for pedestrians and cyclists).*
- *A layout plan for the proposed site should be included – this can be either for the whole site or only character area 5. This can be included as an appendix if necessary.*
- *Details of car parking provision, including quantity, location, any EV provision, and local planning authority guidelines used to inform provision.*
- *Details of cycle parking provision, including quantity, type, and location.*
- *Details of the internal highways design of the residential development, including any provision for pedestrians and cyclists.*

Targets

Section 3.3 should include a biennial breakdown of how the mode share of each mode changes over the five-year travel plan period. This will initially be based on the baseline census data presented.

Measures

The following measures should be considered for inclusion in the travel plan:

- *Coordinate with schools to organise walking to school events*
- *Collaboration with local public transport providers to improve services, negotiate discounts, and trial initiatives*

In addition, the following clarifications are required:

- *The value of the “cycle purchase voucher” should be given*
- *The public transport taster vouchers should be to a minimum value of £50*
- *Paragraph 5.1.3 mentions “A high quality pedestrian and cycle link through the development onto A3035 [sic] Botley Road”. Further details should be given, e.g. is this an update to existing infrastructure?*

Management / TPC role

Section 4 of the travel plan should contain additional information about the travel plan coordinator. This includes:

- *Name, job title, and organisation*
- *Contact details, including phone number and email address*
- *A cost estimate for the travel plan coordinator over the five year travel planning period*

If these details are not yet available, they should be emailed to DPtravelplans@hants.gov.uk when available (and prior to occupation of the site).

Monitoring

Section 5.6 (Monitoring) should include the following details:

- Monitoring timetable as laid out below:

	Baseline (Year 1)	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Level of report	To be submitted one year after occupation. This will include the baseline survey results found in the updated Full Travel Plan and a monitoring report.	Monitoring Report	Full Surveys - Monitoring Report	Monitoring Report	Full Surveys - Monitoring Report

- Snapshot surveys to be conducted for years where a full survey will not be carried out.
- Recognition that HCC requires a 35% response rate for questionnaire surveys.
- Measures to ensure that this response rate is met, e.g., a voucher for supermarket or online retailer.
- Alternative method of survey if 35% response rate not achieved, e.g., ATCs/TRICS.

Action plan

The action plan should be fully costed. These values are used to calculate the travel plan cash deposit.

References to Eastleigh Borough Council in the action plan (in reference to travel plan related items, not planning items such as parking arrangements) should be replaced with Hampshire County Council (e.g., to agree travel plan objectives).

Delivery and Enforcement

Section 4.3 requires the following amendments and additions:

- The travel plan should be secured via a Section 106 agreement, and not a planning condition
- Commitment to pay a travel plan cash deposit
- Commitment to pay HCC's monitoring and evaluation fees

Conclusion

A reference to Eastleigh Borough Council in paragraph 7.1.5 should be changed to Hampshire County Council.

This travel plan will require further amendments as set out above before it can be considered acceptable for submission in conjunction with the proposed site.

Workplace Travel Plan:

Introduction

This travel plan has been assessed using Hampshire County Council's (HCC's) evaluation criteria for the assessment of travel plans – A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans. Whilst the quality of this travel plan is generally good, some amendments are required before it can be approved.

Title page, document control, and introduction

The title page, document control sheet and introduction should contain the following additional information among them:

- *Planning reference*
- *Developer's view on travel planning / statement from the developer supporting the contents of the travel plan*

Guidance

A section should be included which summarises national, regional, and local policy documents relevant to the travel plan. These may include, but are not limited to:

National

- *National Planning Policy Framework (2021)*
- *Planning Practice Guidance 'Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements' (2014)*
- *IHT's 'Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot' (2000)*
- *CIHT's 'Buses in Urban Developments' (2018)*

Regional

- *Hampshire County Council's 'A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans' (2009)*
- *Hampshire County Council's Parking Standards*

Local

- *LPA parking SPD*
- *LPA local plan*
- *Neighbourhood Plans (where applicable)*

Existing site conditions / site audit

The following information should be included in Section 2 of the travel plan:

- *Existing use of each area (including class use if known)*
- *Route maps for relevant bus services*
- *Description of the walk to the nearest bus stops*
- *Details regarding the facilities at the nearest train station, including levels of car and cycle parking, waiting areas, and accessibility*
- *Description of journey to station (including any bus connections between the station and the development site).*

Site Audit – proposed layout

A section should be included in the travel plan which outlines the following information:

- *Proposed site plan(s) – this can be either a proposed site layout of the whole site, or individual relevant character areas. These can be included as an appendix if necessary.*
- *Details of car parking for each development. This should include:*
 - *Quantity, location, and type (e.g., disabled bays or EV charging bays etc.)*
 - *Details of the LPA parking SPD used to inform provision of car parking*
- *Details of cycle parking for each development. This should include:*
 - *Quantity, location, and type (e.g., Sheffield stands or cycle lockers etc.)*
 - *Details of the LPA parking SPD used to inform provision*
- *Any changes to the highways design on the wider site should be included here, if applicable (this includes changes to highways, cycleways, and footways).*
- *Operational hours of each development (if known)*

Measures

The following measures should be considered for inclusion in the travel plan:

- *The travel information packs should also include information of free health apps*
- *On site security*
- *The provision of bike service stations for staff and visitors*
- *Allocation of priority parking spaces for car sharers*
- *Newsletters*

As with the residential travel plan, paragraph 5.1.4 mentions “A high quality pedestrian and cycle link through the development onto A3035 [sic] Botley Road”. Further details should be given, e.g., is this an update to existing infrastructure?

Travel plan management (Section 4)

Details of the travel plan coordinator should be included in this section, including name, job title, organisation, and contact details. If these are not yet available, they should be sent to Hampshire County Council prior to occupation of any workplace and emailed to DPtravelplans@hants.gov.uk.

A cost for the travel plan coordinator is also required.

Monitoring

Section 7.2 (Monitoring) should note that a minimum 35% response rate is required by HCC for questionnaire surveys. Measures to ensure that this minimum response rate is met should also be included (e.g., online shopping or supermarket vouchers).

An alternative method of survey should be included if the 35% response rate is not reached (e.g. ATCs/TRICS surveys).

Action plan

The action plan should be fully costed, including a cost of the travel plan coordinator.

Enforcement

A section should be included which explains the following:

- *That the travel plan shall be secured via a Section 106 agreement. This should also include obligations for individual operators to develop their own full workplace travel plans.*
- *Commitment to pay Hampshire County Council's monitoring and evaluation fees*
- *Commitment to provide a travel plan cash deposit*
- *Sanctions in the event of non-compliance*

This travel plan will require further amendments as set out above before it can be considered acceptable for submission in conjunction with the proposed site.

12.2 WSP Response

- 12.2.1. WSP have updated both the Residential and Workplace Travel Plans based on the recommendations from Hampshire County Council, these are included within **Appendix I**.

13 Junction 7, M27

13.1 National Highways Comment

13.1.1. National Highways have provided the following comment in respect to the modelling undertaken on Junction 7, M27 in the Transport Assessment:

“Section 8 “Future Year Traffic Assessments” of the TA includes modelling of the site access junction only. National Highways would expect modelling of the M27 Junction 7 to demonstrate that the impact of development can be accommodated safely. The capacity assessment of this roundabout should be informed by accurate geometrical plans and traffic signal specification, which can be requested from National Highways.”

13.2 WSP Response

13.2.1. As requested, WSP have obtained the as built signal specification for Junction 7, M27 from National Highways, these are included in **Appendix J**. Traffic flow diagrams from the traffic survey at this junction are available in **Appendix K**. A junction capacity assessment for Junction 7, M27 has been undertaken on the basis of these as built specification, for the following scenarios:

- 2032 Baseline (AM and PM peak); and
- 2032 Baseline and Development traffic (AM and PM peak).

13.2.2. WSP have taken traffic flows which were observed during traffic surveys completed on Thursday 2nd December 2021 to form the basis of this assessment. The following growth factors were derived from TEMPro v7.2 and applied to the surveyed 2021 traffic data to forecast 2032 traffic levels.

Table 13-1 – TemPRO growth factors 2021-2032

	AM Peak	PM Peak
2021-2032	1.121	1.122

13.2.3. Committed development traffic traveling through the M27 Junction 7 were taken from the Transport Assessment which was submitted in support of the Land at Horton Heath, Eastleigh planning application (O/20/89498). This Transport Assessment included the following committed developments:

- West of Horton Heath (X/19/86475);
- North West of Horton Heath (X/19/86303);
- St Swithun Wells, Church (O/13/72471), (RM/17/81871);

- Moorgreen Hospital, Botley Road (F/15/77247);
- Land at Corner of Knowle Lane and Mortimers Lane (O/13/72490);
- Land off Winchester Road (O/13/73707);
- Land North & East of Boorley Green (O/12/71514);
- Land at Stoke Park Farm (O/13/73660);
- Land West of Church Road & North of Breach Lane (O/13/72892);
- Land East of Dodwell Lane & North of Pylands Lane (O/12/71522);
- Pembers Hill Farm, Mortimers Lane (O/15/77190 and RM/18/83278);
- Land North West of Boorley Green, Boorley Green (O/15/75953);
- Land West of Woodhouse Lane (O/18/83634); and
- Land North and East of Winchester Street (O/18/83698).

13.2.4. WSP have also added the committed development traffic associated with two additional sites which have not been included as committed developments in the Land at Horton Health application, this is likely due to their size. These two sites are adjacent to the Ageas Bowl, and are further detailed below:

- Land North of Botley Road (F/19/85439); and
- Land North of Botley Road, West End (O/15/76418).

13.2.5. These committed development flows were then used as the basis of the assessment of the following scenarios:

- **2032 Baseline**, including growthed 2021 traffic flows and committed development traffic (AM and PM peak); and
- **2032 Baseline + Development**, including growthed 2021 traffic flows, committed development traffic as well as the development traffic associated with this development.

13.2.6. Summaries of the results of the junction modelling assessments undertaken are contained within Table 13-2 and Table 13-3.

Table 13-2 – M27, Junction 7 (2032 Baseline)

	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)			PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)		
	MMQ (pcu)	Delay (s/pcu)	D.O.S (%)	MMQ (pcu)	Delay (s/pcu)	D.O.S (%)
M27 Eastbound Off-slip	5	29	61.1	9	35	81.4
A334 Charles Watts Way (westbound)	9	13	66.9	8	14	64.1
B3036 Upper Northam Road	7	34	79.8	4	25	60.9
M27 Westbound Off-slip	11	66	93.2	14	66	94.7
A334 Charles Watts Way (eastbound)	11	41	90.6	10	35	87.3
	Cycle Time: 53s Overall PRC: -7.1%			Cycle Time: 53s Overall PRC: -5.3%		

Table 13-3 - M27, Junction 7 (2032 with Development)

	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)			PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)		
	MMQ (pcu)	Delay (s/pcu)	D.O.S (%)	MMQ (pcu)	Delay (s/pcu)	D.O.S (%)
M27 Eastbound Off-slip	5	29	61.1	9	35	81.4
A334 Charles Watts Way (westbound)	10	15	72.6	9	15	68.0
B3036 Upper Northam Road	6	33	77.9	7	32	76.3
M27 Westbound Off-slip	14	72	95.9	13	63	93.9
A334 Charles Watts Way (eastbound)	14	56	95.1	11	38	89.3
	Cycle Time: 53s Overall PRC: -8.6%			Cycle Time: 53s Overall PRC: -6.1%		

13.2.7. The results of the junction capacity assessment undertaken have found that Junction 7 of the M27 will be operating at capacity in all 2032 scenarios. The approach operating at the

highest level of Degree of Saturation (DoS) is the M27 Westbound Off-Slip in the AM peak with a DoS of 95.9% with an associated average delay of 72 seconds and a Mean Max Queue of 14 PCUs. Full input and output data from the modelling exercise undertaken is included in **Appendix L** of this report.

- 13.2.8. Focusing on the impacts of the development, the development proposals are forecast to generate 50 vehicle movements through the junction in the AM peak, and 43 vehicle movements in the PM peak. This is equivalent to an increase in traffic of 0.8% in the AM peak and 0.7% in the PM peak when viewed against 2032 forecast baseline traffic flows. This highlights that the impact of the development traffic is minimal. The forecast increase in queues on the slip roads can be accommodated and will not block back onto the mainline in both the AM and PM peak.
- 13.2.9. The impact of the development itself is minimal due to the low number of additional vehicles and as such no mitigation measures are necessary to address any operational issues at this junction.

14 A334 Charles Watts Way

14.1 National Highways Comment

14.1.1. National Highways have provided the following comment in respect to the modelling undertaken on Junction 7, M27 in the Transport Assessment:

“National Highways also requests clarification regarding the proposed use of the access on A334 and confirmation that the access will be used in conjunction with events and vehicle type proposed to utilise the access.”

14.2 WSP Response

14.2.1. Use of the access on the A334 Charles Watts Way is not altered by the development proposed by planning application F/22/93194.

14.2.2. The use of the A334 access was granted through planning permissions F/18/83908. Further to this, Hampshire Cricket Club have submitted a Section 73 application (X/21/92054) which proposes to allow bus / coach access on major event days on a left-in / left-out basis via Charles Watts Way. Access to / from the Thorneydown car park for other vehicles has not been altered from the original proposals consented under F/18/83908. A summary of the use of the A334 access, as is proposed under the Section 73 application, is contained below.

Table 14-1 – Summary of event day use of Charles Watts Way

A334 Charles Watts Way Access	
Arrivals	Departures
60 Coaches / Buses	60 Coaches / Buses