

Universal Services
The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD
Telephone 0300 555 1375
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries to	Gemma McCart/ Nick Gammer	My reference	6-3-9-16
Direct Line		Your reference	O/25/99506
Date	6 th March 2026	E-mail	Nick.gammer@hants.gov.uk

Dear Liz

Hybrid Planning Application O/25/99506, Navigator Quarter, Eastleigh, SO18 2NL - Outline application for development of the land adjacent to Southampton Airport to provide employment floorspace of up to 92,000 sqm (GIA) within Use Classes E(g) (ii & iii), B2 and B8 with ancillary offices and areas for service yards, car parking, landscaping, ancillary buildings and associated activities, and access from Wide Lane (all matters reserved except for access). Full planning application for initial infrastructure works and construction of new access road including site levelling and other engineering works. (EIA development).

Thank you for your consultation on the above planning application. The Highway Authority (HA) have previously provided the following comments on this application:

- Navigator Quarter Highway Response O-25-99506 dated 8th August 2025
- Navigator Quarter CTMP Highway Response O-25-99506 dated 15th August 2025
- Navigator Quarter Emergency Access Highway Response O-25-99506 dated 16th December 2025.
- Navigator Quarter CTMP Second Highway Response O-25-99506 dated 18th December 2025

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) raise no objection to the proposed outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Emergency Access arrangements. However, a number of concerns were raised in the Navigator Quarter Highway Response O-25-99506 dated 8th August 2025. The LHA have been liaising with the Applicant to address these. The Applicant has subsequently submitted a Technical Memo titled Post-Application Highways/Transport Comments Technical Response dated 12th December 2025, accompanied by numerous drawings and further Technical Notes. This sets out to review previous highway

Director of Universal Services
Patrick Blogg

comments made and provide clarification and proposed solutions with the aim of addressing the various issues raised. The comments below relate to this Technical Response and its appendices.

The latest submission is also accompanied by a cover letter, also dated 12th December 2025. LHA observations regarding this are summarised below.

- The Local Plan allocation suggests the site impacts can be accommodated without a severe impact on capacity and delay, subject to suitable mitigation, which has yet to be agreed.
- Given the forecast HGV generation resulting from the proposed development, the Wide Lane Bridge works to facilitate two-way HGV movements are required to make the development acceptable. Further comments are provided below regarding the Applicant's suggested occupation trigger of up to 20,000 sqm of development before completion of these works.
Southampton City Council hold existing funding towards this scheme and should comment on the use of this funding.
- The Applicant proposes a proportionate contribution towards a sustainable transport fund towards the below (LHA comments in italics).
 - Provision of a strategic pedestrian/ cycle link between Bishopstoke Road and Wide Lane. *Applicant agreement required to the proposed strategy below.*
 - A bus Level of Service agreement. *Further details required, see comments below.*
 - Supporting other sustainable transport measures, or, if required, a 'monitor and manage' approach, implementing capacity improvements at off-site junctions such as the A335/ Wide Lane junction and Spitfire Roundabout, and potential improvements to the active travel crossing on the latter. *Unacceptable; improvements to A335/ Wide Lane junction and Spitfire Roundabout are required to make the development acceptable and will need to be delivered by the Applicant at an agreed trigger. The LHA have no additional funding to deliver these required works and it should not be the LHA's responsibility to deliver standalone improvement works that are necessary to make the development acceptable. The LHA feel this is in accordance with Paragraph 122 of the CIL Regulations and that the absence of these improvements will result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network.*
 - Shared mobility measures within the site. *A contribution specifically towards such measures may be acceptable; further discussion required.*
 - A comprehensive Travel Plan with associated incentives. *Unacceptable; this should be delivered by the Applicant.*

Transport Vision

While improvements to the site layout have been made, the concerns previously raised regarding the sustainable mode connections required to achieve the Transport Vision remain. The LHA still disagree that under the current proposals the site is accessible to all, via safe and sustainable transport modes or is well-located to take advantage of local populations, particularly north of the site. Given the currently proposed public transport strategy, the LHA would also disagree that it is well connected by bus and rail, again, particularly to areas north of the development. It is unlikely that vehicular traffic to and from the site will be minimised; the current mitigation package proposed plans for vehicles much more than for people and places.

Given the lack of surety around delivery of active travel links and public transport connections, the current proposals fail to demonstrate the vision can be achieved. It is, however, the LHA's view that this can potentially be addressed as set out in this response.

PIA Data

Appendix B of the Technical Note provides additional information as previously requested. The LHA considers that the application would not unacceptably exacerbate accident patterns if a northern pedestrian and cycle route to/from the site is provided. If this route is not provided it would result in an increase in vehicular and active travel users routing via A335 Station Hill/ Twyford Road/ A335 Leigh Road/ B3037 Bishopstoke Road/ Coles Close roundabout and A335 Wide Lane; under these circumstances, accident mitigation would need to be considered further on this route.

Sustainable Mode Access

Regarding LCWIP improvements, the application notes delivery of improvements to Wide Lane bridge are proposed; while welcomed, these are necessary to accommodate the additional HGV traffic forecast to be generated by the proposed development.. Should the northern pedestrian and cycle link not be delivered, improvements to active mode infrastructure along the A335 corridor would be required.

The walking and cycle catchments shown in Appendix D has been corrected, removing unavailable access routes. This demonstrates that in the absence of a route to the north, the site cannot be walked to from any residential areas in Hampshire in under 30 minutes, with most residential areas being significantly in excess of this walking time. Even with the relatively high propensity of people in the local area to walk to work, it is unlikely many would undertake this length of journey on foot. Cycling to the site is a more viable option for Hampshire residents, however, as noted above, LCWIP and safety improvements would require further consideration if a northern route were not provided.

A Healthy Streets review of the access routes and onward connections has been discussed with the LHA, areas for assessment agreed and the review provided in Appendix E. The following routes have been audited:

- Route 1 – Southampton Airport Parkway (SAP) Station
- Route 2 – National Cycle Network (Route 23) via Mitchell Way south
- Route 3 – Wide Lane Sports Centre
- Route 4 – Eastleigh Station via the A335
- Route 5 – Esso Service Station via Conegar Road and Chickenhall Lane
- Route 6 – Eastleigh Station via B3037
- Route 7 – Swaythling Local Centre via Wide Lane (SCC)

Each route has been considered against the ten Healthy Streets indicators, with narrative on whether each route meets the criteria, however this has been presented as a 'pass or fail' rather than scored in accordance with Healthy Streets requirements. Each route should also be scored in 200m sections, to consider availability of seating, shade and shelter. Therefore, whilst the review provides useful Healthy Streets context, it has not been undertaken in accordance with HCC TG19. Where mitigation proposals are required, a full Healthy Streets design check will be required, and this should be undertaken prior to the S278 works submission in order to demonstrate how opportunities to improve the Healthy Streets score have been taken up as part of proposed improvements.

Mitchell Way Improvements

As previously outlined, pedestrian and cycle routes run alongside the existing and proposed access road into the site from the south where it links into existing pedestrian and cycle infrastructure heading in both the Eastleigh and Southampton directions. For the proposed access road, new infrastructure will result in a segregated 2m footway and a 3m cycleway which extends alongside the length of the proposed road to individual site access junctions. At this point segregated foot and cycleways cease, and a 3m shared provision begins to the individual buildings proposed; this is considered acceptable.

For the existing sections of the access road into the site, it was previously raised as an issue that this currently consists of a mix of shared foot/cycleways measuring approximately 2.5m wide, but reducing down to points as narrow as 1.6m wide up to the train station. Within the submitted Technical Response however, an updated drawing is available in appendix G of the document (drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-SK-D-01101 Rev P0) which demonstrates how the shared use facility can be increased to a minimum of 2.5m. This has been discussed at a Hampshire County Council Departure from Standards meeting, where the design has been supported in principle. It should be noted this includes a slight narrowing of the existing eastern footway to a minimum width of 1.62m; on balance, this is considered acceptable to facilitate delivery of the western shared use route.

North of the Southern Station Carpark access, a 3m shared use path is proposed, shown on drawings 24733101-STR-HGN-100-SK-D-01101 Rev P0 and 24733101-STR-HGN-100-DR-D-00202 Rev P04. This, as set out previously, is considered acceptable in principle. It is also outside the currently adopted highway boundary

and will not be offered for adoption. The LHA previously raised deliverability concerns given this section includes existing steps, retaining features, services, lamp columns and signage. The applicant has proposed delivery is secured by condition. The LHA are content engineering solutions are available to enable delivery of the required 3m width footway/ cycleway and accepts this approach.

Delivery of the remainder of the route up to the site boundary shown on drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-DR-D-00201 Rev P03 (and associated viewport drawings) is also considered acceptable in principle, with suitable pedestrian and cycle provision and carriageway width and alignment. However, the final design should include priority for pedestrians and cycles crossing sideroads.

Vehicular Access

The majority of Mitchell Way (beyond a short section of public highway at the southern end) is privately owned and maintained by the Airport and is subject to a 20mph speed restriction.

The previous HCC Highway comments raised concerns regarding the width of certain elements of the vehicle access road into the site. It was noted from the 'Internal Masterplan Layout General Arrangement Plan' drawing that roads were to be constructed with widths of 7.3m, allowing for a single carriageway in each direction of 3.65m in width, which conformed with HCC Technical Guidance Note 1 in regard to minimum widths for such roads - TG1 - Highway Cross Sections, and is shown on the various vehicle tracking drawings. It was however noted that the carriageway does narrow at a point north of the 'Signature Aviation Building' to just 6.0m wide. Appendix L of the Post Application Highways Transport Comments – Technical Response (drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-SK-D-00801) demonstrates that adequate space is afforded for the two-way passing of 16.5m articulated vehicles. As such, the layout is acceptable at this point.

Furthermore, there was also concern raised as to the viability of proposals for a new section of road construction, involving the implementation of a retaining wall proposed adjacent to the railway which would likely require network rail approval/ agreement. It has been confirmed by the applicant that they have 'entered into a BAPA agreement with Network Rail for the Navigator Quarter scheme (Wide Lane Bridge and Mitchell Way improvements)' and that 'Network Rail only typically enter into BAPA agreements if they are happy that schemes can be delivered'. Given this, it would appear that the internal private road design is achievable.

Finally, by way of note, the applicant is reminded that given this road will remain private, it is unlikely Traffic Regulation Orders would be made by the LHA. As such, the speed limit and any parking restrictions would need to be privately marked and enforced accordingly.

Internal Layout

Regarding the internal layout, it is understood that access into the site (Mitchell Way) is to remain private from a point north of the existing HSBC building, and therefore the roads and footways associated with the proposed site will not be put forward for adoption by the LHA. The applicant has confirmed that roads forming part of this Outline application have been designed to HCC and industry standards, and secondary roads will be reviewed as part of future Reserved Matters applications should the site come forward.

As with previous iterations, it is indicatively proposed that the Navigator Quarter will be made up of two 'plots', known as north plot and south plot. The south plot is located immediately adjacent to the airport, and the north plot is located to the north of this. Further to this, there are two layout options proposed:

- Illustrative Site Layout Plan 1 – Drawing NQS-MSA-SI-XX-DR-A-2002; and
- Illustrative Site Layout Plan 2 – Drawing NQS-MSA-SI-XX-DR-A-2005

It should be noted that for the north plot, the layout on both site plans is the same, however for the south plot there are two versions, with 'Illustrative Site Plan 1' having been previously submitted and comments made, and 'Illustrative Site Plan 2' being an updated version to this.

All options have been reviewed, and the following comments are made.

South Plot – Illustrative Site Layout Plan 1

As outlined in the previous HCC Highway Consultation response dated 8th August 2025, the south plot consists of 13 units which are accessed via two access junctions from the main access road, one junction serving units 4 to 15, and the other dedicated to unit 16, and vehicle tracking drawings have been provided that demonstrate that both access junctions are acceptable for use.

It would however be questioned why a more even split of units accessed from each junction could not be provided, in order to better spread the predicted flows between each. Whilst capacity issues at these junctions would not affect the public highway, for the future users it may be prudent to investigate a change in layout accordingly given that it does not appear that the internal layout is set at this stage.

In addition, visibility splay drawings (30228-BGL-XX-LNK-DR-C-00263 Rev P01 and 30228-BGL-XX-LNK-DR-C-00264 Rev P01) have previously been provided which show that appropriate splays can be achieved for a road which would have an anticipated design speed of 30mph. These visibility splays should be free of any vertical obstruction above 1m for the entirety of the splay envelope.

Vehicular movement around the plot appears acceptable with vehicle tracking drawings again previously supplied for articulated lorries which shows two-way vehicle movement is largely achievable, though some localised pinch-points do exist primarily in close proximity to individual unit access junctions. This should however be manageable and again would not affect the public highway.

HGV turning areas are also provided in service yards to enable forward gear access and egress, however these drawings do not show all units. It is recommended that the applicants ensure tracking drawings are provided for all units to ensure they are workable in order to prevent:

- (a) the need for a reverse out of the service yard, and also to;
- (b) provide an indication of what areas will need to be clear of stored materials, racking, etc.

In terms of parking, each unit has an individual car park dedicated to its own use. Regarding the quantum of parking, this has not been assessed as this is a function of EBC as Local Parking Authority, where the Case Officer will need to ensure that the EBC Parking Standards (draft) are fully adhered to. Regarding the parking layout however, this has been assessed and would appear acceptable with adequately sized bays (assumed 2.5m x 5m in line with the EBC Parking Standards 2025) and aisle width (6m) to enable easy turning in and out of the spaces. It is recommended that any spaces adjacent to landscaping of a vertical obstruction (wall/ fence) are afforded an additional 0.3m step out strip to allow for full door opening and remove the need to step onto landscaped areas when accessing a vehicle.

Cycle parking is also to be provided, but no details of either location or type of shelter appear to have been included in the Technical Response, nor have the number of individual spaces. This will be required as part of an internal site reserved matters application, however, the volume, location and infrastructure provided should be sufficient to encourage cycling as a means of accessing the site and be prioritised over the location of staff vehicular parking.

Bin collections will also need to be catered for, with bin collection points required in suitable locations for ease of both use by the occupiers of the individual units and also for collection by the refuse operatives. These should be in unobstructed locations with appropriate drag distances to and from the refuse vehicles. Again, these will be required as part of an internal site reserved matters application.

Finally, in terms of pedestrian and cycle routes, it is noted that the cycle provision ceases prior to entering a plot. It is recommended that cycle facilities continue on site for safety reasons, given the potential flow and type of vehicles which will be accessing the plots, rather than pushing cyclists into the carriageway. This can be reviewed further and addressed at the reserved matters stage.

South Plot – Illustrative Site Layout Plan 2

The south plot consists of 7 units which are accessed via two access junctions from the main access road, one junction serving units 4 to 9, and the other dedicated to unit 10, and with the access locations being consistent with Illustrative Site Layout Plan 1, the vehicle tracking drawings have been provided that demonstrate that both access junctions are acceptable for use.

Again though, it is questioned why a more even split of units accessed from each junction could not be provided, in order to better spread the predicted flows between each, and it may be prudent to investigate a change in layout accordingly.

Similarly, visibility splay drawings (30228-BGL-XX-LNK-DR-C-00263 Rev P01 and 30228-BGL-XX-LNK-DR-C-00264 Rev P01) have been provided, which show that appropriate splays can be achieved for a road which would have an anticipated design speed of 30mph. These visibility splays should be free of any vertical obstruction above 1m for the entirety of the splay envelope.

Vehicular movement around the plot appears to be generally acceptable, however formal vehicle tracking drawings have only been provided for:

- Unit 10 showing articulated vehicle access and turning into the service yard area (Drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-DR-D-00405 Rev P3);
- Unit 9 showing articulated vehicle access and turning into the service yard area (Drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-DR-D-00404 Rev P3);
- Unit 9 car parking movements for a family vehicle (Drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-DR-D-00407 Rev P3); and
- Bus movements from the access junction for plots 4 to 9 heading south to the roundabout and turning back on itself to complete the exit movement (Drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-DR-D-00408 Rev P3).

While it could be dealt with at the Reserved Matters stage, it is recommended that vehicle tracking drawings be supplied for all movements around the site for cars, and into the service areas of each unit for the articulated lorries in order to fully assess that non-obstructive two-way movement and turning is achievable to prevent:

- (a) the need for a reverse out of the service yard, and also to;
- (b) provide an indication of what areas will need to be clear of stored materials, racking, etc.

In terms of parking, each unit again has an individual car park dedicated to its own use. Regarding the quantum of parking, this has not been assessed as this is a function of EBC as Local Parking Authority, where the Case Officer will need to ensure that the EBC Parking Standards (draft) are fully adhered to. Regarding the parking layout however, this has been assessed and would appear acceptable with adequately sized bays (assumed 2.5 x 5m in line with the EBC Parking Standards 2025) and aisle width (6m) to enable easy turning in and out of the spaces. It is recommended that any spaces adjacent to landscaping of a vertical obstruction (wall/ fence) are afforded an additional 0.3m step out strip to allow for full door opening and remove the need to step onto landscaped areas when accessing a vehicle.

Cycle parking is also to be provided, but no details of either location or type of shelter appear to have been included in the Technical Response, nor have the number of individual spaces. This will be required as part of an internal site reserved matters application, however, the volume, location and infrastructure provided should be sufficient to encourage cycling as a means of accessing the site and be prioritised over the location of staff vehicular parking.

Bin collections will also need to be catered for, with bin collection points required in suitable locations for ease of both use by the occupiers of the individual units and also for collection by the refuse operatives. These should be in unobstructed

locations with appropriate drag distances to and from the refuse vehicles. Again, these will be required as part of an internal site reserved matters application.

North Plot - Illustrative Site Layout Plan 1 & 2 (both identical)

The north plot layout is consistent for both Illustrative Site Layout Plan 1 and 2, and as such it has been assessed previously under the HCC Highways consultation response dated 8th August 2025. Comments remain valid, being that the north plot consists of 3 units accessed via a single junction from the main access road; it is anticipated that this would be sufficient for the quantum of development involved.

As with the south plot, movement around the plot appears acceptable with vehicle tracking drawings again supplied for articulated lorries which shows two-way vehicle movement is largely achievable, though some localised pinch-points do exist primarily in close proximity to individual unit access junctions. This should however be manageable and again would not affect the public highway.

HGV turning areas are also provided in service yards to enable forward gear access and egress, however submitted vehicle tracking drawings only show HGV turning and vehicle parking for Unit 3 (drawings 24733101-STR-HGN-100-DR-D-00403 Rev P3 and 24733101-STR-HGN-100-DR-D-00406 Rev P3. It is recommended that the applicants ensure tracking drawings are provide for all units to ensure they are workable in order to prevent:

- (a) the need for a reverse out of the service yard, and also to;
- (b) provide an indication of what areas will need to be clear of stored materials, racking, etc.

As outlined above, a visibility splay drawing has been provided (30228-BGL-XXLNK-DR-C-00264 Rev P01) that demonstrates appropriate visibility splays (set against anticipated road speeds) can be achieved from the access junction that comes off the proposed road into the northern plot. This visibility splay should be free of any vertical obstruction above 1m for the entirety of the splay envelope.

Again, each unit has its own dedicated car park, which appears acceptable in terms of layout, bar the potential need for 0.3m step out strips. The quantum of parking has not been assessed. Cycle parking and bin collection points will also need to be shown on any future Reserved Matters plans for full assessment.

The route to gain access to the potential northern link through the rail arch is segregated away from busy areas such as car parks, which is positive. Lighting of this route will be required.

Pedestrian and Cycle Connection between Plots

In terms of permeability between the units on the site, it was previously recommended that an additional link is provided between the two plots in order to provide permeability, and also for improved access to the northern pedestrian/ cycle route in particular. Without this, an elongated route is required (using 'Illustrative Site Layout Plan 2' for example) for unit 6, which has to head west to the nearest pedestrian access to the east of unit 4 , then north approximately 700m before it can

reach a point adjacent to unit 1, which with an appropriate link would be a c.220m walk. Without such links, it is likely that informal 'mud tracks' will develop as natural desire lines will occur.

Whilst it is noted a shared use path between plots 4 and 5 has been added, reducing the distance somewhat, and that the applicant states a direct link between plots is not possible due to a landscaping buffer, it is still recommended that the provision of a direct link is implemented. However, while disappointing, this does not represent a reason for the LHA to object to the indicative layout.

Emergency Access

The LHA have provided a response dated 16th December 2025 in relation to the proposed emergency access arrangements, raising no objection.

Active Travel Connections

A 3m shared use pedestrian/ cycle route is proposed up to and through the railway line underpass; this is considered acceptable subject to confirmation of lighting being provided. However, delivery of the onward route to Bishopstoke Road remains unconfirmed (further comments below).

A connection from the North Plot to the eastern end of Campbell Road would significantly reduce the distance to Eastleigh town centre, rail station and surrounding residential areas. The Applicant has reiterated the reasons they believe delivery of this link is not feasible, including third party land and access rights issues, and has stated their strategy to facilitate pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the north via Chickenhall Lane.

It was previously noted that the route from Eastleigh via the A335, between South Street and Wide Lane bridge, is currently poor. The LHA suggested consideration should be given to providing pedestrian and cycle improvements as set out within the LCWIP including priority at side roads, potentially provision of a segregated route and improving the narrow section of shared use between the Southampton Airport Parkway access and Wide Lane bridge. The Applicant has responded by noting they have agreed to improve Wide Lane bridge to facilitate HGV movements from their site (design comments below) and will provide a contribution towards 'sustainable transport improvements/ scheme mitigation'. Comments on this proposed contribution in relation to the pedestrian and cycle access to the site from the north are provided below.

Regarding the crossing of the northern arm of Spitfire Roundabout, the Applicant has stated they do not consider improving this crossing point to be 'wholly necessary to support the application'. The LHA disagree with this position and feel a signalised Toucan crossing is required to make the development acceptable. However, while the crossing is on HCC's network, it would almost exclusively serve trips to/from Southampton. As such, Southampton City Council's view on the requirement for this crossing should also be sought.

A design for a Toucan crossing on the northern Wide Lane arm of Spitfire Roundabout has been submitted for review as shown on drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-SK-D-01102 and is considered acceptable in principle.

It should be noted that RSA Stage 1 problem 4.2.1 considers the crossing proximity to the roundabout and the possibility for traffic to misinterpret the green signal as an instruction to proceed into the roundabout. The LHA agree with the audit response; extra markings will be necessary at the preliminary design stage. Furthermore, this is a single-movement crossing, where the pedestrian stud markings will extend across the entire carriageway, which is considered to carry a lesser risk on the approach to a roundabout than a dual-phase crossing where pedestrians cross onto an island, which is more consistent with a signalised roundabout approach.

Sustainable Transport Strategy

Micromobility

The Applicant has confirmed that the two Beryl Bike areas defined on the originally submitted masterplan could be used by any micromobility provider and have been relabelled as Micromobility bays. The Applicant also suggests specific micromobility incentives will be included in future unit specific Full Travel Plans; the Framework Travel Plan should reflect this.

As stated previously, micromobility users are likely to use these to get from residential areas or transport interchanges to the site at the start of their working day and return them to these locations at the end. As such, alongside provision for micromobility parking (and charging, which has not been confirmed) on site and Travel Plan incentives, it is felt expansion and delivery of a micromobility schemes in the area, integrating with any existing scheme, would be required in order for this to be taken up. Delivery of off-site provision has not been explored. The LHA is open to discussions around a contribution towards delivery of micromobility in the surrounding area.

Public Transport Strategy

As stated previously, the Parkway stops are at least 1.6km from the site, and for some parts of the development over 2km. The northern pedestrian and cycle connection is vital for accessing bus services available to Hampshire residents (comments on this below).

In terms of bus services to the site, the LHA welcomes the layout being able to accommodate future bus access. The Applicant has liaised with a local operator (Go Ahead) but does not have any surety regarding buses serving the site post build out. It would be useful to have sight of the correspondence with Go Ahead. The Applicant suggests the provision of a contribution towards future bus access. It is not clear if this applies to bus links from Southampton or areas of Hampshire, or both. However, the LHA are open to discussions around the value and uses of this contribution, which should be agreed at this stage, although require further surety that there is a viable option to serve the site by bus for Hampshire residents.

Furthermore, the previous option suggested by the Applicant of a bespoke service for the site to align with staff shift changeover patterns is not mentioned, this should be considered further by the Applicant as currently there is no viable option to serve the site by bus from within Hampshire. Finally, as stated previously, provision of a northern pedestrian and cycle link and delivery of micromobility services will facilitate access to existing bus services.

External Strategic Transport Connections

Wide Lane Bridge Enhancements

As previously noted, freight movement is likely to be a key component of the development proposal. The most direct route to the Strategic Road Network (motorway) is via Wide Lane to M27 J5; this is proposed to be the only HGV route to/ from the site, secured by condition. The route is currently constrained for HGV traffic at the Wide Lane rail overbridge and is unsuitable in its current form to accommodate the significant additional HGV traffic forecast to be generated by the proposed development. Furthermore, this is a high demand route for pedestrians and cyclists between Southampton and Eastleigh and provides pedestrian and cycle access to the proposed development.

The Applicant has confirmed they are required to fund and deliver Wide Lane Bridge improvements and has submitted updated drawings in appendix F of the Technical Response, with the aim of addressing the LHA's previous design comments. This updated design has been reviewed and comments are provided below.

1. The Applicant has entered into a BAPA agreement with Network Rail in relation to these works. This is adequate confirmation Network Rail consider the improvements deliverable.
2. While Network Rail appear content, the applicant should confirm no other third party land is required for delivery. This should be demonstrated by a land plan showing ownership overlayed on the proposed design.
3. Drawing 30228-BGL-XX-XX-SK-C Rev P6 confirms a 4m width will be provided throughout.
4. The LHA feel the carriageway widening should be extended to provide a more suitable alignment. For example, the south bound approach narrows and then opens up again, increasing the risk of conflict.
5. There are differences between the Steer and Burrows Graham drawings with regard to the proposed kerb line in relation to the existing footway. It is not clear exactly what is being proposed.
6. Proposals show the new kerb line being just behind the existing back of footway, but no details have been provided beyond this point; it may be that a retaining wall or new/widened bridge structure is required. It is unclear how this will be constructed; third party land outside the highway boundary will be required, particularly given the levels (steep banks). This relates to point 2 above. A Vehicle Restraint System (VRS) may be required and has not been reviewed or included in the design beyond a drawing note; this may also impact the land take and affect deliverability. These matters should be considered at this stage to ensure deliverability; further details should be

submitted, including appropriate cross sections, to allow the LHA to better understand buildability and the impact of level differences around the proposed works.

7. Revised tracking drawings, 30228-BGL-XX-WLB-SK-C-0001 Rev P04 and 24733101-STR-HGN-100-SK-D-00302 Rev P03 have been provided, noting a tracking speed of 20mph. On site observations suggest 20mph is an appropriate HGV speed for the existing layout; however, carriageway widening may increase speeds. The LHA are willing to accept a tracking speed of 20mph for the proposed design at this stage, but the applicant should note this may require further consideration at the S278 design stage. The tracking presented appears to show HGVs in very close proximity to the kerbs/ parapets (the distance has not been presented), and extremely close to each other, for a short section on the apex of the bend, leaving little margin for error. However, given this has not been raised in the Road Safety Audit and Network Rail appear content with the design, the tracking is considered acceptable in principle, subject to detailed design.
8. It was previously requested that the forward visibility on approach and through the works area should be provided in both directions. The Technical Response states this has been provided within Appendix F, but it does not appear to be present.
9. A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been carried out and submitted in relation to these works. Problem 4.3.2 has been adequately addressed by the designer. However, Problem 4.3.1 has not and relates to the potential use of VRS as noted above. A Collision Risk Assessment should be undertaken and, if appropriate, VRS included on the in principle design at this stage, rather than just noted on the drawing for future consideration. This relates to point 6 above.

Further information is needed as set out above to demonstrate a deliverable solution for the required widening of the carriageway over the bridge and provision of a suitable active travel route is achievable.

HCC Structures Team comments

No objection to the principle of the improvement works has been raised by HCC Structures team on the basis the bridge structure will be adopted by Network Rail and only the surface will be adopted by the LHA (this should be confirmed by the Applicant at this stage). However, the information below should be noted by the Applicant.

Existing structural circumstances:

Wide Lane Bridge (HCC bridges reference number ST7058) carries Wide Lane (C351) over the Southwestern Railway line between Southampton Airport Parkway station and Swaything station. Wide Lane Bridge is owned and maintained by Network Rail. The railway appears to have no overhead electrical lines in the vicinity of Wide Lane Bridge, however the presence of an electrical third rail at this location has not been verified by HCC Structures Team. The presence of electrical infrastructure in the trackside vicinity of Wide Lane Bridge should be confirmed by Network Rail.

The construction and dimensions of Wide Lane Bridge have not been verified by HCC Structure Team as no drawings or construction information have been supplied to date. It is noted that Wide Lane Bridge crosses the railway at a considerably skewed angle. There appear to be wingwalls to Wide Lane Bridge, which will need to be considered for the location of supports for the footbridge.

Safety improvement works were carried out by HCC in 2005/06, comprising reinforced concrete ground beams to the east footway and west verge on the south approach to Wide Lane Bridge. The ground beams support an open box beam safety fence and timber fencing and are 1.3m wide, generally 0.6m deep (the east ground beam depth reduces to 0.325m over BT ducts). The east ground beam is 17.27m long (measured along the inside face i.e. carriageway side) and the West ground beam is 31.22m long (measured along the outside face i.e. carriageway side). Compressible joint filler and polysulphide sealant was installed at the interface between the ground beams and southern brick pilasters of Wide Lane Bridge. The presence of the east ground beam will impact the proposals for the new footbridge and its southeastern approach. As-constructed drawings can be provided on request.

Geometrical constraints in relation to Wide Lane Bridge:

As this route crosses a railway, members of the public must be prevented from jumping, or attempting to jump, between the proposed footbridge and Wide Lane Bridge. Network Rail should advise on the required minimum distance between the adjacent structures to prevent this. Consideration should also be given to enclosing the footbridge, for example using a steel mesh cage or full toughened glass enclosure, to prevent jumping between the two bridges. Also unauthorised public access to the outside of the structure/ enclosure should be prevented from the outside ends of the proposed footbridge.

It is anticipated the footbridge structure will be adopted by Network Rail and only the footbridge surface will be dedicated as highway. If this is not the case, the Applicant should make the LHA aware of the proposed arrangements and discuss the acceptability of these at this stage.

Should the applicant wish HCC to adopt the structure, a 2m easement will be required around all structural elements to enable future inspections, maintenance and repairs. It should be noted that this usually involves working from a tower scaffold, positioned on the railway line, to access the soffit and outer faces of the bridge deck and parapets. For HCC adoption, structural design of the footbridge and (in any event) geometrical design of the shared use footway/cycleway should be as per Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). The applicant will be required to submit an Approval in Principle document to HCC Structures for the Technical Approval of the footbridge design, in accordance with CG300 Technical Approval of Highway Structures. This may include CD353 Design Criteria for Footbridges, CD143 Designing for Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding, CD195 Cycle Traffic Infrastructure, as well as the usual DMRB codes for bridge design.

If the proposed footbridge becomes Network Rail owned, there may be other design alternatives based on cantilevering the new footbridge from the existing bridge in order that the north parapet of the existing bridge forms the south parapet of the new bridge, thereby allowing full access to the north side of the existing bridge north parapet from the new bridge. In this case, the height of the north parapet of the existing bridge will likely need to be increased. Also, vibration and dynamic response of the new bridge, and their effect on Wide Lane Bridge should be considered. Structural design will be governed by DMRB and Network Rail design codes (these sometimes defer to DMRB but Network Rail should advise on this). If the proposed footbridge structure becomes Network Rail owned, the applicant will be required to submit an Approval in Principle document to HCC Structures for review from a public safety viewpoint.

Construction materials:

As the proposed footbridge crosses the railway, Network Rail should advise on any prohibited or preferred materials. For the supports to the approach ramps and any retaining elements, these are likely to comprise steel and/or reinforced concrete. For the bridge deck, this is likely to comprise steel structural elements. All steel elements should be protected by a long-lasting paint system.

Other considerations:

It is noted that there are lighting columns at the edge of the east footway of Wide Lane and Wide Lane Bridge, and a number of established trees to the east side of Wide Lane Bridge. In addition, there is considerable level difference between the south approach to Wide Lane Bridge and the adjacent land (Premier Inn / HSBC buildings) therefore retaining elements are likely to be necessary to support the widened footway/ cycleway and carriageway. These retaining elements may be subject to technical approval, as per CG300, depending on their retained height, which will require separate Approval in Principle documents to be submitted.

Delivery Trigger

It is noted the Applicant feels some development would be acceptable without the Wide Lane Bridge being able to accommodate 2-way HGV movements. The LHA are open to discussions regarding the trigger for delivery of the improvements. The initial suggestion by the Applicant of an unfettered 20,000sqm of development prior to completion of the works, should be justified; a comparison of existing HGV movements and the forecast HGV generation from that quantum of development would be a useful starting point.

Northern Chickenhall Lane Connection

The link from the site boundary to Bishopstoke Road is required for active travel access to the north of the site for pedestrians and cycles, and to allow access to bus stops/ services on Bishopstoke Road. The route would provide considerable journey time benefits when compared to the alternative via Mitchell Road and access to bus services; the provision of this is required in order to maximise the opportunities to provide sustainable access to the development.

The Applicant has confirmed that a 3m shared use path could be provided up to and under the rail bridge. From this point to Conegar Road the land is HCC owned. This land has been granted planning permission (CS/22/92463) as a Material Recycling Facility (MRF), which does not currently facilitate public access. However, following discussions with the landowner and the Applicant (noting the requirement for the MRF to facilitate access at present is only access for a farm tractor via this route), the LHA consider that sufficient land will be available for a shared use path to be delivered along the eastern boundary of the MRF, connecting to Conegar Road. This element should be delivered by the Applicant.

Conegar Road is also HCC owned and currently has no pedestrian or cycle facilities. The LHA believe it is likely a suitable footway could be delivered on the southern verge of Conegar Road. The design of this footway cannot be considered further until the MRF design is completed. Cycling within the carriageway is considered acceptable by the LHA on Conegar Road based on existing flows and those forecast to be generated by the MRF. The necessary pedestrian and cycle rights of access are yet to be agreed between HCC Estates and the Applicant.

The section of Chickenhall Lane between the junction with Conegar Road and the point it becomes adopted highway at the Prysmian access is private and in third party (Prysmian) ownership. This section of Chickenhall Lane has no pedestrian or cycle facilities, but there is a verge adjacent to the existing Chickenhall Lane carriageway of sufficient width to provide a shared use pedestrian/ cycle path. It is noted that the Applicant has met with Prysmian, provided information and chased for resolution regarding the provision of appropriate facilities, ongoing maintenance arrangements and rights for pedestrians and cycles for this section. Prysmian have recently responded requesting another meeting. As such, there is no certainty that this link can be delivered by the Applicant at this time.

The final section from the Prysmian access to Bishopstoke Road is adopted highway. This section requires upgrading to provide an off-carriageway cycle facility. This is likely to require removal of paid on street parking and/ or third party land. As such, delivery of this section is also not guaranteed, and no design work has been provided to date.

The LHA's strong preference is for the Applicant to be responsible for delivery of the northern pedestrian/ cycle link described above in its entirety. This remains a possibility should discussions with HCC Estates and Prysmian progress positively and subject to further design work. This delivery option should be retained as the preference within any future S106 Agreement.

However, it is recognised that direct delivery by the Applicant is not guaranteed to be possible at this stage. The Technical Note suggests a Sustainable Travel Fund towards various improvements. As set out above, this is not appropriate for all the mitigation listed as some of the measures will be for the developer to deliver. However, the LHA do feel a contribution for full delivery of northern pedestrian and cycle link is an appropriate fallback position in light of the specific circumstances outline above and given the potential land acquisition powers available to the LHA. In order to conclude this element of the mitigation package, a fully costed scheme

should be presented to the LHA for consideration. This should include improvements to Conegar Road, Chickenhall Lane and the existing highway section of Chickenhall Lane (between the Prysmian access and Bishopstoke Road) to facilitate off carriageway cycling.

The LHA consider it necessary for the agreed contribution sum (based on the fully costed scheme) to be secured by way of Section 106 Agreement towards improved pedestrian and cycle access between the site and surrounding communities and bus services to the north, should the Applicant not deliver the northern link directly.

In summary, any future S106 agreement should secure the following:

1. Reasonable endeavours to the satisfaction of the LHA that the Applicant delivers the northern pedestrian/ cycle link prior to first occupation. Confirmation of delivery mechanism to be agreed prior to commencement of the development.
2. Should Applicant delivery of the northern pedestrian/ cycle link be demonstrated as not possible, a contribution, costed in accordance with the Cost Estimating Process, towards full delivery of the link is required, including off road provision on the adopted section of Chickenhall Lane. An in-principle design and full delivery costs for the full route must be agreed, and the contribution paid, prior to commencement of the development.
3. Given delivery of the route relies on third party land and/ or removal of parking, the contribution agreed under point 2 above would be towards design and delivery of the northern pedestrian/ cycle link or suitable alternative improvements to pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the site.

It also should be noted that in all scenarios above, the Applicant must provide onward public rights through the development site; this has been discussed with the Applicant, who is amenable, and should be secured in any future S106 Agreement. It should also be noted that in all scenarios, the Applicant should deliver the pedestrian and cycle route between their site boundary and Conegar Road, including the connection under the railway bridge.

Alternative Northern Connections

The Applicant has confirmed that no connection is proposed to the Itchen Way directly from the site due to the ecological limitations. The LHA understand Eastleigh Borough Council have aspirations to upgrade the Itchen Way to provide better accessibility along the route and would like a connection from the site to be included within the application. The LHA would support the inclusion of this connection, which provides an alternative route to the north for those on foot and possibly (to be confirmed through future design) by cycle. The route is unlikely to be lit. However, feasibility/ optioneering work of these improvements has not been carried out to date and it is not yet known if it would provide a suitable year-round amenity link to serve the site, including cycling rights. At this time, the provision of a connection to and potential for a future improvement of the Itchen Way does not remove the necessity for a northern link via Chickenhall Lane to be delivered as part of the site mitigation.

Active Travel England Assessment

Active Travel England (ATE) have provided and a response to the additional information submitted. ATE does not wish to raise an objection in principle to this application on condition that the outstanding active travel related matters are resolved and mitigation secured via Planning Condition or S106 obligation. ATE note that the LHA has identified several matters that require resolution and it is their view is that, in this instance, the LHA is best placed to address these issues and has a sound understanding of active travel matters in relation to the proposals. ATE therefore defers to the LHA to resolve the outstanding matters. It is understood ATE would review their conditional no objection position should matters not be acceptably resolved and secured with the LHA.

Trip Generation

The Highway Authority previously agreed the TRICS data for each potential land use category, however concerns were raised in relation to the proposal to apply a 'trip budget' for each RM application. This approach was not considered acceptable to the Highway Authority due to deliverability concerns, and the requirement for the impact of the proposed development to be considered holistically. The applicant has subsequently suggested that a planning condition is to be applied which limits the floorspace for each use as follows:

- 27,600 sqm of Class E(g)(ii), (iii) and/or B2 Use (of which no more than 13,800 sqm is for Class E(g)(ii), (iii))
- 64,400 sqm of Class B8 Use (of which no more than 9,200 sqm is for parcel distribution)

The above split of land-uses is in line with 'scenario 1' of the Transport Assessment and therefore subject to a suitability worded planning condition to ensure the floorspaces for each land-use is restricted as above, scenario 1 is considered appropriate for assessment. A summary of the forecast trip generation has been extracted from the TA for clarity:

Table 7.14: Proposed Development Scenario 1 – Total Vehicle Trip Generation

Mode	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)			PM Peak (17:00 - 18:00)			Daily		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Taxi	2	2	4	2	2	3	20	20	41
Cyclists	23	2	25	3	20	23	91	77	168
Cars	270	32	303	34	225	259	1,187	1,213	2,400
Motorcycle	2	0	2	0	3	3	18	14	31
PSV	1	1	1	0	1	1	4	4	7
OGV	25	48	73	47	22	69	484	469	954
LGV	34	29	63	19	22	41	277	282	559
Total Vehicles	334	112	446	103	273	376	1,991	2,002	3,992
Percentage HGVs	7.6%	43.2%	16.6%	46.3%	8.1%	18.5%	24.5%	23.6%	24.1%

A reduction in trip generation due to mezzanine floor space has been removed from the assessment and is not included in Table 7.14 above. The above agreed floor space caps would also apply to mezzanine floorspace; given the floorspace caps (rather than the previously suggested 'trip budget'), any trips associated with mezzanine floorspace should not be reconsidered at the Reserved Matters stage.

As set out previously, the methodology for calculating the multi-modal trip generation is also agreed, and to achieve the modal splits attributed to sustainable modes, a link to the north of the site is required.

Trip distribution and assignment has also already been agreed for both staff and operational trips. HGV trips are to be routed via M27, and the applicant proposes this is to be secured via planning condition, which is acceptable to the Highway Authority subject to agreement with the LPA.

As confirmed via the separate consultation response of 18th December 2025, the outline CEMP confirms that construction traffic and deliveries will avoid peak hours and will travel via Mitchell Way/M27. The outline CEMP is therefore acceptable, and a detailed construction traffic management plan is to be provided for each subsequent phase of development, to be approved prior to commencement of each RM application.

Highway Impact

Study Area

It was previously raised that assessment of Stoneham Lane should be considered given the forecast quantum of traffic using this route. The Applicant has completed an assessment; the forecast increase in traffic due to the development in 2036 will be less than 3% of total traffic and Stoneham Lane has no pattern of injury accidents. The Applicant concludes that it is not considered Navigator Quarter development traffic flows will have a significant impact on Stoneham Lane. Given this section of highway is known to currently function without significant issues, the LHA is minded to agree in this case; no further assessment is required.

It is also noted that Twyford Road Roundabout is not included in the study area. As previously stated, given the level of forecast traffic this is acceptable, however, in the absence of a suitable sustainable modes access strategy to the north, vehicular trips may be higher in this location, necessitating a capacity assessment and potentially mitigation.

Assessment Scenarios

As stated previously, the assessment scenarios are considered acceptable.

TEMPRO Growth

The approach to TEMPRO growth is considered acceptable.

Committed Development

As stated previously, the committed developments included are acceptable.

Junction Capacity

Trip generation and distribution are now agreed. Comments on the modelling of the assessed junctions, outputs and the design and impact of any proposed improvement schemes, are set out below.

J01 Southampton Road/ Wide Lane/ South Street

All previous queries have been addressed, and the modelling is considered acceptable. The junction is forecast to operate over practical capacity (although within theoretical capacity) in the 2036 future year, both with and without forecast Navigator Quarter traffic generation. While there is some reduction in junction performance forecast due to the development, it is not considered necessary to mitigate this impact. However, in the absence of a suitable sustainable modes access strategy to the north, vehicular trips may be higher in this location, potentially necessitating mitigation.

J02 Southampton Road/ Parkway Station

As a standalone junction, all previous queries have been addressed, and the modelling is considered acceptable. The junction is forecast to operate at or over practical capacity (although within theoretical capacity) on one arm in the 2036 future year, both with and without forecast Navigator Quarter traffic generation. While there is some reduction in junction performance forecast due to the development, it is not considered necessary to mitigate this impact. However, in the absence of a suitable sustainable modes access strategy to the north, vehicular trips may be higher in this location, potentially necessitating mitigation.

The Applicant should note that it will be necessary to modify this junction to accommodate the proposals at J03; comments related to J02 in terms of operation and safety issues are included in J03 comments below given the geometry and modelling are closely linked.

J03 A335/ Wide Lane Roundabout

Improvements to this junction are required to mitigate the impact of the development. The applicant has therefore developed a signalised improvement scheme. The proposed design (drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-SK-D-01200) has been reviewed and the following comments are made.

1. Concern exists as the double right turn lanes are retained, although these are alleviated partly by the dualling of the A335 up to the motorway junction. This is accepted at this stage. However, careful consideration will need to be given to the road markings and island shapes at the preliminary design stage to ensure that two lanes of traffic can turn right safely.

2. 3.65m lane widths are still shown in certain places; this can be addressed at the preliminary design stage.
3. The lane reduces to 3.65m for a considerable distance, which is unacceptable as any vehicle broken down will completely block the road. All vehicles obstructed behind a broken-down vehicle will be unable to pass and become trapped. This is a fundamental design issue which should be addressed at this stage to ensure that an acceptable solution for this lane arrangement can be achieved.
4. The merge length has been increased, albeit it is still substandard and will require a departure from standard to be agreed. It is still considered that only a small proportion of drivers would be likely to use A335 nearside lane to turn right. This is further compounded by the unconventional right turn movement from the nearside lane. This should be reflected in the modelling.
5. The design now has traffic segregated through the junction and a separate stopline at the (now) displaced pedestrian crossing. The merge distance is very short and substandard length. The merge distance should be 100m long beyond the stopline. There appears to be enough highway to provide a compliant layout. The central hatched area at the crossing should be removed to discourage pedestrians and cyclists from waiting in this area.
6. Highway land is being used to the north of the junction, which is acceptable and necessary. To address other comments in this review, particularly the segregated left-turn lane width, it may be necessary to take further land. Concern exists over the level differences. The LHA suggests OS LIDAR data is obtained and an outline proposal made for embankment works/ retaining wall, and drainage. This consideration would normally be required later in the design process; however, understanding this constraint is key to determining whether the signalisation of the junction is deliverable.
7. The separation island at the junction is shown as 1.5m wide. This will need to be at least 1.8m, preferably 2m wide minimum to accommodate the signal heads.
8. Regarding the left turn exit from the Parkway Station on to Wide Lane north, the existing centre island has been retained to physically prevent the right turn movement. This leaves a 3.65m kerb to kerb width. Widths between 3.2m and 3.9m should be avoided to discourage overtaking by traffic too close to cyclists.
9. A335 island width between free flow left turn lane and the signalled lanes is less than 1.8 metres wide. The width should be increased to at least 2.0 metres to accommodate signals.
10. RSA Stage 1 Item 4.1.1: The details of the road alignment can be developed during the preliminary and detailed design; however, not only is room required for street furniture and edge strips, etc., there is also a level difference which will need to be dealt with by earthworks or a retaining wall, which may take considerable space to accommodate. This should be investigated in principle at this stage to ensure that a design is deliverable.
11. RSA Stage 1 Item 4.2.1: The LHA agree with Designers' response.
12. RSA Stage 1 Item 4.2.2: This has been raised separately in this review; an appropriate merge length should be shown and considered at this stage.

13. RSA Stage 1 Item 4.2.3. Agree with the designers' response; However, the extended island should be shown and considered at this stage.

Regarding the junction modelling, the model set up is acceptable. The results of the modelling indicate that the junction will fail in 2036 AM, with a practical reserve capacity of -17.1%, and degrees of saturation for all lanes between 98% and 106%. Significant queueing and delay. To provide a junction that accommodates all forecast traffic, the LHA have identified possible improvements to the design/capacity. One of the issues restricting capacity in the model, that will also cause issues on site, is the low cycle time, for example, 64 seconds in the AM peak. This is restricted due to the short flare lengths on Wide Lane Northbound and A335 exit. To improve capacity and allow the cycle time to increase, the LHA suggest the following changes be investigated:

- Relocating the Wide Lane northbound stopline further north. The island can go a meter or so from the edge of the Wide Lane southbound right turn tracks, which will provide at least 10m of flare length.
- Moving the back of the flare of the Wide Lane northbound left turn lane as close to the bridge as possible, a 100m total flare would significantly improve capacity.
- Make the A335 approach nearside lane dedicated to the segregated left turn lane and Lane 2 the flare. This flare length will also need to increase significantly, which may require widening to the south of the A335. This will also provide more resilience against the possibility of traffic backing up to the motorway Roundabout.

With these geometric changes and an increase in cycle time to around 90 seconds, it may be possible to provide a junction that operates within capacity.

The Applicant has suggested a proportional contribution towards delivery of this mitigation scheme. This is not acceptable. Should the junction remain as existing, the forecast delay and queueing resulting from the proposed development would be considered by the LHA as severe. Furthermore, the queue lengths forecast would block back through M27 J5 roundabout and result in stationary traffic on the M27 J5 Eastbound, and in 2036 westbound, motorway off-slips, causing an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

The Technical Note (Appendix V) is unclear regarding the presentation of model outputs for the existing road layout. Assessment of the queueing is not straightforward as the lane simulations assumes infinitely long approach lanes. The existing flare on the A335 approach is approximately 6 PCUs long. In the 2028 base plus development scenario there is a queue of 34.1 PCUs in the nearside lane and 80.1 in the offside lane. Combining these and letting traffic make full use of the flare $(34.1 + 80.1 - 6)$ results in a practical queue back from the give way line of 108.2 PCUs or 649.2m. There is 380m between the two junctions or 63 PCUs so the impact on the motorway in the 2028 base plus development scenario will block back through the M27 J5 roundabout causing operational and lane blocking issues, in turn significantly reducing the capacity of the M27 J5 roundabout. In the 2036 scenario the queue in the AM peak increases to 223.9 PCUs $(165.8 + 64.7 - 6)$ or 1,343m which will clearly have an impact on motorway and all surrounding roads.

Regarding the existing road layout in the PM peak, results in the 2036 Baseline + Development scenario suggest a queue of 140.6 PCUs or 843.6m on Wide Lane South. Although this will not impact M27 J5 roundabout, this queue will extend back through the Spitfire Roundabout and have significant implications for the surrounding local highway network. The northern wide lane approach also experiences issues with a forecast queue of 77 PCUs or 462m.

To help assess the impact of the development, the table below summarises the forecast queues with the existing road layout, comparing the impact with and without development in the two future years. The increase in queue length on the A335 (NW) arm in the AM peak period in 2028 due to the development is significant and results in blocking back through J5. In 2036, the J03 is forecast to block back through M27 J5 without development, however, the queue length in the with development scenario is significantly greater (1,343.4m compared to 528m) leading to likely queuing on both motorway off-slips. In the PM peak, the development is forecast to significantly increase queuing in both future years (c. 6 times the queue length) on the Wide Lane (S) arm. This queue would block back through Spitfire Roundabout and into Southampton.

Existing Layout Queue Length Summary

Approach	Combined average maximum queue length (assuming traffic makes full use of Approach Flare)							
	AM Peak				PM Peak			
	2028 Baseline	2028 Baseline + Dev	2036 Baseline	2036 Baseline + Dev	2028 Baseline	2028 Baseline + Dev	2036 Baseline	2036 Baseline + Dev
Wide Lane (NE)	8.5 PCUs (51m)	11.9 PCUs (71.4m)	11.3 PCUs (67.8m)	15.5 PCUs (93m)	28.6 PCUs (171.6m)	48.3 PCUs (289.8m)	56.5 PCUs (339m)	77 PCUs (462m)
Wide Lane (S)	3 PCUs (18m)	6 PCUs (36m)	7.2 PCUs (43.2m)	18.2 PCUs (109.2m)	6.9 PCUs (41.4m)	67.5 PCUs (405m)	24.6 PCUs (147.6m)	140.6 PCUs (843.6m)
A335 (NW)	37.5 PCUs (225m)	108.2 PCUs (649.2m)	88 PCUs (528m)	223.9 PCUs (1343.4m)	4.2 PCUs (25.2m)	11.5 PCUs (69m)	6.9 PCUs (41.4m)	35.1 PCUs (210.6m)

*A335 approach to M27 RB exit distance = 63 PCUs (380m)

It should also be noted that the assessment of the physical queue length is optimistic. Firstly, an assumption has been made that traffic will make full use of the flare, which it will likely not be able to. Additionally, it is assumed that one PCU of traffic is 6m long; this assumes traffic will be queueing bumper to bumper, whereas this will be a rolling queue with significantly longer gaps, so the impact may extent back significantly further than predicted.

Given the forecast impact of the proposed development set out above, it is considered necessary for the Applicant to deliver improvements to this junction directly via S278. The suggestion of a proportional contribution is not acceptable; the LHA have no funding (or realistic prospect of receiving additional funding) to make up any shortfall to deliver the scheme, which is required as a direct result of the proposed development. The improvements are required to make the development acceptable and must be delivered in full by the Applicant. The LHA is open to discussions regarding an appropriate trigger for these works.

A final point regarding the suggested proportional contribution relates to the benefit of these works. The improvement scheme as proposed on some arms only just addresses the impact of proposed development, while on other arms does not quite fully address the development impact. While a proportional contribution is not acceptable for the reasons set out above, the rationale is also not understood as there is no wider benefit; it is not fixing an existing problem, it is solely (and on some arms, not fully) mitigating the development impact, with the improved junction plus development operating with similar delay and queuing compared to the no improvement and no development scenario.

J04 Wide Lane/ George Curl Way/ Mitchell Way 'Spitfire' Roundabout

Previous modelling comments have been addressed. The design of the mitigation (option 2b) including a toucan crossing shown on drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-SK-D-01102 is considered acceptable in principle at this stage. There will be further considerations and likely minor amendments that can be addressed at the preliminary design stage. This mitigation is required to make the development acceptable and should be delivered in full by the Applicant.

Travel Plan

A revised Framework Travel Plan (FTP) has been submitted dated November 2025. The following comments are made on this updated FTP.

Targets/Measures

The measures indicated will not fully deliver the proposed targets due to:

- The distances from the site to public transport is unlikely to encourage take up of bus and train travel. Within the Travel Plan, there are currently no clear measures to facilitate overcoming the barrier related to the distances to the bus stop and the train station.
- Although the availability of Micromobility services could facilitate overcoming the distances to public transport, other than the provision of parking spaces, there is no mention of working with a Micromobility providers to facilitate the basing of micromobility services at the site. The Applicant would need to ensure that there are a sufficient number of that bikes and e-scooters, that they have a fully charged battery and are available for travel between bus stops and the site.
- The current proposal of reducing parking spaces only once staff members take up car share could be strengthened through consideration of a permit parking system. The push for more stringent parking measures assumes that there are alternatives for people including the bus shuttle service and micromobility services, highlighting the importance of these.

The Applicant should enter into negotiations/ discussions with Micromobility providers to encourage use of these services; there needs to be a budget set aside for:

1. If initially Micromobility providers do not consider the site viable
2. Any improvements to Bus stops to facilitate use.
3. For staff discounts to encourage staff to use the services.

A contribution to cover points 1 and 2 above could be appropriate; the LHA is open to discussions in this regard. Point 3 is a Travel Plan measures and should be included within the Framework Travel Plan.

Not everyone is physically able to use micromobility services, therefore a free circular staff shuttle bus that can ferry staff to Airport parkway station and Eastleigh station could be considered, unless/ until public transport provides for these journeys.

Monitoring and Review

HCC also has guidance drawn from the DfT on when the surveys should be undertaken. The DfT offers the following definition for a neutral monitoring period:

“Surveys should typically be carried out during a ‘neutral’, or representative, month avoiding main and local holiday periods, local school holidays and half terms, and other abnormal traffic periods. Neutral periods are defined as Mondays to Thursdays from March through to November (excluding August), provided adequate lighting is available, and avoiding the weeks before/after Easter, the Thursday before and all of the week of a bank holiday, and the school holidays.”

The DfT offers the following definition for a neutral monitoring period:

“Surveys should typically be carried out during a ‘neutral’, or representative, month avoiding main and local holiday periods, local school holidays and half terms, and other abnormal traffic periods. Neutral periods are defined as Mondays to Thursdays from March through to November (excluding August), provided adequate lighting is available, and avoiding the weeks before/after Easter, the Thursday before and all of the week of a bank holiday, and the school holidays.”

Surveys

- TRICS SAM surveys are required for years 1, 3 and 5. These surveys compliment the annual staff survey and should also be reflected in the monitoring schedule. TRICS SAM surveys are a HCC policy; please see HCC’s guidance on Travel Plans.
- Incentives for site users to complete the annual surveys will need to be added; this can be a retail voucher.

Action Plan

- The Sustainable Travel Vouchers budget should be separated from other activities such as bike doctors for clarity.
- The cost for the site wide TPC should be increased, as it is expected that the final Full (unit specific) Travel Plan will come to an end 5 years after occupation of the last unit. The TPC also has a number of units to liaise with and support, which in itself would require additional funding outside of the TPMs.

Fees

Fees section is missing

Travel Plan Duration

5 years from the occupation of the final qualifying unit.

Hampshire County Council recently update its Travel Plan guidance, including templates, which can be found here:

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/travelplans/assessment>.

Mitigation Summary

The Applicant has agreed to fully fund and delivery Wide Lane bridge improvements. Justification for and agreement of an appropriate trigger for delivery of these works needs to be agreed at this stage. The use of existing contributions held towards delivery of these works should be discussed with SCC.

The Applicant is suggesting contributing towards (that is, partially funding) improvements at the Wide Lane and Spitfire roundabouts. It is noted the Applicant previously agreed to fully fund the Spitfire Roundabout improvement works, however, this position appears to have changed. Partial funding of these improvement schemes is not acceptable; improvements to these junctions are required to mitigate the impact of the development and the Applicant should deliver these improvements directly via S278 agreement. The LHA have no funding (or realistic prospect of receiving additional funding) to make up any shortfall to deliver these schemes. Provision of a proportional contribution towards these works does not guarantee, or give a realistic prospect of delivery. In the absence of delivery of these mitigation schemes, it is the LHA's view that there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety and the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

Mitigation relating to the northern pedestrian and cycle link, bus services and Micromobility require agreement at this stage.

Provision of future unit specific Full Travel Plans should be secured in any future S106 Agreement to be carried out by the developer; a contribution towards delivery of these is not acceptable.

Recommendation

There are a number of areas where further information is required as set out in this response before the Highway Authority can provide a recommendation. Until the additional information is provided the Highway Authority will not be in a position to agree the transport impacts of the development proposals and suitable mitigation. I look forward to receiving further information in due course, at which point I will be able to provide an update on the position. In the meantime, if you are minded to determine the application, please contact the Highway Authority for highway reasons for refusal.

I trust the above is clear. Please do not hesitate to contact Nick Gammer should you wish to discuss anything further.

Yours sincerely,

Gemma McCart
Transport Team Leader