

Hampshire 2050
The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UL
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	
Date	8 th August 2025	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 reviewed the following documents, with comments provided below.

- Navigator Quarter, Southampton – Transport Assessment (TA) dated June 2025, Reference 24733101.
- Navigator Quarter, Southampton – Framework Travel Plan dated June 2025, Reference 24733101.

The application site under consideration is situated to the north of Southampton Airport within Eastleigh Borough Council. It is 92,000sqm in size and comprises two plots of undeveloped agricultural land. The development forms part of the Solent Freeport scheme. The site lies upon land allocated for employment use in EBC's adopted Local Plan under policies E7 and E9. Relevant extracts from these policies include:

- Vehicular access to the site shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority.

- Are supported by transport assessments which confirm local network capacity and are consistent with the airport operators' agreed Airport Surface Access Strategy.

Transport Vision

In line with the updated NPPF, a vision led approach is proposed, which is welcomed by the HA. A Transport Vision has been provided, copied below.

The Navigator Quarter development will deliver a high-quality, well-connected masterplan designed around delivering flexible, modern employment units that will provide for a range of occupier's requirements. This will be within an environment that meets their operational needs where people want to work within, and is accessible to all, via safe and sustainable transport modes. The Site is well located to take advantage of local populations, and specifically Eastleigh and Southampton. It is well connected by rail and bus, allowing for employees to easily access the site via sustainable travel modes from both the local area and further afield. Measures both on and off site will improve facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, helping to minimise vehicular traffic to and from the site and also assisting the authorities and National Highways aims of reducing car-based trips within the immediate vicinity of the site and on the Strategic Road Network.

Notwithstanding the issues that accompany employment sites such as this, whereby opportunities to affect modal shift are limited by the nature of the mix of vehicle types they generate, the applicant supports the national, regional and local guidance and best practice which seeks to shift away from planning for vehicles, towards planning for people and places, i.e. a Vision Led approach based on Decide and Provide principles.

Comments are provided below regarding the sustainable mode connections, however, the HA would disagree that under the current proposals the site is accessible to all, via safe and sustainable transport modes or well located to take advantage of local populations, particularly north of the site. Given the currently proposed public transport strategy, the HA 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 proposals plan for vehicles much more than for people and places.

Finally, currently the TA fails to demonstrate the vision can be achieved.

PIA Data

The Transport Assessment includes an analysis of personal Injury Accident (PIA) data for the most recent 5 year period. A brief description of accidents is included, however, the location is not always clear. Appendix F contains plots of accidents, but no data, so this cannot be analysed and should be provided.

There are some known PIA clusters in the area, as set out below. This has been updated from pre-application comments in accordance with the revised trip generation and distribution.

- Northbound A335 at the M27 junction 5 interchange. This is operated by National Highways, who will comment, however, there is a cluster of accidents here that may require mitigation.
- A335 Station Hill/ Twyford Road/ A335 Leigh Road/ B3037 Bishopstoke Road/ Coles Close roundabout records a cluster of accounts. However, the increase in forecast vehicular trips through this junction is not expected to unacceptably exacerbate concerns here.
- The A335 Wide Lane has several concerns, primarily associated with the various junctions along the route. Further details and analysis of this route, and possible mitigation, should be provided. Improvements noted within LCWIP Route 340 may be beneficial in terms of accident reduction.
- The Eastleigh grid system in general. This has not been included within the accident data and should be considered in terms of walking and (particularly, given the distance) cycling routes from residential areas to the site.

Sustainable Mode Access

A summary of LCWIP improvements is provided, however, no commitment (or mention) of delivering these is included within the TA.

The walking and cycle catchments shown in figures 3-5 and 3-6 assume there is pedestrian and cycle access to the north, which is agreed to be necessary, however is not considered to be realistic given the current access strategy proposed by the Applicant. Table 3.3 of the Transport Assessment shows a relatively high propensity of people in the local area to walk to work. This positive trend should be built upon through the delivery of active travel routes. Figure 3.6 is described in the TA as a 30 minute cycle catchment plan, although shows many areas within a 30-40 minute zone. Again, it is not clear if any assumptions have been made about the routes required to make these journeys.

Tables 3.7 and 3.8 demonstrate a high level of pedestrian crossings of Mitchell Way, particularly at the southern zebra crossing, with almost 5,000 users per day. The Applicant should ensure through appropriate design that these movements are not impacted due to development traffic.

On a general note, a Healthy Streets assessment of the access routes and onward connections will be required.

Mitchell Way Improvements

The 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 existing sections of the Mitchell Way, this currently consists of a shared use foot/cycleway measuring c.2.5m in width, that terminates a short distance north of Spitfire Roundabout. The existing footway from this point to the train station varies in

width, reducing to points as narrow as 1.59m wide. To the north of the rail station, footway widths narrow further (1.3m), and there is no continuous link provided beyond the Signature Building. Whilst current levels of vehicle, pedestrian and cycle flows may suggest that this provision is acceptable, clearly the increase levels of all these modes as a result of the proposed development requires upgraded provision to provide suitable access for all and to promote sustainable transport options.

As such, an upgrade is shown on drawings 30228-BGL-XX-XX-DR-C-00007 Rev P01 and 30228-BGL-XX-XX-DR-C-00008 Rev P01. This outlines proposals to provide a shared pedestrian cycle route along the western edge of Mitchell Way from a point linking into the existing provision to the south, leading along the road to a point where it meets the segregated provision of the new link road.

Whilst it would have been preferable to have a segregated foot / cycle link along the whole length of Mitchell Way, it is acknowledged that land constraints affect the implementation of this, and a shared use facility would therefore be acceptable in this case. However, it is noted that the existing footway between the end of the existing shared use section and the Southern Station carpark access on the western side of Mitchell Way will not be improved. It appears the applicant is suggesting changing this existing footway to shared use; the width varies between 1.59 and 2.08m, with no margin, for a length of c.175m. This area has high current pedestrian flows and that would see a large increase in vehicular traffic (including HGVs) and active travel use as a result of the proposed development. Furthermore, the effective width would be even less than the 1.59-2.08m stated above due to constraints around the path. The existing infrastructure is not considered acceptable to convert to a shared use path, also accommodating cycles. The resulting in a gap in suitable cycle facilities is not acceptable; provision of an acceptable width (minimum 3m effective width) shared use path in this area is required. Pedestrian and cycle priority over side roads/ accesses should be included.

North of the Southern Station Carpark access, a 3m shared use path is proposed. Whilst it would have been preferable to have a segregated foot / cycle link over this section, land constraints make delivery of this challenging. The 3m width shared use facility is considered acceptable in this location. However north of the southern Station Carpark access along the station frontage there are existing steps, retaining features and services; further details should be provided regarding how a 3m width path will be delivered here. Lamp columns and signage will also require relocation, which should be detailed within the proposals.

A segregated facility for the northern part of the link road to the site is proposed, which is welcomed. A parallel crossing at the northern end, linking to another segregated facility on the southern site abutting the site frontage. Side road accesses on the western side will be reconfigured to accommodate this.

A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has not been included and is required for all works.

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 proposed access road into the site utilises the existing Mitchell Way Road, heading into the site from the south via the Spitfire Roundabout, passing between various commercial buildings, including the Southampton Parkway Rail Station to the west and Southampton Airport to the east. Heading north, the existing road layout is to be utilised until it reaches its end to the west of the northern most point of the runway. At this point, a new road is to be constructed which heads east to the proposed Navigator Quarter site passing to the north of the runway. This is shown on the submitted 'Internal Masterplan Layout General Arrangement Plan' drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-DR-D-00402 available at Appendix J of the submitted TA, and the submitted 'Masterplan Layout General Arrangement Overview Plan' drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-DR-D-00401 available at Appendix I.

It is noted from the 'Internal Masterplan Layout General Arrangement Plan' drawing that roads are to be constructed with widths of 7.3m allowing for a single carriageway in each direction of 3.65m in width. This would accord with HCC Technical Guidance Note 1 in regard to minimum widths for such roads - [TG1 - Highway Cross Sections](#), and as shown on the various vehicle tracking drawings located at Appendix J, the layout provides adequate width for the passing on two 16.5 metre articulated vehicles throughout the site, inclusive of the various priority junctions, though some non-designated lane movements will be required. This is considered acceptable in principle and suitable for the purpose proposed.

Visibility splay drawings provided also demonstrate that appropriate visibility splays (set against anticipated road speeds – assumed to be 30mph) can be achieved from the access junctions served from the proposed road, as well as forward visibility splays which are also shown on drawings provided. Both will need to be kept clear of any vertical obstruction (i.e. landscaping) above 1.0m in height for the entirety of the splay envelope. For clarity, details of the HCC standards can be found in the HCC Technical Guidance Note 3 - [Technical guidance notes | Transport and roads | Hampshire County Council](#)

With regard to the existing element of the access road, this is discussed within the submitted TA at sections 3.14 to 3.18, where it outlines that the carriageway width ranges between 7.0 and 7.3m, which would again be acceptable. However, it outlines at section 3.17 that the carriageway does narrow at a point north of the 'Signature Aviation Building' to just 6.0m wide. Whilst it would be anticipated that this narrowed width remains potentially sufficient for the purpose of two-way articulated vehicle movements, given the straight carriageway layout at this point, it is noted that no vehicle tracking drawing has been submitted to demonstrate this. Whilst the route accommodates articulated vehicle movements at the present time, there will be a significant increase in these movements as a result of the proposals, and therefore the Applicant should produce a vehicle tracking drawing (noting an appropriate tracking speed on drawings) for this area of the site and ensure free-flowing movements can be achieved. Should a pinchpoint be identified that restricts

movement, localised widening should be investigated, which appears achievable given the area of undeveloped land to the west.

Regarding the proposed new section of road construction, the retaining wall proposed adjacent to the railway may require network rail approval/ agreement. Network Rail should confirm the proposals are acceptable in principle. There are elements of the design that would be unacceptable if offered for adoption, however, the Applicant has been clear this is not the case therefore no comments have been made in this regard.

Given this road will remain private, the Applicant should note that it is unlikely Traffic Regulation Orders would be made; the speed limit and any parking restrictions would need to be privately enforced.

No Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been included for any of the works and is required.

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 HCC as local Highway Authority. However, it would be advisable that the developer ensures that the roads and footways are designed to minimum industry standards and / or Hampshire County Council's best practice as set out in <https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards> , and that an appropriate Private Management Plan is put in place to deal with any future issues. Developers should also be made aware of the Advanced Payment Code (APC) that will be required by the Highway Authority. Details of this can be found via the following link - <http://documents.hants.gov.uk/transport/APCProcess-Guidancedocumentforwebsitev22018-04-02.pdf>

Having reviewed plans, the following comments are made:

Though not specifically forming part of this current 'all matters reserved except for access' application, 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.

As a general comment, the proposed access road infrastructure will result in a segregated 2.0m footway and a 3.0m cycleway which extends alongside the length of the proposed road to individual site access junctions where segregated foot and cycleways cease, and a shared provision begins to the individual buildings proposed. It would be questioned why this cessation of segregation ends at this point, with the preference to be that full segregation is fully continuous to the end destinations.

South Plot

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. 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 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 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.

Each unit has an individual car park dedicated to its own use. In terms of 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 5.0m) and aisle width (6.0m) 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 TA, 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.

North Plot

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 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.

As outlined above, a visibility splay drawing has been provided (30228-BGL-XX-LNK-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 of 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 '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. As outlined above though with the general comment regarding the widths of shared foot/ cycle routes within the built area, a widened segregated route would be preferential, the proposed route appears to be a narrower shared route. Lighting of this route will be required.

Finally, during pre-application discussions HCC requested the inclusion of a north-south pedestrian/ cycle route within the site between the North and South Plots to provide better and shorter permeability between the two, and also for access to the northern pedestrian/ cycle route in particular. This has not been included. Without this, an elongated route is required between plots and to reach the northern

pedestrian and cycle access (with onward routes to bus stops) and to reach the on-site bus stop. This is detrimental to sustainable mode access, would likely result in informal mud tracks developing and should be reconsidered.

Emergency Access

To the north of the proposed sites, it is noted that no vehicle access is proposed. This raises concern given, should an incident occur that results in a blockage to movements south of the site, it is unclear how emergency vehicles would access the proposed development, particularly given the proposed single access road is in a cutting and in close proximity to a runway. The Emergency Service should be consulted and provide a view on the necessity for a secondary emergency access. The only reasonable option for a secondary emergency access, unless this can be taken across the runway, is via a northern link onto Chickenhall Lane.

Should the intention be to provide emergency access from within the airport, the details of this should be provided, including how the internal layout (to be considered under future Reserved Matters applications) is secured to facilitate this. Evidence of consultation with and agreement from the emergency services in this regard should also be provided.

Active Travel Connections

A 3m shared use pedestrian/ cycle route is proposed up to and through the railway line underpass. However, no onward route linking to public highway has been proposed to be delivered as part of this application (further comments below).

A connection from the North Plot to the eastern end of Campbell Road has also been considered but is not proposed. This would significantly reduce the distance to Eastleigh town centre, rail station and surrounding residential areas. In the absence of a northern link via Chickenhall Lane, the HA disagree with the conclusion that there would be insufficient demand to warrant the delivery of a bridge over the railway line to support the application. It does not appear delivery opportunities have been explored with the relevant landowners, including Network Rail, prior to this option being discounted; further consideration of this option should be explored as a potential mechanism to unlock the site for sustainable travel.

There appears to be no connection proposed to the Itchen Way; paragraph 4.37 of the TA states:

The opportunity to connect the Site to the Itchen Way PRow route has been considered, via a 3m section of shared-use footway/ cycleway from the masterplan. However, while it may be technically feasible to provide this connection, the ecological impact of these proposals is considered to outweigh the benefits of providing a connection to the PRow at this time.

As currently proposed, the only pedestrian and cycle access to the site is via Mitchell Way to the south, with no northern connection delivered as part of the proposals. This represents a significant and unacceptable barrier to sustainable mode use for all residents to the north, not only on foot and by cycle, but also by bus

given there is no direct bus route from the northern residential areas to the site, nor Southampton Airport Parkway.

The route from Eastleigh via the A335, between South Street and Wide Lane bridge, is currently poor. Consideration should be given to providing pedestrian and cycle improvements as set out within the LCWIP. This includes 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.

Finally, consideration should be given to improving the crossing of the northern arm of Spitfire Roundabout. This is currently wide and uncontrolled and is a barrier to active travel trips between Southampton and the site.

Beryl Bikes

While micromobility schemes such as Beryl Bikes are welcome, 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) on site, it is felt expansion and delivery of a micromobility schemes in the areas would be required in order for this to be taken up. Commitments at this stage should not be specific to Beryl Bikes given potential to expand existing provisions within the SCC network. This needs to be explored further and incentives to try/ use these should be included in the Travel Plan.

Public Transport Strategy

The proposed improved connections to bus stops are noted. However, the Parkway stops are at least 1.6km from the site, and for some parts of the development over 2km. The connection under the railway line to the north is also noted, but this does not provide an onward link to connect to bus services on Bishopstoke Road.

The options proposed in the TA are summarised below.

1. Extend Unilink U1A/U1C into the site from the existing Southampton Airport stop.
2. A bespoke service for the site to align with staff shift changeover patterns.
3. Extending the Airport Shuttle Service into the site.

Regarding Option 1, while this would benefit Southampton residents, the U1A/ U1C does not serve areas north of Southampton Airport, with the exception of two evening Services that run to Eastleigh Bus Station. This change would serve no benefit to Hampshire residents and would not encourage bus use from the surrounding areas north of the site.

Option 2 could potentially benefit residents in the northern (Hampshire) surrounding areas, for example Eastleigh town, Chandlers Ford, Bishopstoke and Fair Oak. Further details of the areas served and a commitment to provision of this service should be provided.

Extending the Airport Shuttle Service into the site could be beneficial, particularly if the Unilink U1A/U1C services are not extended into the site and for those travelling by train, as it would avoid the 20-30 minute walk to from these stops to the site. However, given there are effectively no direct bus services from the residential areas to the north, users would already have had to make a change to a second bus or rail service to reach Southampton Airport Parkway. Another change to the shuttle service (or a significant walk) would make journeys unattractive and it is felt would not prioritise sustainable transport modes nor be considered a high-quality public transport service.

As stated within the TA, further discussion is required to agree acceptable public transport provision. Also of note is that some destinations are better served by Eastleigh Rail Station than Parkway. In the absence of a connection via Campbell Road, the shortest route from here to the site is via the northern link, adding weight to the requirement for this route to be provide to a high standard as set out below.

Waste Collection

Given the site would not be offered for adoption, this matter should be considered by Eastleigh Borough Council.

External Strategic Transport Connections

Wide Lane Bridge Enhancements

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 significant additional HGV traffic. The recorded average weekday 2-way HGV movements of 178 (1% of the total 17,760 vehicular movements from tables 3.4 and 3.5 of the TA) would increase significantly as a result of the proposed development to a forecast of 942 daily HGV movements. Unless an appropriate improvement resolving this issue is delivered via S278 agreement by the applicant, it will be considered a severe impact on the highway network and an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

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.

As such, it is the HA's view that improvement of this bridge is fundamental. It is considered necessary for the development to fully fund and deliver an acceptable mitigation scheme for the following reasons:

- To allow two-way HGV movements required to avoid an unacceptable residual cumulative impact on the road network.
- To facilitate safe access to the development. The forecast level of movements would result in a significantly increased chance of two large vehicles meeting and having to either perform unsafe reversing movements

or mount the footway. This would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety for drivers, cyclists and other footway users.

- Encourage sustainable modes. The increase in HGV movements either very close to (and potentially upon), the footway and on the NCN23 cycle route will be extremely off putting to existing and future pedestrians and cyclists. In the absence of an alternative route, the site would not be considered to meet the NPPF criteria of prioritising sustainable modes of transport, providing safe and suitable access for all users, give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements or creating places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

The applicant proposes measures to enable two-way HGV traffic to pass on Wide Lane bridge through provision of an active travel bridge on the northern side to allow carriageway widening which would facilitate two-way HGV movements; drawings 24733101-STR-HGN-100-SK-D-00301 Rev P01 and 24733101-STR-HGN-100-SK-D-00302 Rev P01 and 30228-BGL-XX-WLB-SK-C-00001 Rev P03 (appendix L), 30228-BGL-XX-WLB-SK-C-00001 Rev P03 and 30228-BGL-XX-XX-SK-C-00002 Rev P03. The Following comments are made on these improvement proposals:

- Confirmation should be provided from Network Rail that they consider the improvements deliverable.
- It is presumed the land the new sustainable mode bridge over sails is in Network Rail ownership, and is therefore within the applicant's control, but this should be confirmed.
- Drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-SK-D-00301 Rev P01 notes a potential width of the share use path south of the bridge as 3.5m. The deliverable width should be confirmed (noting drawing 30228-BGL-XX-XX-SK-C-00002 Rev P03 does not have this ambiguity and states a 3.5m width).
- The tracking shown on drawings 24733101-STR-HGN-100-SK-D-00302 Rev P01 and 30228-BGL-XX-WLB-SK-C-00001 Rev P03 appears to show two HGVs passing. However, tracking is tight leaving little margin for error, and the tracking speed has not been included; this is required and should be appropriate for the speeds expected.
- The tracking is close to the new kerblines, and the distance from the new kerblines to the parapet is not stated. As above, agreement that the improvements are acceptable from Network Rail should be provided.
- Consideration could be given to additional widening to lengthen the leading and trailing tapers. Lengthening of the northern leading taper for example may mean the southbound HGV is set further east, hugging this kerb before entering the bend and therefore increasing the spacing between passing vehicles.
- Revised central road markings should be shown to reflect the widening and new swept paths
- The forward visibility on approach and through the works area should be provided in both directions for the appropriate speeds (these should be recorded 85%ile speeds as per TG3). Vegetation removal could be considered to improve forward visibility.
- The width of the path over the bridge is 3m. Given the parapets/ railings on both sides, the effective width would be 2m. The minimum effective width should be 3m (TG10 paragraph 5.2.14), meaning a 4m width bridge would be required. If this cannot be achieved, an in-principle Departure from Standard

should be progressed at this planning stage to ensure the works are deliverable.

- No Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been included for any of the works and is required.

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.

It is noted in Chapter 8 of the TA that the Applicant feels some development would be acceptable without the Wide Lane Bridge being able to accommodate 2-way HGV movements. The trigger for delivery of improvements can be discussed once the delivery mechanism (Section 278) and further details of the scheme (as requested above) have been agreed.

Tables 8.8 records HGV flows '*A335 (North West of Wide Lane/ A335 Rbt)*'. This does not appear relevant as it does not show the number of HGVs using Wide Lane Bridge.

Table 8.9 records '*Wide Lane (South of Wide Lane/ A335 Rbt)*' and therefore, as the HA understands it, does show HGVs using Wide Lane Bridge. The recorded HGV movements in the AM and PM peaks are 64 and 37 respectively. The forecast HGV movements from the development is 73 AM peak hour and 70 PM peak hour 2-way trips. That is a 114% increase in 2-way HGV movements in the AM peak a 189% increase in the PM peak. The forecast increase in daily HGV trips is 178 to 942; a 529% increase. There are also c.195 2-way bus movements per day across this bridge. In the HA's view this supports the requirement for an appropriate improvement to be delivered via S278 agreement by the applicant to make the development acceptable.

It is noted pedestrian/ cycle count surveys have been completed on Wide Lane Bridge and at the pedestrian crossing points on Mitchell Way. This is likely (especially for Wide Lane bridge) to underreport the typical pedestrian and cycle use given the winter weather conditions and lack of daylight. Furthermore, a severe weather warning due to Storm Darragh was in place on the 7th and 8th of December. The LHA hold one historic survey of cycles only (not pedestrians) for Wide Lane bridge, undertaken Wednesday 11th November 2015, which is only a marginally better time of year. Over the 12-hour survey period 7am to 7pm, 177 cycles were recorded, demonstrating significant usage even during winter/ darker conditions.

Northern Chickenhall Lane Connection

Regarding access from the north, the Plot 1 land parcel immediately south of the railway line the Applicant has confirmed that a 3m shared use path will be provided up to and under the rail bridge. From this point north to Conegar Road the land is HCC owned. This land has been granted planning permission (CS/22/92463) as a Material Recycling Facility, which does not currently facilitate public access. However, HCC feel land could be made available for a shared use path to be delivered along the eastern boundary of the MRF. While land could be provided

(subject to the Applicant concluding discussions and coming to agreement with HCC's Estates and Minerals and Waste Teams), delivery of this route would not form part of the MRF construction, or any other HCC works, and should be delivered by the Applicant.

Conegar Road is also HCC owned and currently has no pedestrian or cycle facilities. As noted in the TA, HCC has discussed this matter with the Applicant. The Applicant should further progress discussions with HCC to agree delivery of suitable facilities, a maintenance regime and access rights in perpetuity over this area.

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 ownership. The TA notes that this section of Chickenhall Lane has no pedestrian or cycle facilities, but there is a verge adjacent to the existing Chickenhall Lane carriageway sufficient to provide a shared use path. Provision of appropriate facilities, ongoing maintenance arrangements and rights for pedestrians and cycles for this section should be progressed between the Applicant and relevant landowner; HCC are amenable to being part of these discussions.

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 vital access to bus stops/ services on Bishopstoke Road as well as onward pedestrian and cycle connections. The Applicant should set out details (including drawings/ designs for review) of how the full route will be improved, secured and delivered. A metalled surface, suitable width/ arrangement, rights suitable for walking and cycling and lighting allowing year-round use should be provided throughout. Cycling on carriageway within the current public highway section of Chickenhall Lane is not considered appropriate and off carriageway facilities for this section should be considered. Finally, the route should be secured to be complete and open for use prior to first occupation of the proposed development.

While provision of this route would have some wider sustainable mode connectivity benefits, a connection to the north is required to make this development acceptable. In the absence of this connection the HA consider the development does not prioritise sustainable transport modes and does not provide suitable access for all users.

Regarding the MRF permission referenced within the TA, this development is significantly different in scale. The MRF is a relocation proposal for an existing facility and is forecast to generate c.120 two-way vehicular movements per day, compared to almost 4,000 vehicle movements forecast under this application. The mitigation and access requirements for these sites are not comparable.

Chapter 8 of the TA suggests a contribution may be appropriate mitigation to provide this link and states: *should be as part of the 'sustainable transport interventions fund' and for these works to be delivered by HCC as land owner and also the relevant highway authority. An appropriate funding mechanism would be secured through the S106 legal agreement.*

While it is appreciated that the Applicant does not own the land required to deliver the route, the link is required to make the development acceptable and therefore further discussions regarding the delivery of the route and the associated mechanism for this is required with the relevant parties.

Alternative Northern Connections

The TA notes possible improvements to the Itchen Way that could facilitate an alternative northern connection. These improvements are not well progressed and are far from guaranteed. If they were progressed, there is no certainty the improvements would provide a suitable amenity link to serve the site. The provision of a connection to and potential for a future improvement of the Itchen Way does not address the need for a northern link as part of these proposals.

Active Travel England Assessment

This assessment is aimed at addressing ATE criteria and, as such, the HA will defer to ATE to comment on the suitability of the assessment. However, in relation to each criteria, the HA note:

1. The design of improvements and delivery mechanism has not been agreed for either appropriate connections to the north or the pedestrian and cycle improvements at Wide Lane Bridge.
2. Section C relates to Bishopstoke Road itself, rather than Chickenhall Lane between Conegar Road and A335/ Bishopstoke Road junction (where the HA feel improvements are required). The proposed solution of planning conditions (/obligations) to provide access from the Site to Mitchell Way and Conegar Road do not address the access issues. Contributions to improving these routes are mentioned, but as currently set out, this does not provide sufficient certainty the required improvements and public access to make the development acceptable will be delivered.
3. The amendments to Mitchell Way have been reviewed by the HA (comments above). Access to Bishopstoke Road bus stops (and onward routes) is not proposed to be delivered by the applicant. Paragraph 4.11 of the TA states a connection to the Itchen Way will be made, however, paragraph 6.52 (and 6.66) states *the ecological impact of these proposals is considered to outweigh the benefits of providing a connection to the PRow at this time*. Clarity on what is proposed is required. The nearest bus stops (in the absence of a route to the north, or a change in service), are 1,700m from the site. The nearest facilities, within the airport itself or rail station, are a mile away.
4. Comments on cycle access via Wide Lane (including Wide Lane Bridge), Mitchell Way and from the north are provided above.
5. It is not clear if service U1C will be diverted to serve the proposed bus stop within the site. If it is, this only provides direct bus access to the site from Southampton, highlighting the need for a route to bus stops north of the site. There is no direct link for pedestrians between the southern and northern plots, as noted above, to conveniently access this stop if it is served; a significant 'dog leg' via the access road is required under the current proposals.

6. Concerns with both the internal and external links are set out above.
7. As above, there is no direct active travel connection between the plots and segregated cycle provision has not been provided internal to the parcels.
8. No comments.
9. To be agreed during any future Reserved Matters applications.
10. HA comments on the submitted Framework Travel Plan are provided below.

In general, the TA has not considered the suitability of pedestrian and cycle routes beyond the immediate access points to the site, Mitchell Way, Wide Lane bridge and Chickenhall Lane. A wider assessment of the existing infrastructure and potential improvements to encourage the use of sustainable modes and provide access for all links from residential areas and public transport connections to the site should be provided.

Trip Generation

The scoping note sets out the trip generation methodology to forecast number of trips that could be generated by the proposed development and compared these to the trips included within the SRTM. In terms of the assessment of highway impact, the LHA require a standalone assessment of the proposals based in first principles, rather than use of the SRTM, particularly as the SRTM assessment was based on a significantly different quantum and land use (30,000sqm of office floorspace) and the exact trip rates used are unknown. As such, this comparison serves little benefit and has not been reviewed or commented upon.

Trip Rates

The TRICS database has been used to estimate trip rates, and therefore trip generation, using comparable developments. The following employment sub-land use categories have been used to identify sites for each potential employment land use.

- TRICS Category B – ‘Business Park’ for the Proposed Development E(g)(ii) Research and development of products and processes and (iii) Industrial Processes land use.
- TRICS Category D - ‘Industrial Estate’ for the Proposed Development B2 – General Industrial use.
- TRICS Category F - ‘Warehousing (Commercial)’ for the Proposed B8 – Storage and Distribution use.
- TRICS Category G - ‘Parcel Distribution Centres’ for the Proposed B8 – Parcel Distribution Centre use.

The use of England only sites, excluding Greater London and the exclusion of surveys carried out during the COVID-19 period is acceptable as is the use of sites with vehicle only surveys, giving a larger dataset. Justification has been provided for the removal of specific sites in Appendix P. The land use categories included, and the forecast trip rates for these are considered acceptable.

Trip Generation

The application is Outline; the proportion of each proposed development land use is unknown, and flexibility is hoped to be retained within any future permission. Two scenarios have been considered.

- Scenario 1:
 - 15% Class E (g) (ii) R&D and (iii) Industrial Processes
 - 15% B2 - General Industrial Use
 - 60% B8 - Warehousing Use
 - 10% B8 – Parcel Distribution.
- Scenario 2:
 - 10% Class E (g) (ii) R&D and (iii) Industrial Processes
 - 10% B2 - General Industrial Use
 - 75% B8 - Warehousing Use
 - 5% B8 – Parcel Distribution.

In terms of trip generation, Class E (g) (ii) R&D and (iii) Industrial Processes generates the highest forecast number of car trips and B8 – Parcel Distribution generates the highest forecast number of HGV trips. These proportions are relatively low in the suggested scenarios above. Assuming any future planning permission limits these two land uses to the percentages given in Scenario 1 above (that is, 15% Class E (g) (ii) R&D and (iii) Industrial Processes and 10% B8 – Parcel Distribution) then Scenario 1 is considered acceptable to assess the development impact on the highway network. Restricting the quantum of floor space on this basis, rather than a percentage, would add clarity.

Should the Applicant not be willing to restrict these land uses to the above, a more robust assessment, with higher proportions of these land uses, is required. The proposal of a 'Trip Budget' for the site is not acceptable, further comments on this below.

Scenario 1 forecasts the following vehicular trip generation, extracted from the TA:

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%

It is noted a reduction has not been applied to the above for Mezzanine floorspace. However, a 50% reduction in trips has been applied for Mezzanine areas in the

100% B8 scenario. The Applicant should clarify the area of floorspace to which this reduction has been applied and note (and compare to the above) the trip generation if this reduction is not applied. The HA's concern is that in the absence of this reduction the 100% B8 (Warehousing) scenario would generate more HGV trips than is being tested by the Scenario 1 trip generation.

It is also proposed to apply the 50% reduction to the total mezzanine trips at the Reserved Matters stage when full details of the proposed mezzanine floorspace are known for individual units. The Applicant has confirmed that the TRICs sites used do not include any element of mezzanine floor space, and therefore trip generation from mezzanines is not already included in the forecast trip generation. As such, a reduction in trips associated with mezzanine floor area may be considered acceptable, however, the justification provided is anecdotal and regarding the application referenced, while the TA suggests a 50% reduction, the LPA did not specifically accept this, simply stating *"The development proposals for Plot 12 would not result in traffic or person trip generation levels above that permitted and assessed as part of the DCO for SLPEMG"*.

If a reduction is agreed at the Reserved Matters stage, it could be that mezzanine flooring is restricted to storage only in any future permission. Furthermore, the LPA should confirm that Mezzanine floor area would be included in the total floor area permitted (and any change in use of mezzanine floorspace would be restricted); that is, any future permission will be restricted by Gross Internal Area, which would include mezzanine floor areas, and not Gross External Area, which would not. Finally, any reduction, if agreed, would only apply to B2 and B8 land uses/ trips.

Trip Generation Budget

To retain flexibility of land uses whilst ensuring that the proposed development trips do not exceed those tested in Scenario 1, it is proposed that a 'Trip Budget' is secured in planning. The trip generation associated with each Reserved Matters Application would be calculated (and presumably agreed with the LPA in consultation with the HA). If the cumulative trip generation for any Reserved Matters application exceeded the Trip Budget (although it's not clear if this relates to all vehicles, PCUs or if there would be a separate HGV cap), that parcel would not be allowed to be developed as that land use.

This approach is not considered acceptable by the HA for the reasons set out below:

- It is not considered appropriate to permit development under an outline permission that may not be deliverable at the Reserved Matters stage. It is not possible to adequately mitigate the outline application in a viable way using a Trip Budget approach.
- A robust assessment should be carried out at this outline planning stage to ensure future development can be accommodated and is wholistically mitigated from the outset.
- It may mean the final Reserved Matters parcels cannot be occupied if the cap is reached, or further mitigation may be required, which should be dealt with at this outline planning stage to ensure that any severe impacts arising from

the outline quantum of the development can be effectively mitigated now and not at the Reserved Matters stage.

Proposed Development Multi-Modal Trips

The forecast trips by mode are shown in table 7.22 of the TA, copied below. While the methodology for calculating these is acceptable, to achieve the forecast bus, cycle and (in particular) on foot trips forecast, a link to the north of the site would be essential.

Table 7.22: Proposed Development Scenario 1: Multi-modal Trips

Mode	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)			PM Peak (17:00 - 18:00)			Daily		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Train	34	7	41	6	27	33	163	166	329
Bus, minibus or coach	17	3	20	3	14	17	81	83	164
Taxi	5	1	6	1	4	5	23	24	47
Motorcycle, scooter/ moped	2	0	3	0	2	2	12	12	23
Driving a car or van	304	62	366	53	246	300	1,465	1,495	2,960
Passenger in a car or van	29	6	35	5	23	29	139	142	282
Bicycle	19	4	23	3	16	19	93	95	188
On foot	72	15	87	13	59	71	349	356	705
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Vehicles	483	98	581	85	391	476	2,325	2,373	4,698

Employee Vehicle Distribution (Light Vehicles – Car, Motorcycles, Taxis)

The use of Journey to Work Census data for Eastleigh 006 MSOA area is appropriate, as is Google Maps to ascertain the quickest route for assignment of these trips. Where two routes have the same journey time, a 50/50 split of these trips has been applied between the two routes, which is acceptable. The forecast distribution and assignment in Table 7.23 of the TA is considered acceptable.

Light Goods Vehicles (LGV) Distribution

The distribution of development generated LGVs is based on recorded turning counts at surveyed junctions. While turning counts at the junctions remote from Spitfire Way Roundabout are for general traffic, not specifically LGVs, this will give a reasonable approximation of likely distribution and assignment. This methodology and the resulting distribution and assignment are considered acceptable.

Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) Distribution

The Applicant suggests a condition where HGVs route to and from the M27 only, to reduce the potential impact of HGVs on local roads. This may be acceptable and to some extent will be self-enforcing given height restrictions and the nature of the surrounding highway network, however further discussion around enforcement including the Local Planning Authority will be required before this approach can be

confirmed. The HGV distribution and assignment on the road network Hampshire County Council as HA is responsible for are considered acceptable.

It is noted that delivery and servicing vehicle trips are already incorporated within the vehicular trip rates and that a delivery and servicing strategy will be provided and agreed as part of any future Reserved Matters applications. Similarly, a detailed construction management plan would be a condition of any future permission if granted, to be updated in accordance with any future Reserved Matters applications.

Highway Impact

Junction Model Overview and Study Area

The proposed study area and junctions assessed is not considered acceptable. The traffic distribution includes a forecast 91 trips using Stoneham Lane. As such, this route should be assessed.

It is also noted that Twyford Road Roundabout is not included in the study area. Given the level of forecast traffic this is acceptable, however, in the absence of a northern pedestrian and cycle link (also connecting to bus services), vehicular trips may be higher in this location, necessitating a capacity assessment and potentially mitigation.

Assessment Scenarios

It is noted that the junction peak hours have been individually assessed and modelled accordingly to reflect the busiest AM and PM hour at each location, which is welcomed.

The proposed future year assessment scenarios of 2028 base, 2028 base + development, 2036 base and 2036 base + development are acceptable. These future years have been assessed using the Scenario 1 trip generation.

TEMPRO Growth

The HA have reviewed the TEMPRO methodology and provide the following comments:

- The TEMPRO adjustment assumes that the employment within the SRTM DS3 modelling, which included 30,000sqm of B1 office uses for the Navigator Quarter, is accounted for in the TEMPRO employment growth for Eastleigh between 2023 and 2036.
- The TA assumes that 1 job per 30,000sqm would result in 3,000 jobs.
- The HA note that the TEMPRO housing and employment projections for Eastleigh are based on the Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2016 – 2036, which in turn fed into the current local plan.
- Having reviewed the SHLAA assessment and Local Plan the HA agree with the approach utilised in the TA to assume zero employment growth within TEMPRO between 2023 and 2036 on the basis that the Navigation Quarter is anticipated to be included in the employment growth assumptions.

However, the HA have not been able to replicate the standard or adjusted factors presented within the TA. The growth factors presented in the TA for 2023-2025 are higher than those extracted by the HA. The factors extracted for 2025-2028 and 2025-2036 are lower than those extracted by the HA. Therefore, this should be revisited by the applicant and clarification provided to the HA on the scenario and version of TEMPRO utilised and how the alternative assumptions have been applied. The HA require the core scenario to be utilised in the assessment. At this stage the growth factors applied in the TA are not agreed.

Committed Development

The committed developments include are acceptable.

Junction Capacity

Given the comments above regarding the overall trip generation from the site and the TEMPRO methodology, the model inputs may require further work. However, to expedite progress of the application, the model set up for each of the junctions within Hampshire County Council's remit as HA have been reviewed. Where mitigation has been proposed, comments on this are also provided. Modelling outputs will be commented upon once the inputs, model set up and, where applicable, mitigation design have been agreed as acceptable.

J01 Southampton Road/ Wide Lane/ South Street

1. Saturation flow for Arm 2 lane 1 has been directly entered whilst the others have been calculated using the RR67 method. Please could this be explained.
2. How the cycle time has been determined should be confirmed. The cycle times could be increased in forecast scenarios to provide additional capacity.
3. It is not necessary to model phase F (this will not affect the results).
4. Intergreens from D to E are missing (this will not affect the results).
5. Bonus green times have been used. It is not clear whether these are to represent Phase E (Stage 2) demand dependency, the pedestrian crossing phase D (Stage 3) or both. Given the very low flow turning right into South Street from Southampton Road, it is unlikely that phase E will run, therefore stage 2 could be removed from the stage sequence and any bonus times for this lane also removed. If bonus greens have been used to account for the demand dependency of the pedestrian crossing, then details, surveys and any assumptions that have been made to calculate the times should be provided.
6. Lane 3/1 has a minus -1 second bonus green; this should be explained.
7. How the queueing up and down Wide Lane/ Southampton Road affects this junction should be considered; a queue survey or any observations of peak hour traffic conditions at this junction should be provided.

J02 Southampton Road/ Parkway Station

1. Phase delays are included in the configuration although they have not been entered in the model (this will not affect the results).

2. The cycle times can be modified to achieve around 1-5% positive PRC to reflect MOVA operation.
3. Stage 5 and Phase H do not need to be modelled and can be removed.
4. Details of how the bonus greens have been calculated should be provided.
5. Some of the saturation flows have been directly entered, whilst others have been calculated using RR67. Clarification regarding this approach should be provided.

J03 A335/ Wide Lane Roundabout

1. The geometry CAD plans do not include any Xref layers so it is not possible to review or comment on the geometric parameters used in the model.
2. It is not clear why so many different scenarios have been produced with dummy lanes when the lane simulation facility in J9 or J10 could be used. This method is not taking into account the flaring, assuming that traffic always has access to the lane. This should be corrected.
3. The Wide Lane S arm approach half width (6m) looks very wide; this should be confirmed.

Regarding the mitigation design at this junction (Appendix DD, drawing 24733101-STR-HGN-100-DR-D-00302 Rev P01), the HA has the following comments.

- On the A335 arms it is proposed to amend the lane entries allowing 2-way movements through the roundabout. There is concern that this would lead to side on collisions due to the limited roundabout footprint and number of movement options being put through the circulatory carriageway and on exit. This is also not allowed under CD116.
- Further to the above the design is also expecting these side-by-side movements to merge over a short length immediately after exiting. This is particularly problematic on the western arm where you have 2 lanes merging into 1 lane and the segregated lane from the south also merging (3 into 1).
- The design may create capacity issues and conflict on the exit arms. The proposals raise road safety concerns and there are concerns that the operation may not be as modelled.
- Further points to note include the effectiveness of the segregated lanes and safe operation, these include:
 - 1) The Wide Lane to M27 lane merges so soon after this will not really allow a true opportunity to merge and would just push waiting on the exit arm
 - 2) Regarding the A335 to Eastleigh movement, the longer merge could create issues for vehicles getting across to access Parkway station, which requires crossing the adjacent lane/ movements.
- The following additional information is required to assess the acceptability of the mitigation design:
 - Vehicle tracking of all movements through the roundabout, including side by side merging, to be provided to the Safety Auditor for review.
 - Road Safety Audit 1 and designer's response.

Even if the above are considered acceptable, an in-principle Departure from Standards will need to be agreed with the HA at this planning stage to ensure the works proposed are deliverable.

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

1. The geometry CAD plans do not include any Xref layers so it is not possible to review or comment on the geometric parameters used in the model.
2. The mitigation involves adding a left turn only and ahead marking into the Wide Lane Northern arm. The base scenario modelling assumes a total capacity for the lane plus a flare and the demand is applied to the total capacity (effectively assuming traffic will use both lanes evenly). The mitigation limits which traffic can use either lane and unless the flows are exactly 50/50 one of the lanes will exceed 50% of the total demand flow. With no other geometric changes, it does not follow that Arcady would produce a more favourable result as demonstrated. Regardless of whether practically the mitigation provides an improvement on site the methodology used in the modelling is flawed. The more favourable result demonstrated in the Arcady mitigation scenario is likely to be due to the use of a dummy arm. The entry width has been halved but the mitigation model assumes two separate approach lanes each with its own effective flare length. This does not reflect the mitigation layout and results in an overestimation of capacity on this arm. Instead, the lane simulation function in Arcady Junctions9 (or preferably Junctions10) should be used, which would forecast a reasonable result.

Travel Plan

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>.

In general, the travel plan is light on measures and detail. Our suggested measure list for commercial sites is available here:

<https://documents.hants.gov.uk/transport/suggested-travel-plan-measures-commercial.pdf>

This contains a list of measures that would support sustainable travel for the proposed development. Some key omissions are listed below:

- There is no provision for subsidised or free Beryl Bike access to introduce/ encourage usage, despite the fact that two Beryl Bike stands are proposed for the site.
- 'Restraint based car parking' is briefly mentioned; while any staff parking strategy will be forthcoming at the reserved matters stage should the development progress, the Framework Travel Plan should include any proposed parking restrictions for staff.
- It is proposed that employee information is disseminated via a noticeboard. This would be more effective in an employee pack, made available to all new employees at the point of hire. This pack should include a bespoke map showing cycling and walking links from the site, bus stops and the time it takes to walk to them, etc, not just HCC/ EBC maps of the wider area.

All measures need to be accurately costed for the full duration of the travel plan, including the travel plan coordinator post and presented in the Framework Travel

Plan. These costings will form the value of the travel plan cash deposit, to be secured via S106 Agreement, and should be included as a column at the end of the action plan in Table 9.1.

The applicant should review the measures list, add in further measures that are relevant and achievable and cost these accordingly. An updated Travel Plan should be submitted for review.

Monitoring approach

The proposed monitor and manage agreement with the Councils to ensure that a 'sustainable transport interventions fund' is used to address the impacts of the proposal, requires further discussion. As set out above, the mitigation at Wide Lane Bridge and the northern link should be delivered directly by the applicant. However, this approach may be acceptable for other mitigation measures.

Mitigation

The TA summarised the mitigation package. This is copied below in italics, with HA comments below.

- *Provision of a new active travel footway/cycleway to the western side of Mitchell Way between the masterplan and the Airport Parkway Station.*
Design comments need to be addressed.
- *Full provision of a new primary spine road to serve the proposed development with a segregated cycle/pedestrian route running alongside it. This has the potential to form part of the future CLLR if it were to subsequently come forward.*
Noted, however for the purposes of the application this represents a private development access road, and not mitigation.
- *Provision of a shared use footway/ cycleway link from the North Plot to underneath the railway line to the north, that could ultimately connect with a potential future active travel route to the north.*
The onward active travel link to Bishopstoke Road needs to be designed and secured as set out above.
- *An obligation/ S106 requirement for Unit/ Plot specific Travel Plans to be produced prior to occupation of any Units, with associated monitoring undertaken for a 5-year period post occupation of each Unit/ Plot.*
Travel Plan comments above need to be addressed.
- *A financial contribution for the provision of two Beryl Bike bays within the masterplan and associated membership.*
Comments above need to be addressed. Wider implementation of micromobility should be considered.
- *Full payment for the identified off-site improvement to the Spitfire Roundabout.*
Mitigation, once agreed, should be delivered by the Applicant via S278 Agreement.
- *Appropriate financial contribution to a Sustainable Transport Fund towards improvements for the Wide Lane Roundabout. This could potentially be a monitor and manage solution.*

Mitigation, once agreed, should be delivered by the Applicant via S278 Agreement. Given the forecast impact, a monitor and manage approach to the direct delivery requirements is not acceptable.

- *Provision of an appropriate financial contribution towards the Wide Lane Bridge active travel bridge (to support design fees and/or capital costs for its provision)*

Mitigation, once agreed, should be delivered by the Applicant via S278 Agreement

This HA response notes the requirement for additional consideration and assessment of a number of areas, which may lead to further mitigation requirements not listed above.

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