

To National Highways

CC

- Liz Harrison (EBC)
- Bloc Group
- Atkins Property
- AGS Airports
- MSA

From Steer

Date 27 November 2025

Project Navigator Quarter, Southampton

Technical Memo

Project No. 24733101

Post-Application National Highways Comments – Technical Response

Introduction

1. The Hybrid Planning Application related to Navigator Quarter was submitted to Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC) on behalf of Blocwork (Eastleigh) LLP and Southampton Airport Limited (SIAL) and was validated on 17 July 2025. The EBC planning application reference is O/25/99506. Steer prepared the following transport documents to support the planning application:
 - Transport Assessment (TA);
 - Outline Framework Travel Plan (FTP); and
 - Environmental Statement (ES) – Transport Chapter.
2. Responses have since been received from National Highways is summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Format of responses from consultees

Organisation	Format of comments	Date issued
National Highways (NH)	PDF File: 010825 Navigation Qtr NHPR Hold_Redacted	1 August 2025
	Email exchange regarding M27 J5 LinSig model	12 September 2025
	Email exchange regarding TEMPro assumptions	25 September 2025
	Comments received by email	4 November 2025

3. Steer's responses to the post-application comments received to date from National Highways (Table 1) are documented in Table 3.
4. Supplementary evidence for the responses in Table 3 is provided in the following appendices (summarised in Table 2), which include detailed technical notes, highway design drawings and other sources of information. These are provided to National Highways via a Sharepoint link (issued 27 November 2025).

Table 2: List of supporting information

Appendix reference	Document name	Details
A	Itchen Way Ecological Constraints Tech Note	Technical Note issued by MSA to EBC outlining the ecological constraints in providing the Itchen Way connection.
B	Updated GIS Catchment Maps	• Cycling Catchment Plan (Current Infrastructure) • Walking Catchment Plan (Current Infrastructure)
C	Modelling Technical Note	Technical Note setting out the modelling results of the seven junctions within the study area using Junctions 9 and Linsig v3. Updated note with all of the junction mitigation results to be provided in due course.
D	MSA Note on TA Core Scenario 1 – Trip Generation	Email correspondence from MSA setting out the Applicant’s position regarding the trip budget/use class caps for any permission that may be approved for the Navigator Quarter development.
E	Merge and Diverge Assessment Technical Note	• Technical Note summarising the merge and diverge assessment undertaken at the M27 J5.
F	Updated Junction Modelling Files	Updated junctions modelling output files for M27 J5 (all scenarios)
G	TEMPPro Email Correspondence	• Email correspondence with HCC confirming approach to applying TEMPPro factors; and • Excel Spreadsheet setting out a TEMPPro factor comparison.

Table 3: Response to National Highways comments

Ref.	NH Comment	Applicant Response
Introduction		
1	Related to para 1.1 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): <i>SIAL's role as Applicant suggests that the proposed development could very likely have an airport-related element which the site is ideally located to fulfil. However, that won't necessarily reduce the potential traffic impact on the broader highway network if, say, the site accommodates air-related parcel/goods movements. With the exception of air-to-air transfer, parcels/goods travelling through the airport will still use the highway network to travel to and from the airport.</i>	The exact nature of the units proposed will be confirmed at Reserved Matters stage. However, it is important to note that the trip generation assessments undertaken in the Transport Assessment made no allowance for any potential trip generation reduction associated with any air-to-air transfer activities. Any potential reduction applied to trip generation associated with this activity will be discussed at Reserved Matters stage.
2	Related to para 1.15 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): <i>This does not appear to require the proposed development to assess a traffic impact scenario assuming a new Chickenhall Lane Link Road. It only requires that '[the] design and layout of new development ... not preclude ... the provision of a new Chickenhall Lane Link Road' and 'the development proposals ... make a contribution towards the full link road proportionate to the traffic impact' and that '[p]arts of [the Link Road] ... be constructed as part of the new Site access arrangements'.</i>	Noted
3	Related to para 1.15 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): <i>How much can the proposed Chickenhall Lane Link Road (CLLR) be expected to affect the trip generation of the proposed development and potential flows on the SRN?</i> <i>Would it possibly (i) heighten the accessibility of the site thereby maximising possible traffic generation possibilities and (ii) increase the possibility of development traffic routing to and from the north via M3 J12 and to and from the west via M3 J13?</i>	All Transport Assessment scoping discussions for the planning application have reflected the Proposed Development being delivered in future highway assessment scenarios without the CLLR being implemented, as a vehicle access route. That methodology has been agreed with EBC and HCC and the Transport Assessment has therefore been undertaken on the basis that the CLLR is not in place at the point the development becomes operational.

Ref.	NH Comment	Applicant Response
Existing Site, Accessibility and Transport Conditions		
4	<i>See 3 above for routing possibilities if the proposed CLLR was to be delivered</i>	See response to comment 3
5	<i>Pedestrian and cycle access isn't simply limited by the site being on undeveloped land; railway lines arguably present the biggest challenges.</i>	This is recognised.
6	<i>Is the Itchen Way Navigation Heritage Trail a plausible walk and cycle option - at least at the moment? See paragraphs 5.35 and 5.36 in the TA.</i>	At the present time, the Navigator Quarter site is private land with no public right of access to or across it and there is no formal public connection currently between the site and the Itchen Way Navigation Heritage Trail. The TA recognises the limitations with this route during poorer weather conditions/ hours of darkness, and that is it more suitable for leisure users. It is intended that alternative active travel routes will be used in the first instance, given their higher suitability. It is not possible to provide a connection to the Itchen Way directly from the Site. Please refer to the Technical Note prepared by MSA at Appendix A which sets out the constraining ecological factors, in addition to security, useability, safety, archaeology as well as landscape and visual impacts reasons.
7	<i>Is the 'Less than 10 minutes' isochrone to the west and northwest of the site realistic given the severance associated with the rail lines?</i>	Figure 3-5 and 3-6 in the TA had assumed that following: - Campbell Road connection via rail line was 'open'. We accept that this does not actually allow access however, and have removed this in the updated catchment map (Appendix B). - Site northern active travel route via the Network Rail bridge underpass was 'open', and would provide access to those northern catchments. We accept that this does not actually allow formal access in the existing situation however, as it is restricted to farmer and Network Rail maintenance access only (not public access). We have removed this as a connection in the updated catchment map (Appendix B). As part of the updated catchment map, it is also confirmed that the following assumption were applied:

Ref.	NH Comment	Applicant Response	
		There is currently no connection between the Site and the Itchen Way Navigator. The updated catchment map therefore shows a more realistic representation of accessible areas in the existing situation, which is namely limited to areas along Mitchell Way, George Curl Way, A335 and Wide Lane (towards Swaythling).	
9 / 10	<i>Related to para 3.80 -3.81 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025):</i> <i>Irrespective of whether the 2021 Census data was used or not, the specific location of the site cannot be expected to have a similar walk or cycle share as the more densely developed parts of Eastleigh which would dominate the 2021 data.</i> <i>Mode split assumptions appear irrelevant to the assessment of vehicular impacts given the way vehicular trip generation has been estimated (using TRICS vehicular rates rather than person rates broken down across the different modes).</i>	The forecast vehicular trip generation for the proposed development (used to assess the impacts on M27 J5) was based on vehicle trip rates from the selected TRICS sites. Census mode shares were not used to forecast vehicle trips.	
11	<i>Related to para 3.93 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025):</i> <i>This section ought to be updated/corrected to include the counts undertaken at M27 J5 in 2025 (c.f. paragraph 8.74 and paragraph 3.6 of the 'Highways Modelling Technical Note' in Appendix Y).</i>	A summary of the updated traffic counts is provided in the Highways Modelling Technical Note located in Appendix C of this response.	
12	<i>Related to para 5.3 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025):</i> <i>Surely the Wide Lane Bridge is to the southwest of the site.</i>	This was a typo in the original Transport Assessment.	
13	<i>Related to para 6.9 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025):</i> <i>When were baseline mode shares agreed with National Highways?</i>	Please note the response to Comment 10 above.	
Trip Generation			
14	<i>Related to Table 7.4 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025):</i> <i>The upper end of the 'Class B2 General Industrial (TRICS - Industrial Unit)' and 'Class B8 Storage and Distribution (TRICS Parcel Distribution Centres)' appear low - 9,216sqm and 6,016sqm respectively.</i> <i>Note: Table 7.5 suggests that the latter is incorrect: Site SO-02-G-01 Horton Road, Slough, Colnbrook' is 15,583sqm.</i>	It is confirmed that TRICS site SO-02-G-01 Horton Road, Slough, Colnbrook does have a 15,583sqm, however this site was discounted as the survey was undertaken during COVID-19 and not considered an accurate reflection of travel behaviour.	

Ref.	NH Comment	Applicant Response	
15	<i>Related to Table 7.5 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): Site SO-02-G-01 Horton Road, Slough, Colnbrook' is 15,583sqm. The upper end of the 'Class B8 Storage and Distribution (TRICS Parcel Distribution Centres)' in Table 7.4 therefore appears incorrect.</i>	See previous response to comment 14.	
16	<i>Related to Tables 7.22 and 7.23 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): National Highways' feedback at the scoping stage included the following: 'Use B8 accommodates potential parcel distribution activity. Parcel distribution rates should also be used to represent a potential B8 worst case trip generation.' 10% and 5% parcel distribution does not represent a potential 'worst case trip generation' for the site.</i>	It is proposed to restrict the quantum of floorspace in line with the TA Core Scenario 1 that was assessed in the Transport Statement. Further details are provided in the MSA Note issued on 22/10/2025 which is included in Appendix D for reference.	
17	<i>Related to para 7.40 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): National Highways' feedback at the scoping stage included the following: 'HGV trip generation is not typically associated with the number of loading bays available – it is the other way around (i.e. the number of HGV loading bays required is a function of the HGV trip generation). The number of HGV loading bays available does determine HGV bay capacity (which is a different matter).'</i>	No reduction has been applied to mezzanine floorspace trips within the main TA trip generation Scenario 1 which is proposed to be reflected in the land use restrictions. Further details are provided in the MSA Note issued on 22/10/2025 which is included in Appendix D for reference. Any potential reduction in trips associated with mezzanine floorspace will be discussed at Reserved Matters stage when the extent of mezzanines are known.	
18	<i>Related to para 7.31 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): This is true as long as the mezzanine floor space is not re-purposed for additional site activities (e.g. business-related activities additional to those normally associated with the activities the site was developed to accommodate).</i>	See response to comment 17	
19	<i>Related to para 7.32 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): Decisions reached elsewhere or even locally for other developments do not necessarily stand as precedents.</i>	See response to comment 17	

Ref.	NH Comment	Applicant Response	
20	<i>Related to para 7.34 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): Scenarios 1 and 2 would not be considered 'worst case' scenarios by National Highways. See comment 16.</i>	See response to comment 17	
21	<i>Related to para 7.47 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): The increases in LGV and OGV trips are significant, especially the latter in terms of pcus</i>	Noted.	
22	<i>Related to para 7.57 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): Scenarios 1 and 2 would not be considered 'worst case' scenarios by National Highways. See comment 16</i>	See response to Comment 16.	
23	<i>Related to para 7.58 and 7.59 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): Mode split assumptions appear to be irrelevant to the assessment of vehicular impacts given the way vehicular trip generation has been estimated (using TRICS vehicular rates rather than person rates broken down across the different modes).</i>	This is correct.	
24	<i>Related to Table 7.23 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): As significant (i.e. in addition to trips actually using the M27) are the 62% and 67% of employees travelling through M27 J5 in the morning and evening peaks hours (M27 East, M27 West, Stoneham Lane, Basset Green Road and an estimated 50% of Stoneham Way trips).</i>	The trips passing through M27 J5 have been assessed within the Transport Assessment highway impacts and junction modelling.	
25	<i>Related to para 7.70 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): This appears to be reasonable until one recognises the step-change in LGV traffic that the proposed development might involve with LGVs having a wider footprint because not simply service in nature. LGV trips associated with parcel distribution activities would be expected to have a large footprint.</i>	This point is noted. However please see the response to comment 16.	
26	<i>Related to para 7.71 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025):</i>	Noted.	

Ref.	NH Comment	Applicant Response	
	<i>The proportions of LGVs travelling from/to the M27 and through M27 J5 appear to be reasonable unless strategic rather than local parcel distribution occurs on the site.</i>		
27	<i>Related to para 7.71 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): JSJV's calculations yielded slightly higher but sufficiently close flows (6% and 4% higher in the AM and PM peak hours) through M27 J5 than those presented in Appendix W. 0% HGVs on the M27 westbound off-slip at M27 J5 in the AM and PM peak hours is incorrect.</i>	This was an error in the % change formula. 13 HGV trips are forecast out of the total 60 proposed development movements (21% HGVs) during the AM peak on the M27 J5 westbound off-slip. During the PM peak 24 HGV trips are forecast out of the total 37 trips (65% HGVs) on the off-slip. The physical number of HGVs was used in the modelling assessments and not the percentage.	
28	<i>Related to para 7.77 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025): JSJV's calculations yielded higher flows (10% and 13% higher in the AM and PM peak hours) through M27 J5 than those presented in Appendix X possibly because of the 0% HGVs on the M27 westbound off-slip at M27 J5 in the AM and PM peak hours in Appendix W.</i>	Without further context it is not possible to respond to this comment.	
Highways Assessment			
29	<i>JSJV is still to review the material provided in Appendix Y. Such a review will await receipt of model materials for M27 J5. See comments 31 and 33.</i>	Actioned – material sent to NH on August 7 2025 (via Sharepoint link).	
30	<i>National Highways would be interested in the modelling of Junction 06 (M27 J5).</i>	Actioned – material sent to NH on August 7 2025 (via Sharepoint link)	
31	<i>Please supply the models of M27 J5 and all materials used to develop them (traffic surveys, drawings, etc.) to National Highways.</i>	Actioned – material sent to NH on August 7 2025 (via Sharepoint link)	
32	<i>Five model links for J06 are missing from the table (9/2 Southern Circulatory Right Ahead, 9/3 Southern Circulatory Right, 10/1 Western Circulatory Ahead, 10/2 Western Circulatory Right Ahead and 10/3 Western Circulatory Right).</i>	Actioned – This were included in the material sent to NH on August 7 2025 (via Sharepoint link)	
33	<i>Please supply the models of M27 J5 and all materials used to develop them (traffic surveys, drawings, etc.) to National Highways.</i>	Actioned – material sent to NH on August 7 2025 (via Sharepoint link)	
34	<i>Related to para 8.63-8.68 of the submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025):</i>	i) See response to comment 16 above.	

Ref.	NH Comment	Applicant Response
	<i>The use of parcel distribution rates and distributions for a higher amount of the B8 use is likely to result in higher flows through M27 J5. National Highways will therefore require the full assessment of M27 J5 (i) with a higher amount of parcel distribution activity than assumed and (ii) a review of the off and on slips in both directions (i.e. CD 122 assessments) to confirm that the additional traffic generated by the proposed development will not create or aggravate safety issues on the off and on slips.</i>	ii) A Merge and Diverge assessment has been undertaken – the output results are contained at Appendix E . Further responses on this are provided in relation to comment 46 onwards subsequently within this table.
Comments received by email from National Highways on 12 September 2025.		
M27 Jct 5 LinSig Model		
35	<i>Lane 5/1 should arguably be a short lane since it is only around 90m in length. However, given the relatively low levels of queuing on this arm converting from the current 'long' lane to a 90m short lane is unlikely to have any material impact on the model.</i>	This lane has been coded as a long-lane because, although it is 90m in length (~16 PCUs), only ~10 PCUs can discharge during its 16s of green (based on its lane capacity of 2133 PCU/hr). As the stored vehicles cannot normally clear in one cycle, the lane behaves as a continuous long-lane rather than a short lane/flare. The modelling result output files for the updated M27 Jct 5 assessments have been provided at Appendix F.
36	<i>Saturation flows used comprise a mix of mostly directly entered with some using RR67. The directly entered discharge rates are slightly higher (some 2,100-2,200 PCUs/hr) than normally expected (around 2,000 PCUs) for this type of site, although the values used appear to be supported by saturation flow survey information supplied with the model (16367 Southampton Sat Flows Site 4.xlsx). The saturation flows are therefore probably acceptable, but the methodology for the setting of saturation flows, including reference to the survey, needs to be detailed in the modelling technical note.</i>	The Modelling Technical Note has been updated with these results, and can be found at Appendix E. The modelling result output files for the updated M27 Jct 5 assessments have been provided at Appendix F.
37	<i>Lane 1/1 which uses RR67 to estimate saturation flow has no radius specified for the ahead movement even though vehicles proceeding ahead would be passing through the same bend as those turning left. Please check and correct as appropriate.</i>	This update would have minimal impact on the Saturation Flow/DoS value <1% and is therefore deemed unnecessary to update. The modelling result output files for the updated M27 Jct 5 assessments have been provided at Appendix F.
38	<i>All internal lanes with signal-controlled upstream feeds should be set to 'Ignore Random Delay'.</i>	This update would have minimal impact on the queue lengths and is therefore deemed unnecessary to update.

Ref.	NH Comment	Applicant Response	
		The modelling result output files for the updated M27 Jct 5 assessments have been provided at Appendix F .	
39	<i>The give-way parameters for lane 4/2 include a Maximum Flow of 1439 PCUs/hr which seems high for single lane entry to a roundabout (and also happens to be the same as the default setting for give-way behaviour as opposed right turn situations). Please check if this is correct. Also, it would be helpful if the rationale for the setting of give-way parameters were explained in the modelling technical note.</i>	This has been included in the re-run modelling assessments for M27 J5. The Modelling Technical Note has been updated with these results, and can be found at Appendix C. The modelling result output files for the updated M27 Jct 5 assessments have been provided at Appendix F.	
40	<i>Controller parameter values used matches the controller configuration information provided with the model.</i>	No action required.	
41	<i>It is noted that there are Green Time adjustments of between -1 and -2 seconds on most lanes. The modelling technical note does not mention these or provide an explanation and rationale for their use in the model. Please can an explanation for the use of these adjustments be provided and set out in the modelling technical note?</i>	These are based on UGT values calculated as part of the saturation flow/DoS survey measurements. More details have been provided in the technical note (Appendix C).	
42	<i>Spot checks suggest that the surveyed traffic flows do not match the flows used in the model, with those in the latter slightly higher (e.g. movement from Zone A 'A335' to M27 East in the 7:30-8:30am hour is 361 PCUs in the survey but 375 PCUs in the model). What is the reason for the discrepancy?</i>	The difference is based on slightly different application of PCU factors/ grouping of vehicle types. The Steer assessment was 14 PCU's higher than the surveyed flows, so is a worse case, but the level of difference is negligible.	
43	<i>All modelled scenarios use a cycle time of 80 seconds. This appears to be supported by traffic signal timing survey information supplied with the model (16367 Southampton Signals Times Survey Site 4.xlsx).</i>	No action required.	
44	<i>Base model calibration and validation is thorough with comparisons of queue lengths and Degrees of Saturation provided in the modelling technical note. These show a reasonable correlation in both cases suggesting that the model is generally sound. However, queue length comparisons for the A335 (South) Stoneham Way arm appear to be omitted from Tables 4-15 and 4-16. Why is this? Some form of check on this approach is important given (1) the apparent high levels of queuing on this arm evident in the queue survey information provided (16367 Southampton Queues Site 4 only.xlsx); and (2) the need to ensure that</i>	The Modelling Technical Note has been updated to further include this information, and can be found at Appendix C .	

Ref.	NH Comment	Applicant Response	
	<i>assume give-way parameters are set accurately (especially given the potential error in lane 4/2 noted above).</i>		
45	<i>Table 5-1 sets out the modelled forecast scenarios. However, the modelling technical note does not provide any detailed information regarding growth factors applied, proposed development traffic flows and so on. This should be provided or at least some reference given to other documentation which provides details of the forecasting assumptions. Traffic flow diagrams of base and future turning movements would also be useful so that the input of traffic into the models can be checked.</i>	The submitted Transport Assessment (June 2025) included the following: - Chapter 7 – Proposed Development trip generation and distribution, including diagrams. - Chapter 8 – Highways impact assessment methodology including: → Summary of Assessment scenarios. → Tempro growth assumptions. Please note Martin Hubbard also provided clarification on the Tempro growth calculations applied by email to Nick Gammer HCC dated 11/09/2025. This correspondence has been included in Appendix G. → Committed schemes and Airport Masterplan growth methodology. → Turning movement diagrams.	
Comments received by email from National Highways on 4 November 2025.			
Merge and Diverge Assessment			
46	As stated in an email to Steer on 3rd September 2025, National Highways has noted the absence of a 'worst case' assessment assuming greater parcel distribution activity on the site (5% and 10% parcel distribution do not represent a potential 'worst case trip generation' for the site). Should the applicant stand by the statements in the TA that the assumed scenarios represent 'worst case' assessments, National Highways will want information concerning the mechanisms the applicant will be proposing to limit parcel distribution activities on the site to those assumed in the assessment.	No further action required.	
47	roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk shows that DfT count site reference 48091 is to the west not east of M27 Junction 5 (paragraph 7.23 of the TA acknowledges as much). DfT count sites references 73068 and 48064 are to the east of M27 Junction 5. Please confirm that the correct counts have been used and have also been correctly applied to calculate traffic for the merge/diverge assessments. ALL OF THE COMMENTS CONCERNING THE MERGE AND DIVERGE ASSESSMENTS BELOW ARE SUBJECT TO THIS BEING CONFIRMED.	The correct location was used to establish the mainline flows, however the reference within the text of the TN is incorrect. The reference number should be ref: 73608 rather than ref: 48091. The flows within the TN are therefore accurate, and the TN has been updated to reflect the correct DfT count reference. The updated TN is included at Appendix E.	

Ref.	NH Comment	Applicant Response	
48	It is difficult to establish the exact layout that currently exists in the field from online material. However, the existing layout appears to be Layout A1 (Figure 3.30a) with 4 upstream lanes and 4 downstream lanes rather than Layout B2 (Figure 3.30d) with 4 upstream lanes and 4 downstream lanes. All the other layouts appear to be correctly identified.	The report has been updated to identify the existing layout of the eastbound diverge as A1 Taper Diverge.	
Merge Analysis			
49	JSJV's checks focused only on the 2036 with development flows. The following comments therefore only relate to the 2036 with development assessments.	No further response required.	
50	The number of lanes required in the case of each layout ought to be specified (i.e. the number of upstream and downstream lanes given on Figure 3.12b).	The TN has been updated to include this.	
51	See comment 47 above	See response to comment 47.	
52	This statement would only be true if the existing 'C' layout was less than it actually is – i.e. 4 upstream lanes and 4 downstream lanes. The required layout according to Figure 3.12b is Layout E with 2 upstream lanes and 3 downstream lanes. Layout C with 4 upstream lanes and 4 downstream lanes provides 2 additional lanes upstream of the merge for mainline traffic to distribute across in advance of the merge facility significantly lessening merge conflicts	This has been updated in the TN.	
53	4 downstream lanes as well as 4 upstream lanes already exist. Paragraph 20 appears to acknowledge as much.	This has been updated in the TN.	
54	The type of E layout ought to be specified (i.e. an E layout with 2 upstream lanes and 3 downstream lanes) because it is significant. JSJV believes that the existing layout – Layout A1 (Figure 3.30a) with 4 upstream lanes and 4 downstream lanes – could be adequate for all of the demand flows tested.	This has been updated in the TN.	
55	The number of lanes required in the case of each layout ought to be specified (i.e. number of upstream and downstream lanes).	The TN has been updated to include this.	
56	See comment 47 above	See response to comment 47.	

Ref.	NH Comment	Applicant Response	
57	Agreed assuming the flows used are correct.	No further response required.	
58	JSJV's checks focused only on the 2036 with development flows. The following comments therefore only relate to the 2036 with development assessments.	The TN has been updated to include this.	
59	The number of lanes required in the case of each layout ought to be specified (i.e. the number of upstream and downstream lanes given on Figure 3.12b).	See response to comment 47.	
Diverge Analysis			
60	The number of lanes required in the case of each layout ought to be specified (i.e. number of upstream and downstream lanes).	The TN has been updated to include this.	
61	JSJV concluded that a 'C' layout with 3 upstream and 2 downstream lanes is required as a minimum rather than an 'A' layout with 2 upstream and 2 downstream lanes.	This has been updated in the TN.	
62	See comment 47 above	See response to comment 47.	
63	The existing layout appears to be Layout A1 (Figure 3.30a) with 4 upstream lanes and 4 downstream lanes rather than Layout B2 (Figure 3.30d) with 4 upstream lanes and 4 downstream lanes.	The Note has been updated to identify the existing layout of the eastbound diverge as A1 Taper Diverge.	
64	Agreed but assuming the existing layout is Layout A1 with 4 upstream lanes and 4 downstream lanes and also assuming the flows used are correct	No further response required – see response to comment 47.	
65	The number of lanes required in the case of each layout ought to be specified (i.e. number of upstream and downstream lanes).	The TN has been updated to include this.	
66	See comment 47 above	See response to comment 47.	
67	Agreed assuming the flows used are correct.	No further response required.	
68	JSJV believes that the existing layout – Layout A1 (Figure 3.30a) with 4 upstream lanes and 4 downstream lanes – could be adequate for all of the demand flows tested.	This has been updated in the TN.	