Hello

I am a resident of Colden Common, near Winchester, which lies adjacent to the route of the Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project's construction. Whilst I support the intent of the project overall, Colden Common Parish Council have made their residents aware of the recently published Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan for the project, which details the impact the construction ill have locally, the scale of which we were not previously aware of, and I would like my comments to be considered as part of the consultation.

My comments concern the compounds, routing and access adjacent to Colden Common & Otterbourne, corresponding to locations L-1 to L10 & M-1 to M-2 in the document. I will work East to West, to align with this numbering.

Firstly a general point on traffic marshals - the plan relies on their use throughout. It is worth considering who they are and how they are equipped. This is a junior role, requiring only a short training course, generally provided to agency staff, who are then equipped with hi-viz trousers & jacket, helmet or cap, and boots. They may have a Stop/Go sign and torches, but generally little protection from traffic beyond hi-viz.Their use on busy roads, in rural/semi-rural areas without street lighting both early & late in the day, can be dangerous without consideration of road speed, visibility beyond vehicle's braking-distance, etc. Where they may be most vulnerable, the contractors should consider whether traffic-light-based traffic management would be more appropriate.

Compound L1: This compound is adjacent to the B2177 Portsmouth Road, south-east of the junction with Stroudwood Lane. The compound is immediately adjacent to the Portsmouth Road, in an area currently unlit by street lighting. At peak there will be a total of 109 2-way LGV or HGV vehicle movements per day, plus undocumented number of PCV or private staff vehicles. This corresponds to a 1-way movement, potential obstruction of traffic, 218 times per 12-hour shift, or 1 every 18 minutes. This is a busy, fast & unlit road, shaded by mature trees and heavily used by both commuters and heavy traffic. I would suggest you may need to consider traffic-light measures on this road. It is also immediately adjacent to the South Downs National Park boundary. Both the compound and the access will potentially require floodlighting. Has the visual impact on the national park been assessed?

Compound L2: This compound is to the west of Stroudwood Lane, accessed via a haul road from compound L1. The document does not mention in the text, or provide a diagram for the layout of this haul road's junction with Stroudwood Lane, which is a narrow unlit lane with passing places, edged by hedgerows. 158 1-way movements are expected here at peak, according to table 5-32. This lack of planning will lead to unsafe crossings and hazards to other road users. Have the sight lines, traffic volumes or environmental impact been considered for this junction?

Compound L3: This compound is further West from L2 and accessed via a very long haul road from the L4/L5 compounds adjacent to the B3354 Winchester Road, crossing a number of watercourses. Compounds L2 & L3 are either side of the access road from the B2177 Portsmouth Road to Low Hill Farm. Has consideration been given to negotiating access via this access road to both compounds, to minimise the need for haul roads and to remove the need to cross Stroudwood Lane?

Compounds L4, L5 & L6: L4 & L5 are close to each other to the west of the B3354 Winchester Road, whilst L6 is opposite L5, to the west of the road. The proposed access to the east of the road appears to connect to the L4 compound, but no connection from the road, or from L4 parallel to the road, is shown to L5. How will compound L5 be accessed? The proposed access to L6 is opposite L5. Will this become essentially a crossroads, where unplanned access to L5 is achieved by a straight-line from L6? If this is the assumption, why has it not been allowed for in this

document and properly modelled? The B3354 forms a major access route from the M3 Junction 11 to the M27 at Hedge End, used to "cut the corner" for commuters and commercial traffic in significant volumes and providing a diversion route during motorway roadworks or accidents. The combined peak movements for L3/4/5 & L6/& on either side of this road are 204 2-way movements per day, i.e. 408 1-way movements. This corresponds to 34 movements per hour in a 12-hour shift, one every 1.76 minutes. This is a significantly congested commuter, commercial and bus route. Even outside of the morning peak period, this will effectively gridlock the road, delaying public & school bus services, commuters and deliveries across a large proportion of the Solent region. From a purely-local viewpoint, almost all of Colden Common's secondary school-age children attend Kings School in Winchester. Most of those travel on buses that arrive using this road. Similarly, Colden Common's only bus service, the 69, travels from Fair Oak to the village, before going on to Twyford & ultimately Winchester. This is used to access Peter Symonds College for sixth-form aged children, the Royal Hampshire County Hospital and services & jobs in Winchester by residents from Fareham, Bishops Waltham, Fair Oak, Colden Common & Twyford. It is also a frequent ambulance access route serving all of Winchester, Southampton & Portsmouth's Accident & Emergency departments. This will effectively block that route for thousands of users, with no adequate diversion route possible, due to the low rail bridge at Allbrook. You also need to consider that the access to L4 in particular is partway down a steep slope from the top of Fair Oak down to the Portsmouth Road junction at Fishers Pond, all unlit. This will affect sight lines, braking distances and overall visibility, particularly in winter months. I would strongly advise you to require traffic-light control over this complex junction, covering L4, 5 & 6, and coordinated with the lights further North at the Portsmouth Road junction. I would also urge you to consider whether the siting of L4/L5 and their access could instead be directly from the B2177 Portsmouth Road, to avoid this congestion. Whilst there are a number of watercourses in this area, there are existing access roads that cross these nearby, serving both Marwell Manor Farm and Rookery Farm to the South of Portsmouth Road, access to which could be negotiated with the landowners. The B3354 Winchester Road is an essential component of the strategic road network for South Hampshire and the Solent region and already a major choke point. Potentially blocking this road, especially whilst simultaneously impacting the B2177 Portsmouth Road for compounds L1 & 2, will have a significant impact on the community, economy & safety of a very large regional population.

Compounds L7, L8 & L9: Compound L7 is accessed via L6 and has no apparent adverse impact other than its additional strain on the B3354 Winchester Road, as detailed above for L6. However, L8 is adjacent to L7, on the other bank of a watercourse. Rather than accessing L7, a long T-shaped haul road is proposed from Church Lane to serve both. Surely it would make more sense to effectively bridge the watercourse and serve L7 via L6, significantly shortening the haul road? As L9 is also adjacent to L10 also seemingly separated from it by a watercourse, the same logic should also apply there. There should be no need to excavate a road across approximately 2 miles of open countryside, adjacent to a national park, when access can be achieved via the road network at either end. This haul road is also planned to cross Bishopstoke Lane, for which no diagram has been provided, as with Stroudwood Lane above. Table 5-32 indicates 110 1-way HGV movements per day across this road at peak, for which no crossing has been planned. This will have a material safety impact on a busy rat -run commuter route, especially when it is inevitably used to avoid the disruption planned for both the B3335 Highbridge Road & B3354 Winchester Road. Additionally, the junction proposed for the haul road with Church Lane is in a dangerous location. The road immediately to the west of the planned access is both a sweeping bend and a steep hill, at a point where the speed limit drops from 40mph to 30mph. Traffic will approach at speed and have very little notice of the obstruction caused by manoeuvring HGVs, even with traffic marshals. The statement in diagram 710166-STA-GEN-XX-DR-CH-00021 of "Y-distance' of 90m is required for desirable access visibility based on an assumed design speed of 30mph" might be technically correct as the limit is 30mph at that spot. However, it is more likely that vehicles will be braking to reach 30mph from 40mph at that point, having only just reached the limit change signs from the west.

Compound L10: This major compound on the B3335 Highbridge Road would have 670 1-way vehicle movements per day at peak, over a 12-hour shift, equating to 56 per hour, or roughly 1 per minute.This excludes PCV or private staff vehicle numbers, which have not been provided, when PCV numbers were provided for other compounds. As with the B3354, the B3335 Highbridge Road is a significant arterial route, albeit one restricted to the south of the site by the low rail bridge and narrow road at Allbrook. It serves as a major commuter route between the M3, Winchester and Eastleigh and is essential for Colden Common & Twyford residents accessing Eastleigh by car for work, healthcare or

education. Lying between L10 and M1,2 &3 is Kiln Lane, which is also restricted by narrow, weight-restricted bridges and is the southern boundary of the South Downs National Park. The L10 compound also lies between homes on Wardle Road and Brambridge (Church Lane). Has an environmental impact assessment assessed the noise & light disturbance to the residents of these areas? Southern Water already own a large, mostly empty compound on the opposite side of Highbridge Road, adjacent to Kiln Lane. Has the possibility of sighting the majority of L10 on this location been assessed, where it would have lesser impact on residents, even if a smaller site was still required at the current L10 to facilitate the straight-line tunnelling to M1? Additionally, the reason Southern Water operates that site is due to the significant flooding issues they are managing from the sewer network, where its overflows to the River Itchen back up to people's homes in Brambridge without ongoing pumping. Has any assessment of the impact of constructing a large compound with significant water & sewerage needs in Highbridge Lane on these flooding issues been completed? Will the project indemnify the local residents of any issues arising as a result of operating such a large site in this vulnerable area? Paragraph 3.5.2 also specifically excludes the potential Construction Workers Hub from the scope of this document, but notes it "will use an existing suitably consented site". As L10 is one of the larger sites in this area, it seems likely that L10, or possibly L4&5, will host this facility for at least some of the period. Whilst they note that these will be identified during the construction phase, a potential shortlist of sites must exist, as they will have had to allow for the necessary space in their consented plans. Are any of the sites in this vicinity included in that shortlist, and what impact will that have on the traffic movements at those locations?

Compounds M1 & 2:These compounds sit to the west of the main railway line, to the south of Otterbourne Supply Works. Access to them is proposed from the western end of Kiln Lane, in Otterbourne, on the opposite side of the weight-restricted bridges from L10. The planned junction is a crossroads. At peak, the two sites will have a combined 215 2-way movements per day, meaning 430 1-way movements per day in a 12-hour shift, 36 per hour, roughly 2 every 3 minutes. The proposed access sits immediately to the west of a blind corner. Whilst this route would be closed to heavy traffic, Kiln Lane is a heavily-used commuter route, due to the volume of traffic on the B3354 Winchester Road and B3335 Highbridge Road, as people and their satnavs look for alternative routes to avoid the traffic.The road is also narrow, and I note from diagram 710166-STA-GEN-XX-DR-CH-00023 that they have assumed the width of Kiln Lane, not measured it, although they have noted in the document that it will be too narrow in places for 2 HGVs to pass or potentially for HGVs to pass LGVs. Their solution is planned to be to implement temporary road closures between the access point and the mini-roundabout between Kiln Lane and Main Road, roughly half a mile to the west. Whilst infrequent, this would lead to congestion on Main Road in Otterbourne, blocking the major bus travel corridor between Eastleigh & Winchester, as well as access to M3 Junctions 11 to the south & Junction 11 to the north. M2 sits adjacent to M3, itself adjacent to the Otterbourne. Access between the two is however blocked by a solar farm installation & a watercourse. IT would appear possible that access to M2 & M3 could be achieved with reduced impact on Kiln Lane and its junction with Main Road by use of a haul road between M2 and Main Road to the west, meeting Main Road opposite Coles Meade, south of the Old Forge public house. This would negate the need for changes to the Main Road mini roundabout and reduce congestion. However, as the HGV movements are only planned for the start and end of the M1&2 compounds' construction & removal, in paragraph 5.6.166, this may be disproportionate.

Overall comments: Access to the sites from the motorway for L1 to L10 is all via Twyford and Colden Common on the B3354 Winchester Road / Main Road / High Street, to Junction 11, via either the B3335 Highbridge Road or B2177 Portsmouth Road where needed. M1& 2 will access Junction 12 to the south via Otterbourne Hill / Main Road, whilst M3 & the Treatment Works will use Main Road / Otterbourne Road to go north to Junction 11 as well. Whilst the Otterbourne sites largely book-end the village of Otterbourne rather than pass through it, they do still impact the travel corridor that this forms between Eastleigh & Winchester and the two motorway junctions. The Colden Common sites, L1-L10, all the traffic impacts both Colden Common and Twyford. Twyford, lying within the National Park, is heavily congested for much of the day, including outside the traditional peak hours, due to the narrowness of the road at this point, and the volume of traffic travelling to/from the M3. All of that traffic passes through Colden Common, the majority on the B3354 Winchester Road through Fishers Pond (past L4/5/6), with some branching down either the B3335 Highbridge Road (past L10) above the village, or the B2177 Portsmouth Road (past L1) below it. Summing the total movements expected for L1-10 at peak, all of which will transit Twyford and Colden Common either to the east or west., it could add 590 2-way movements, 1180 1-way movements per day. This potentially

includes 103 2-way HGV movements, 206 1-way movements per day. Whilst not all the peak periods might coincide, the potential for requiring over 200 HGV journeys per day through an already heavily-congested area, at peak, is a monumental failure of planning. Whilst the project may be of a national strategic nature, the congestion, disruption to education, healthcare & work, health impact, property damage and effect on the economy across the region will be immense, and that is just for L1-10. The project sectors to the east, as well as Otterbourne to the west will compound these effects and lead to an unacceptable impact on the region as a whole. Given that the entire project falls within the Hampshire County Council area and does not cross any first-tier local authority boundaries, the fact that this has been designated a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project to remove it from local planning control does not to me seem to be an attempt to deliver national infrastructure in a timely manner, rather a deliberate attempt to ignore the local and regional impact, only a small portion of which I have detailed above. It seems to me to have been driven by cost implications for Southern Water, not for the public good. Given the density of population in this county & region, the national park setting, these impacts seem disproportionate. A major replan of these works should be required, and taken out of Southern Water's hands.

Yours sincerely

Chris Westall

