

17<sup>th</sup> July 2010

Keith Wilcox and Heather Walmsley  
Transport for South Hampshire  
Southside Offices  
The Castle  
Winchester, SO23 8UD

Dear Keith and Heather,

### **Preliminary M27 Corridor Study**

Botley Parish Action Group together with Durley and Curdridge Parishes Action Group have prepared some comments and questions on the preliminary Study. In view of the quickly developing situation regarding the abolition of the South East Plan and the SDA N/NE of Hedge End, we considered that it was important to register our ideas at this stage. We would of course like to comment further when the final version of the Study is published together with the Parallel Studies.

Our comments and questions are obviously related mainly to the SDA N/NE of Hedge End and the effect that this would have on transport in the area. Your response would be most welcome.

#### Summary comments

This study sets out clear and stark warnings on the scale of transport issues that the SDA N/NE Hedge End would create.

Even “stringent Reduce and Manage measures” would barely dent the level of daily severe traffic congestion on both the M27 and spilling over onto local roads. Creating and enforcing such measures and constraints would also involve high cost, require changes in work and travel patterns, and reduce employment choices across the wider local population.

This SDA is therefore far more likely to present a threat to economic prosperity and quality of life, than help to achieve the growth target that has been adopted as the core objective.

The study finds that, “movements to and from the development are predominantly into Southampton”. This predetermines that on transport issues alone, the remoteness of the site, coupled with the current road layout makes this an unworkable and totally ill-conceived location for an SDA.

We are concerned that the report has no reference to the costing of any of the “reduce and manage” measures included. How and when will the cost effectiveness of the measures and any other costing factors involved be assessed?

The report undermines three key “planks” presented by PUSH to justify the SDA – firstly that people would use rail and bus, as well as cycles, to a greater degree than now, thus reducing the impact of car traffic – yet the report dismisses rail as almost irrelevant.

The Botley by-pass would be an integral part of the SDA infrastructure, yet the report says that it would not be paid for by developers – ie development would not justify the by-pass.

The SDA was going to be a sustainable community with many of the residents working IN the SDA etc. – yet the report states that many of the residents of the SDA, as well as Fareham SDA and Whiteley extension, would go to work/shop etc in Southampton, and would need to use Junction 8. This would undermine the case presented by PUSH that the SDA is in a good location – it is in a bad location if people living there need to get to Southampton to work.

We also have the following questions, which we would appreciate being addressed and answered individually.

#### QUESTIONS

S-2 What would be the road safety implications of “...will increase to significant overload conditions on much of the motorway which would be operating with severe congestion.”?

S-2 Would the intention to “...prioritise the A3024 Eastern Access into Southampton” make a meaningful difference? Crossing the M27 at J8 would be a longer route, put further load on the Maypole Roundabout, and the A3024 still converges at Bittern with the A334 route through J7.

S-4 Self containment - How can you ensure that there will be 25% trips remaining in the area, when it is also stated that this level has not be attained in the UK?

3.12 Adjustment factors - Table 3.17 - What do “propensity to use” factors mean and how have they been calculated?

3.12 The 90% containment on Education seems high. Does the proposal include schools within the SDA for children of all ages? Also, is this assumption consistent with the proportion of children who currently do not attend their nearest school?

4.7 Assumptions of impact – Table 4.1 - Please explain the origin of the factors and the basis on which you can ensure that they can apply to the M27.

4-9 Managed motorways - How can you ensure that the West Midlands hard shoulder running is relevant to the M27?

5.133 The number of departing external car driver trips seems low. Is it realistic to assume that only about one in seven households (849 out of 6000) would have a car driving out of the SDA area during the morning peak? Especially since many households would have more than one worker and more than one car. How was this figure arrived at?

5.7.1 What would be the cost of providing improved access to M27 J8 that would justify the assumption that it would attract 70% of traffic from the SDA (vs 30% to J7)?

Yours sincerely

Stan Holden, Vice Chairman

Cc Matthew James, Feasibility Study Manager, PUSH