

# HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

## Decision Report

<b>Decision Maker:</b>	Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment
<b>Date:</b>	11 March 2021
<b>Title:</b>	Interim Transport Position Statement – Western Basingstoke
<b>Report From:</b>	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

**Contact name:** Hannah Roper

**Tel:** 03707 794421

**Email:** Hannah.roper@hants.gov.uk

### Purpose of this Report

1. The purpose of this report is to agree an interim highways transport position statement related to growth potential to the West of Basingstoke. It is a means of clarifying the Highway Authority's priorities for transport infrastructure and planning of future development.

### Recommendations

2. That the Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment approves the interim transport position statement for Western Basingstoke, as set out in the report, as a means of clarifying the Highway Authority's priorities for transport infrastructure and planning of future development.
3. That the Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment approves the interim position statement being used to form the basis of future highway development control responses related to development in Western Basingstoke.

### Executive Summary

4. This paper explains why an interim transport position is needed for emerging land use plans to the west of Basingstoke. It discusses a number of transport infrastructure issues that may be associated with those land use changes and proposes a number of interim statements which will serve as guidance to the local planning authority and developers when seeking to bring forth future development.

### Contextual information

5. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council has recently embarked on its Local Plan Update (LPU) process, as the current plan period only extends to 2029. As part of the update the Borough Council has started to engage with Hampshire County Council as Highway Authority to discuss the transport implications of the new Local Plan/Local Plan Update (LPU). Furthermore, the

Local Planning Authority is setting out a vision for growth to the west of Basingstoke which indicates that this is an area where large land use changes are being considered.

6. To the West of Basingstoke there are a number of large sites that have been granted planning permission and are building out. This includes the Manydown North Development and large housing sites alongside the A30 including Kennel Farm, Hounsome Fields and the Golf Course. Beyond this there are a number of large development proposals that landowners/developers, hospital trusts or others are promoting as either live applications, exception sites or ones to be considered for inclusion in future Local Plans. These include:
  - a significant regional distribution centre (that is a live planning application due for determination in March 2021);
  - potential relocation of an expanded North Hampshire and Basingstoke Hospital; and
  - proposals for significant housing and employment growth being advocated by developers and landowners as part of a Manydown South development, for which conceptual plans have been submitted as part of the LPU 'call for sites' in the Borough Council's recent Issues and Options consultation.
7. The current planning system is based on establishing Local Plans with relatively short timelines. In the context of development of the scale being considered, identifying and safeguarding strategic transport infrastructure requires a much longer strategic view than one local plan time horizon. If a long-term view, such as the one being sought to take in the development of an interim highways position, is not taken, development has potential to come forward in piecemeal and potentially conflicting ways.

### **An Interim Transport Position**

8. The Highway Authority has developed an interim transport position which is intended to set a strategic transport framework within which the Local Planning Authority, landowners and developers can masterplan their proposals and bring them forward. It will guide any conversations the highway authority has with the local planning authority, developers, scheme promoters or the wider community.
9. The status as 'interim' reflects the fact that planning over such a long time period is subject to a great deal of uncertainty about matters of detail which may only become clear over time. It is also a reflection of the fact that many of the land use changes mentioned above have no planning status as they are not included in a current local plan. The interim position may be developed into a more formal highways planning position as future land uses become more certain or if the Local Planning Authority adopts them into future planning documents with formal status. It is anticipated that the LPA will use the interim transport position as a basis of direction for the Transport Assessment which will present the evidence base for the LPU. Authority is sought to use the interim transport position as a basis for highway development control responses around Western Basingstoke.

10. It is not normal practice to engage in developing interim transport positions for potential future development not included in a local plan. This would be expensive and potentially abortive which would be a poor use of public money. However, this development situation in Western Basingstoke is rare. It is one of a very few in Hampshire where the scale of development is as significant and where the Local Planning Authority has also recognised the potential in its 'Vision for land north of M3 J7'.
11. For the purpose of developing the interim position Hampshire County Council has had regard to the land uses mentioned above in order to give an indication of the scale and type of land use changes that are being considered. In doing so the County Council as local highway authority is not presupposing a future land use or indicating support or otherwise for any particular development. In the absence of a defined long term future land use plan the following quantum end state of development has been used for the purpose of testing the interim position:
  - 11,000 residential units (266.76 ha);
  - employment (67 ha);
  - hospital with Intensive care unit and Research facility
    - assume 35ha dedicated to hospital internal floor area of 115,000 sqm - 840 bed spaces, ancillary space 4,500 sqm, parking for 2,800 spaces (1,800 staff, 1,000 visitor) 140 units of staff accommodation;
  - 15ha dedicated to hospital research facility;
  - Primary Schools to serve the development;
  - Secondary School; and
  - University campus, possibly included in the above hospital research facility or Local/District centre.
12. The logic behind the interim position is explained in the rest of this report and is summarised into interim statements. They are based on the end state land use assumptions set out above. They have then been tested using the North Hampshire Transport Model 2019 (NHTM19) base model. This is a robust evidence base that is an up-to-date Department for Transport (WEBTAG) compliant transport model.

### **New Highway Infrastructure**

13. The provision of a new strategic relief road/bypass does not appear to be warranted between the A30 near to J7 of the M3 and the A339. To ensure clarity in the terminology used, in this context a relief road bypass is considered to be characterised as high capacity, probably dual carriageway standard, faster (50+mph) road with few on and off junctions. Its critical purpose being to move large volumes of motorised traffic at speed. The reason such a road is not needed is because there is no evidence to support the need to provide a sub-regional or through traffic movement function as its primary purpose. This is not surprising as other strategic routes (A34, M3/A33) cater well for the north-south longer distance traffic.
14. The evidence for this is that, of the total vehicles travelling eastbound on A339, around 36% continue on the Ringway North and around 30% of vehicles follow Ringway West to move towards central Basingstoke. A small proportion of

traffic moves towards A33 Northbound and around 14% of vehicles join M3 at Junction 6 and continue Eastbound. Very little traffic is observed to be moving towards M3 Southbound, heading in the direction of Winchester.

15. Traffic moving Westbound on A339 of which around 15% of vehicles are the through traffic from London and M3. A small proportion of traffic can be seen originating from A33 north and the majority of the traffic is originating from central Basingstoke through the Ringway West and North. Minimal traffic is observed to be originating from M3 south and Western Basingstoke.
16. The Local Planning Authority and landowners/developers should plan to deliver a development link road to distribute development traffic to the A30/M3 J7 and to the A339 from the development. Modelling suggests that the road will predominantly carry development generated traffic and serve a local movement function. It also suggests that the trigger for completing a whole route link is likely to be reached at higher potential levels of growth. In the meantime, it can be built out in parts over time, to serve development traffic needs. The evidence for this is that the levels of traffic generated by the development itself are generating the need for the link road not through traffic. At higher levels of growth this level of traffic cannot reasonably be accommodated by the existing local road.
17. The link road would vary in its form across its length reflecting the evidence that demand is highly variable at different points along its length. At some points it would need to carry higher development traffic flows at which point its form would probably be of a wider single carriageway standard (except at critical junctions) and be of a 30mph/40mph speed profile. In lower capacity stretches the road would be narrower and have a speed profile of between 20/30mph. The road should be designed to support a 'movement' function for local traffic while at the same time having a strong 'place making' function along most, if not all, of its length. Such a road might be characterised by active frontages, slower traffic speed, multi modal use and many junctions serving the local traffic function of the link.
18. The Local Planning Authority and Developers are encouraged to safeguard and plan to deliver a development link road through their developments. They should make use of existing local modelling tools (or updates thereof) to determine the demand, capacity requirements and trigger points for when they would need to deliver parts of the route over time. They are also asked to consider and work with the highway authority to plan its form in line with the expected function of carrying local development traffic and facilitating a strong placemaking role.
19. It is considered essential to have a north-south active modes (walking and cycling) link of high quality, linking the developments north of the railway with those to the south. High quality means direct (probably a new rail crossing), prioritised access, comfortable, safe to use and well integrated into the movement strategies for each development. It is important for this be delivered in the early stages of any development south of the railway. This will establish and lock in active travel behaviours and may be vital in linking schools with their future catchment areas.
20. Crossing the railway with a local public transport or Mass Rapid Transit service in the shorter term would be desirable but not essential. This is because it is

recognised that other options exist for public transport services that could facilitate a good public transport offer without a railway crossing at that stage.

### **New Highway Infrastructure: Interim Statement**

21. **Statement 1:** Based on current anticipated development levels, it is not anticipated that a new strategic western relief road/bypass (providing a sub-regional transport function for through traffic) will be required to connect the A30/M3 J7-A339. This position may need to be revisited in subsequent Local Plan Transport Assessment work, once development plans are finalised or if there is a significant change in the type and scale of growth within the Borough or within other regional growth plans, particularly at Winchester and/or West Berkshire.
22. **Statement 2:** The Local Planning Authority and landowners/developers should plan to deliver a development link road to distribute development traffic to the A30/M3 J7 and to the A339 from the development. The Local Planning Authority and developers should plan for land for a route to be safeguarded, if required, through the current LPU (2038) and within masterplans, so that the ability to provide such a route is not prejudiced by development taking place to a shorter timescale.
23. **Statement 3:** To assist with this process the Local Planning Authority and developers should explore, within the master planning process, the form and function of a development-led new local Distributor road (ultimately linking to the A30 and A339) with the use of the NHTM19 transport model, to establish when a road of this nature will be required and its likely capacity to inform the safeguarding requirements.
24. **Statement 4:** Upon developing land to the South of the railway the Local Planning Authority developers should plan to deliver active modes routes, including a new or enhanced active modes link across the railway, facilitating direct and convenient access between developments both north and south of the rail line.

### **Mass Rapid Transit**

25. As outlined in the Basingstoke Transport Strategy (<https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/strategies/transportstrategies/basingstoke-transport-strategy>) a step change in the provision of public transport is essential and the priority element required to ensure that future development is well connected by an attractive and viable public transport service.
26. The strategy sets out that this will be best achieved through a town wide Mass Rapid Transport (MRT) network made up of priority corridors (on the existing network and within new development) and a new rail/bus transport interchange in the town. The services should be high frequency, fast, reliable and comfortable and penetrate the strategic development areas, key employment and leisure destinations. The County Council is currently developing more detailed plans for the A30 MRT corridor and also a town wide 'blueprint' of the whole network to ensure it can be connected across the town.
27. A key design principle of future public transport services is that they should be supported by creating the right incentives (e.g. complementary parking

charges and provision, integrated ticketing) to support a commercial operation without long lasting subsidy. Future land use masterplans and their access strategies should seek to embody this principle and should not rely on long term revenue intensive support options for traditional bus services.

28. Park and Ride to the west of Basingstoke may have a role to play in supporting future MRT options. Consideration should be given to identifying a facility in association with a potentially relocated hospital. This would need to be developed in association with the town centre/leisure park regeneration and their associated parking management strategies which should complement the operation of a successful park and ride service.
29. MRT infrastructure should allow sufficient priority over other traffic to facilitate its successful commercial operation, higher mode share aspiration and minimised journey times by public transport. These are all required to make the MRT offer as competitive as possible against the private car alternative. Developers should consider infrastructure that gives guaranteed reliability, so solutions like those listed below:
  - transit-only sections of route, akin to a BRT busway or a parallel transit route;
  - transit/bus lanes in each direction;
  - transit/bus lanes in the key locations;
  - transit/buses running with general traffic in areas where congestion does not arise and where this best serves communities;
  - gating of traffic at the entry to sections combined with approach transit/bus lanes to manage congestion; and
  - no specific physical priority but adoption of Cooperative Intelligent Transport Systems (C-ITS) strategies to manage transit/buses and general traffic through signal junctions.

### **Mass Rapid Transit: Interim Statements**

30. **Statement 5:** The LPU and developers should build MRT into their movement strategies and masterplans and, where desirable, provide the necessary infrastructure. They will need to take account of the County Council's emerging study work on a network wide blueprint for MRT and specific work on the A30 corridor. They will also need to develop the network within their own site plans and to serve future residents. Developers should adopt the MRT network and its sustainable transport principles into their master planning, as per the MRT Vision.
31. **Statement 6:** The LPU and developers should be clear that the LHA will require them to demonstrate as part of their masterplans and access strategies that MRT or other public transport services will have long term commercial viability, not requiring ongoing subsidy.

### **Crossing the Railway Line (Manydown sites)**

32. It will be expected that the railway line between Manydown North and South West Basingstoke will require suitable crossings to ensure adequate north -

south connectivity. Discussions with Network Rail indicate a strong preference for such infrastructure to be in the form of bridges however further exploration of tunnelling should be pursued to establish whether this could be a viable option. The highway authority considers that crossing of the railway will be required at some time as a direct result of the development.

33. To ensure sustainable connections between Manydown North and development south of the railway can be put in place, the provision of a bridge for active modes is considered essential. This is needed at an early stage and before a crossing for road traffic. It would need to be of good quality, which means a minimum of 4 metres width, segregation for pedestrians and cyclists in accordance with LTN1/20 design standards and it must be direct and well connected to suitable routes on either side. This will help promote walking and cycling in the short-medium term planning horizon, rather than encourage general traffic movements for short distances within the south west development areas. The crossing could be created at the point of the existing footbridge north of Dorset Gardens, although it is anticipated that it would need to be replaced to meet the quality standards required.
34. Initial traffic modelling work indicates that a vehicle crossing will be triggered at higher levels of growth. It is impossible to say at this time what the trigger point is as it can be conditional upon how successful the development masterplans are in achieving transport sustainability and promoting public transport, walking and cycling. At this time it remains unclear if that crossing would need to facilitate all vehicle movements. This is because the need to provide for public transport and MRT will be related to the development movement strategies and plans and the MRT design work which is currently progressing and being led by the County Council. When this work is completed it will become clearer. In the meantime, the LPU and developers are requested to plan for its delivery.
35. It is suggested the LPU reviews its current land safeguarding for the railway crossing indicatively safeguarded in the current Local Plan policy SS.10 as part of the North Manydown development site and align this with a new safeguarding for the south of the railway line. It is likely the safeguarding will need to provide land further east towards Dorset Gardens and be wider to allow for the appropriate active modes crossing and future MRT and road connections to the bridge decks.
36. Further work with Network Rail is required to agree the exact location and design of the crossing/s and it should be noted that Network Rail's position on crossing types and locations may change over time.

### **Crossing the Railway (Manydown sites): Interim Statements**

37. **Statement 7:** A high quality active modes crossing of the railway will be required at an early stage to support growth to the south of the railway line. It would need to be of high quality, of at least 4metre width and designed for segregated use compliant with the requirements of LTN 1/20.
38. **Statement 8:** It is expected that when the need for a development link road is fully triggered it will require a road bridge crossing of the rail line. It is likely that the bridge will initially be required to facilitate future MRT provision. Its

potential use for other vehicles would need to be kept under review and appropriate consideration should be given to how appropriate priority is given to public transport and other modes if and when that time comes.

39. **Statement 9:** That the Local Planning Authority should, in conjunction with the landowner, review and refine the existing land safeguarding for the railway crossing (and accesses to the crossing points) within North Manydown. Furthermore, it should ensure that appropriate safeguards are in place to the south of the railway, including land safeguardings if required, in association with Statement 4 on Highway Infrastructure.

### **Local Road Network and Sustainable Transport**

40. It is important that the impacts of development on the local highway and transport network are mitigated through a multi-modal approach, taking into account the priorities set for public transport and active modes. The strategies should have ambitious but realistic targets for transport sustainability and carbon neutrality. As such the development masterplans should aim to achieve high levels of self-containment and incorporate mode share targets, similar to those in a town centre. The following issues will need to be addressed.
41. Widening and/or junction improvements along the A30 (south west Basingstoke) need to be considered to accommodate dedicated MRT infrastructure and cycle lanes (separated from pedestrians). Study work underway will identify the land required for safeguarding along this route in order to develop the MRT network and will be recommended for inclusion in the LPU.
42. In order to ensure efficient traffic operation of key “A” roads, such as the A30, accesses from the development onto A roads and other key routes should be kept to a minimum. Developers should seek to optimise their proposed new accesses and where possible collaborate with other developers so that new accesses can, where appropriate and desirable, serve multiple developments. New accesses onto “A” roads should only be proposed where there are no other reasonable alternatives.
43. More detailed analysis of the impact of development on the local road network will need to be explored in the transport assessment of the local plan and by developers advocating sites in latter stages of the planning process. The County Council has made available a new transport model (NHTM19) for the planning authority and developers to use to test future land use changes.
44. Notwithstanding the need to undertake new transport assessment work there are considered to be a number of junctions where the Highway Authority already has an understanding of the impacts of growth and where it is considered likely that improvements will be needed which may also require safeguarding in a future local plan.
45. One such junction, located within Kempshott, is known as Fiveways. The transport assessment for the current Local Plan, and developer’s mitigation package for North Manydown planning application, identified a short-term improvement to the signalised junction at Fiveways to cater for development



within the current Local Plan. It is now very unlikely to withstand additional growth and demand beyond 2029.

46. A high-level desktop analysis of the junction suggests a new or significantly modified junction, potentially with a new approach to area wide traffic management is likely to be required. There is a reasonable probability that land outside of the highway boundary may be needed to achieve a new junction. The transport assessment for the new local plan should seek to identify a solution and, if required, land safeguarding for appropriate land to enable delivery.
47. Another is the Camrose Link scheme which was part of the Brighton Hill Roundabout scheme improvement. The link was removed from the scheme for planning reasons but is important to deliver in the medium term, to complement the main roundabout scheme. The planning authority should also safeguard a Camrose Link in any future development of the football club land as part of a package to facilitate the planned level of development to the west.
48. In order to mitigate and offset the impact of increased traffic caused by development and support carbon neutrality ambitions, developers are advised to look beyond the immediate development boundary and at area wide traffic solutions that could enhance the transport sustainability of neighbouring urban areas in Basingstoke. Sustainable traffic management, mode priority treatments and the reallocation of road space, such as the following examples, should be considered in dealing with the adjacent local transport network that could be retrofitted into existing established areas:

Low traffic neighbourhoods:

- traffic cells are created where through-traffic is restricted by barriers like bollards or planters;
- urban boulevards/avenues or people-friendly main roads with safe space to cycle, generous pavements, planting, seating; and
- connected quiet streets that link the traffic cells with safe crossings across the boulevards/main roads. This creates a town wide network of direct routes for walking and cycling that any age or ability can use.

Filtered permeability:

- filtering out through traffic on local streets but maintaining access via certain roads for residents; and
  - public transport priority, measures to speed up the journey times of buses.
49. It is likely that implementing such approaches to mitigate or offset the impact of development on the local transport network will lessen the magnitude of traditional highway capacity improvements that may have historically been applied through a predict and provide approach.
  50. The same sustainable traffic management principles, concepts and treatments outlined in paragraph 26 should be applied to the design and layout of new development also. The focus should be on maximising the internalisation of trip making to within the development boundaries and reducing the need to travel.

## Local Road Network and Sustainable Transport: Interim Statements

51. **Statement 10:** Achieving transport carbon neutrality and transport sustainability from future development should be a key goal. In doing so ambitious but realistic targets for self-containment and mode share should be applied. Developers may also need to offset their impact by looking beyond their development boundaries.
52. **Statement 11:** The local planning authority may need to include a number of land safeguardings in its LPU. Consideration should, in particular, be given to the need for safeguardings at the Fiveways junction, the Camrose Link and for a segregated cycle facility on the A30.
53. **Statement 12:** New accesses onto “A” roads should be kept to a minimum and should not unduly affect the safe and efficient operation of key routes. They should be designed to be efficient in transport capacity terms and only be proposed where there are no other reasonable alternatives. Joint arrangements serving multiple development sites may be considered where this improves efficiency and meets other objectives.

## Rail

54. Hampshire County Council is not a rail authority but is responsible for developing integrated transport strategies. At this time it is not the County Council’s intention to formally develop or assess a detailed business case for a new rail station specifically serving planned development to the west of Basingstoke. This is because this can only be done when there is more clarity on future land uses, once the impact of the pandemic on rail demand is better understood and when the nature of the new rail and interchange infrastructure is more firmly established. In the meantime, the County Council will be keen to explore, with the rail sector, the Local Planning Authority and third part scheme promoters the strategic high level business case better.
55. A number of factors need to be considered when developing rail proposals. It remains unclear at this time if rail and MRT would compete with each other or if they would have different catchments and customers. MRT is known to be a significantly more affordable and practical transport solution for shorter journeys of up to approximately 10 miles. For journeys beyond this distance rail can often offer a quicker more attractive proposition to some customers.
56. In high level terms a critical mass of population is needed to serve a station. A population in excess of 10,000 is typically required to generate sufficient demand to justify a viable service. With this in mind, it suggests that whilst rail may have potential it may not be viable until the latter end of development build out. In the meantime, MRT is likely to be key to locking in higher levels of mode share by public transport.

## Rail: Interim Statement

57. **Statement 13:** Hampshire County Council does not see the provision of a new rail station to the west of Basingstoke as a prerequisite for planned residential or other development to the west of the town. However, it does recognise that such provision could provide additional journey options for residents across the wider area. Pending the development of any business case for a new (or

reopened) rail station, the County Council retains an open mind as to the potential benefit.

### **Strategic road network M3 junction 7**

58. The performance of the M3 junction 7 is the responsibility of Highways England (HE) which manages the Strategic Road Network (SRN). HE has for some time held concerns about the safety of the M3 in this vicinity, principally because of the increase in traffic at the point where the M3 and A30 merge and diverge. There is a known issue about safety problems caused by the short weaving distance between the junctions 7 and 8. HE is also concerned that growth to the west of Basingstoke may trigger a need for a large capacity enhancement at junction 7. To date the work required to determine if this is the case or if future growth can be accommodated safely has not been done. The lack of clarity at this time creates significant uncertainty.
59. A high-level model assessment of the impacts on the immediate **local** road network leaving junction 7 and operated by the County Council has been undertaken. These initial results suggest that the A30 arm of J7 will come under strain in the future as will the A30 Southwood corner signalised junction. This junction may require significant improvement, possibly a large gyratory rather than single junction, in order to operate efficiently. At the present time it is unknown, pending more detailed study work, whether the land required to deliver the scale of improvement required is currently contained in the highway boundary and whether third party land will be required.
60. In the absence of a local plan allocation for much of the development potential to the North of Junction 7 there is a risk that piecemeal highway improvement plans will come forward for the local junctions. This means each development could come forward on a 'first come-first served' basis, and that the junctions and links might need to be improved multiple times to respond to each development in turn. In practice, if a trigger point for a large-scale enhancement was reached the developer that triggers it would need to meet the full brunt of the cost. These in turn would highly likely impact that development's viability.
61. If HE and the County Council (as local highway authority) were to develop a long term motorway and local junction and link improvement plan it would have limited planning status. This is because there is no Local Plan allocation on which to base a plan and so it would not be binding on any developer. The cost of optioneering, feasibility and developing a plan is likely to be expensive and is not something to be done lightly when there is no land use allocation and when public funding is potentially involved.
62. The Local Planning Authority and developers should consider the criticality of resolving this issue now or awaiting the next local plan update when relevant future land allocations may or may not be made. They may wish to arrange for a study to be commissioned in agreement with the two accountable Highway Authorities.

## **Strategic Road Network: Interim Statements**

63. **Statement 14:** A strategic study is needed to understand the impact of growth on M3 junction 7, which is the responsibility of Highways England and the immediate local road network including the A30 Southwood Corner signalised junction, which is the responsibility of the County Council.
64. **Statement 15:** Until a study is complete, it cannot be determined whether the impacts on J7 and the A30 are capable of mitigation. The work is, therefore, required in order for the highway authorities to determine what infrastructure interventions are required and to take a view on the acceptable impact of future development.

## **Consultation and Equalities**

65. Engagement on the principles of this interim transport position for Western Basingstoke has been carried out with key partners and organisations. This includes, with landowners, County Councillors for Western Basingstoke, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council officers and lead members, Highways England and the Hampshire Hospitals Federation Trust.
66. All organisations supported the development of this Interim Transport Position Statement. Most commented that the clarity it creates is very beneficial and helps create a useful framework for growth.
67. The County Council attended the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Senior Management Board, which is a meeting of the senior leadership and Members and presented a draft interim position. The Board encouraged the County Council as highway authority to take a leadership approach. It was keen to see the County Council develop more detailed highway and transport plans. In particular this meant helping to resolve the uncertainty around infrastructure solutions around M3 Junction 7. Statements 14 and 15 relate to this. The board expressed support for work to be done to test the business case for a new station to the west of Basingstoke as per statement 13. They also requested that a high level of ambition should be sought for all future development to consider its carbon neutrality and sustainability in transport terms, as per statements 10 to 12. There was also support for the MRT statements.
68. Many other views expressed related to new highways and local road infrastructure. There was general support for these but also a recognition that there are still many uncertainties to be resolved over time and when considering the details further when they become known. It was noted that the Borough's Vision for Growth north of Junction 7 and that of the interim transport position are complementary. This bodes well for the integration of the interim position into the future Local Plan.
69. Developer's views on the interim position are more mixed. In general, there is support for the interim position. The benefit being that it creates a framework and alleviates some of the uncertainty about the future. However, it also establishes an informal position on a number of issues which have cost implications which impact on development commercial and potentially masterplans. These issues will not be resolved at this time and are likely to play out during the planning process and development planning negotiations.

The key issue here appears to be the statement that developers should plan to deliver a development link road. In doing so it puts the onus on developers to consider how they would provide the link within their development, it also places a fiscal incentive on developers to avoid the need to trigger more expensive infrastructure by creating well thought through and sustainable transport masterplans. Developers would also like more certainty around infrastructure solutions around junction 7 and the immediate local road network and see value in this being studied. Statements 14 and 15 apply to this.

### **Climate Change Impact Assessments**

70. Hampshire County Council utilises two decision-making tools to assess the carbon emissions and resilience of its projects and decisions. These tools provide a clear, robust, and transparent way of assessing how projects, policies and initiatives contribute towards the County Council's climate change targets of being carbon neutral and resilient to the impacts of a 2°C temperature rise by 2050. This process ensures that climate change considerations are built into everything the Authority does.
71. As an interim position statement with limited planning status, it is not considered necessary to complete the climate change tool/ carbon assessment at this stage. A carbon assessment may be required in due course as the interim transport position is adopted into the Local Plan, future transport strategies, scheme studies and or schemes prior to delivery.
72. A general carbon neutrality approach is included in the approach to local road network and sustainability. It reflects the fact that recent audit work undertaken by the Carbon Trust for the County Council has identified that transport contributes 37% to all carbon emissions from all sectors. Transport is also the sector which appears hardest to reduce when compared to other sectors like energy. It therefore places a high level of ambition on developers and the Local Planning Authority not only to look at a traditional approach to transport mitigation but also how that mitigation can support adopted carbon neutrality targets from the transport consequences of development. It also suggests developers look beyond their immediate boundary to offset their carbon impact by retrofitting transport measures in existing urban areas of Basingstoke that reduces existing carbon impacts from transport.

**REQUIRED CORPORATE AND LEGAL INFORMATION:**

**Links to the Strategic Plan**

<b>Hampshire maintains strong and sustainable economic growth and prosperity:</b>	yes
<b>People in Hampshire live safe, healthy and independent lives:</b>	yes
<b>People in Hampshire enjoy a rich and diverse environment:</b>	yes
<b>People in Hampshire enjoy being part of strong, inclusive communities:</b>	yes

**Other Significant Links**

<b>Links to previous Member decisions:</b>	
<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
Basingstoke Transport Strategy	16/07/2019

**Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents**

The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)

<u>Document</u>	<u>Location</u>
None	

## **EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT:**

### **1. Equality Duty**

The County Council has a duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ('the Act') to have due regard in the exercise of its functions to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by or under the Act with regard to the protected characteristics as set out in section 4 of the Act (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation);
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic within section 149(7) of the Act (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation) and those who do not share it;
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic within section 149(7) of the Act (see above) and persons who do not share it.

Due regard in this context involves having due regard in particular to:

- The need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons sharing a relevant characteristic connected to that characteristic;
- Take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
- Encourage persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

### **2. Equalities Impact Assessment:**

This decision seeks approval for an interim highways transport position statement for Western Basingstoke and does not have a direct impact on residents at this stage. Therefore, it has been assessed as having a neutral impact on groups with protected characteristics.