

Connie,

Please forgive my tardiness – I hope you can either accept this e-mail or can use it to formalise our response.

Nothing in my response should be considered to suggest these proposals are or might be acceptable, merely that these should be examined to support a planning application including an appropriate level of detail.

### *EIA Screening/Scoping*

I *do* consider the proposed development to be *EIA development*. I come to this view because existing commitments as part of current Strategic Development Locations, along with those in the emerging Local Plan Update (LPU) will contribute to cumulative effects in the area. Together these existing/emerging will deliver 5-6,000 additional homes in this part of the Borough, as such I consider the pressure on the A327 corridor will contribute to transboundary effects. Through our Duty to Co-operate WBC has engaged with Hampshire County Council, but the Councils evidence has not yet been tested through Examination in Public. In the circumstances, I think it would be prudent to adopt a cautionary stance on EIA screening.

Whilst the development proposals represent strategic development, I believe that the scope of an Environmental Assessment can be refined to scope out some elements of detail and focus on salient matters. The Technical Note provided at Appendix 3 confirms some of my assumptions, suggesting flows on the A327 are around 15,500 AADT, as such, following the IEMA Guidelines and Design Manual for Roads & Bridges, I am content severance will be 'very high'. Given the magnitude of this factor, I would urge the application to investigate the provision of footbridge/subway across the A327 and how this could be delivered to ramp up/down to the east – which may have further EIA implications not identified in the screening submission.

### Transport Assessment Scoping

We would also welcome early discussions with the applicant to engage in the Transport Assessment scope that would be necessary to support the application. This will also require a cumulative assessment, taking account of current and emerging proposals in the Borough. As the lead-in time for such exercises are likely to delay proposals for much of the summer, we would suggest that the applicant considers the following:

- To understand the magnitude of severance effects, we recommend that a ([SAM](#)) travel survey is conducted of Poperinghe Way site to gauge both comparable travel demands for the proposed development and understand the effects of severance on walk/cycle trips to facilities in Arborfield.

- Any traffic modelling should be undertaken exploring existing committed and emerging development and infrastructure proposals. As the Council has not completed the Examination in Public, it will be desirable to agree the '[uncertainty log](#)' so that this aligns with the equivalent [cumulative assessment](#) considered in any EIA.

From an initial overview of the illustrative masterplans, I note this contemplates just one point of access on the A327. Given the physical/environmental constraints of the site and its proximity to Church Road, I believe the designers and I might agree that the A327/Church Road junction should be closed, with access retained through the development site. However, considering the proximity and safety of the West Court and adjacent site access and how this would be essential for any bus strategy, I would suggest the applicants contemplate how a secondary (perhaps restricted) access might be achieved to the south.

I trust the above is sufficient for your purposes but do not hesitate to come back to me if you require more information,

Regards,

**Alan Lewis**, C.Eng FIHE CMILT VR.

Highway Development Manager

Phone: 0118 237 9661

Mobile: 0782 553 2189