



CLr Edward Heron
Executive Lead Member for Transport
and Environment Strategy
The Castle
Winchester
Hampshire
SO23 8UJ

Contact : Martin Tod
Direct Line : 07887 986048
Email: mtod@winchester.gov.uk

Date: September 20, 2022

Dear Edward,

As promised, I wanted to write to outline the City Council's concerns about the road system to the north of Winchester, confirm that we are willing to collaborate with you and Cala on finding solutions and our thoughts on the most effective model for public engagement.

In essence, we are concerned that there is not an agreed and coherent proposal for the road system in north Winchester – not just regarding public concerns about the diversion of Andover Road – but the design of Winchester Avenue, Andover Road (especially if undiverted), Priors Dean Road and Worthy Road – and how they relate both to current traffic flows and mitigate and manage the impact of new development at St John Moore Barracks and a potential north Park & Ride.

Looking at each road in turn:

- **Winchester Avenue** was agreed in 2011 as a realignment of the Andover Road designed to run through the middle of the Kings Barton estate. If built as planned, issues include:
 - Resident concern at the severance effects within the development with the current design cutting the development in half – particularly since the urban centre design (originally designed as 20mph shared space) is no longer a permitted design and no revised design has been put forward
 - General concerns about road specification and its ability to handle likely traffic volumes – especially if we see development on the site of Sir John Moore's barracks. City Council officers are also concerned about the noise impact should vertical deflection be used to slow traffic at junctions as currently seems to be the case – particularly when road works on the M3 or A34 lead to overnight HGV diversions.
 - If the Andover Road diversion is not implemented, the risk of significantly increased traffic levels – effectively doubling the road capacity into the city – and lack of clarity about how this might be handled.
 - Lack of clarity at the design for the local centre and lack of agreement to an adopted design for the road as a whole, despite the expectations of the original S106 agreements in 2011.

[Continues/...



- **Andover Road** is the historical road into Winchester from the north. Pedestrian fatalities on this road have already led to the need to install a new pedestrian crossing – and this is before the quadrupling of population of Kings Barton as it is built out and planned further construction on the east side of the road. If kept open:
 - There will be major severance issues separating Kings Barton from the schools and other community and commercial facilities to the west of the development. No plans have been put forward to address this.
 - Further changes will be needed to support the houses already given permission (in 2011) to be built on the road.
 - Keeping Andover Road open alongside Winchester Avenue doubles road capacity into the city while cutting walking and cycling routes dramatically vs. the current permitted plan. We will need a strong alternative to encourage a shift to walking, cycling and public transport access from the north – as well as ensuring that changes to the road network reduce the pressure on the Worthy Lane and Carfax junctions.
 - It is far from clear how the northern and southern junctions will be managed when the development is built out particularly if both Andover Road and Winchester Avenue are designed for through use.
- **Priors Dean Road and Worthy Road.** If there are any issues with congestion or slower speed on Andover Road or Winchester Avenue, then there is concern that Priors Dean Road and Worthy Road will be used as a rat-runs. Currently both are designed and signed as 30mph roads. This will be a particular problem if either Andover Road or Winchester Avenue includes a 20mph section (as is currently planned for Winchester Avenue).

Whatever solutions emerge as Hampshire's highways engineers work towards an integrated solution alongside Cala, I am particularly keen to support strong public engagement with local elected representatives and residents.

The primary forum that meets in public and brings together the elected representatives and views both of the residents of Kings Barton and of the nearby communities affected by the development of Kings Barton is the **Kings Barton Forum**. This meets regularly with County, City and Parish representatives from the affected areas – and we want to help ensure that they are actively engaged as plans progress.

Separately, there are two affected parishes (**Littleton & Harestock Parish Council** and **Headbourne Worthy Parish Council**) and a committee of Winchester City Council representing the unparished area of the city (**Winchester Town Forum**) that also meet in public and have strong interest in any proposed system for movement in the north of Winchester. Finally, the **Kings Barton Residents Association** is not a statutory body but should also be engaged.

As a Council, we are happy to support your work to find a solution to the road system in the north of Winchester. Please let me know if there is anything else we can do to help.

Best wishes,



Cllr Martin Tod

Leader, Winchester City Council

cc: Cllr Steve Cramoysan, Chair, Kings Barton Forum, Winchester City Council
 Cllr Mike Craske, Chair, Winchester Town Forum, Winchester City Council
 Cllr Jane Rutter, Chair, Headbourne Worthy Parish Council
 Cllr George Sallis, Chair, Littleton & Harestock Parish Council
 Mike Slinn, Vice-Chair, Kings Barton Residents Association
 Stuart Jarvis, Hampshire County Council