



Statement of Common Ground between
BCP Council and Hampshire County Council (0597)

BCP Local Plan Examination

20 December 2024
Version FINAL

1. General

- 1.1 The Council has prepared this Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) to assist the Inspectors at the BCP Local Plan Examination.
- 1.2 Hampshire County Council's response to the public consultation on the Draft BCP Local Plan (March 2024) identified some issues with the Draft Local Plan. The purpose of this SOCG is to set out the agreed position between BCP Council and Hampshire County Council (representor id 0597).

2. Declaration

Name	Organisation	Signature	Date
Steve Dring Planning Policy Manager	BCP Council		20 December 2024
Emily Howbrook MRTPI Strategic Planning Manager	Hampshire County Council		20 th December 2024

3. Agreed position

- 3.1 The summarised comments, officer response and agreed position is set out in the table below.
- 3.2 Boxes highlighted green are agreed positions, orange boxes are not yet agreed. Red text denotes possible modifications to text.

Plan Ref	Full representation	BCP Summary	Support/ Object	BCP Action	BCP Response	Hampshire CC position
Evidence Base	The County Council notes that the evidence base for the BCP Regulation 19 Local Plan does not include a Transport Assessment (TA) document to support the associated spatial development strategy. There is a traffic forecast report, however this report is difficult to interrogate and does not easily allow the County Council to identify the precise impacts of the BCP Regulation 19 Local Plan spatial development strategy on specific junctions and sections of the Hampshire highway and transport network. The County Council would welcome a discussion with BCP on whether additional evidence base work is being undertaken and will be published to enable the County Council to appropriately assess and comment on the proposals within the plan.	Evidence base does not include a Transport Assessment (TA). The traffic forecast report does not easily allow the County Council to identify the precise impacts on specific junctions and sections of the Hampshire highway and transport network.	Objection	Modification	The Local Plan evidence base comprises a forecast report using the South East Dorset transport model. An additional transport assessment is not necessary. To assist HCC we have discussed the impacts (see section 4 below). Our evidence shows that trips generated from planned growth in the Draft BCP Local Plan will not have an unacceptable impact upon junctions in Hampshire. We will continue joint working to monitor the situation and suggest this commitment is included as a modification to Policy T1. Action: Add a criterion to Policy T1: 'I) working with Dorset Council, Hampshire County Council and National Highways to monitor cross boundary journeys and provide a functioning joined up transport and public rights of way network.'	Noted
E3	(A2 (EM.1) Northern Aviation Park – Bournemouth Airport (155,000 sqm B2/B8)): The County Council is currently developing proposals to upgrade the Avon Valley Path to facilitate access for cyclists. The County Council would therefore welcome discussions with BCP regarding opportunities to link the Avon Valley Route with the BCP cycle route network enabling a cross boundary active travel route between the airport, aviation park and Ringwood.	The County Council is developing proposals to upgrade the Avon Valley Path and would welcome discussion to link the Avon Valley Route with the BCP cycle route network between the airport, aviation park and Ringwood.	Comment	No action.	Action: Add a criterion to Policy T1: 'I) working with Dorset Council, Hampshire County Council and National Highways to monitor cross boundary journeys and provide a functioning joined up transport and public rights of way network.'	Noted
T2	The County Council has recently adopted a new Local Transport Plan (LTP4) that sets out the vision, intended outcomes, guiding principles and policies for	The County Council has recently adopted a new Local Transport Plan (LTP4). The Transport Policies set out in T1, T2 and T4 of the BCP Reg 19	Support	No action	Support noted. No action required.	

Plan Ref	Full representation	BCP Summary	Support/ Object	BCP Action	BCP Response	Hampshire CC position
	<p>planning and delivering transport in Hampshire in the period up to 2050. Key objectives within this document are the encouragement of modal shift, decarbonising the transport system and the need to plan more effectively for people and places. The Transport Policies set out in T1, T2 and T4 of the BCP Reg 19 Local Plan align well with the aims and objectives of the Hampshire LTP4. Hampshire County Council welcomes Policy T2.1 which states that development will only be permitted where: c) the impacts on the local and strategic highway network arising from the development itself, or the cumulative effects of development on the network, are mitigated through measures prioritised in the following order that would avoid and/or reduce the need to travel by private motor vehicle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. active travel; ii. public transport; iii. provision of improvements and enhancements to the local network; and iv. contributions towards necessary or relevant off-site transport improvement schemes.” <p>The County Council assumes that this policy will be applicable to the local highway network across the county boundary in Hampshire where development impacts from the BCP local development strategy are anticipated. The County Council would welcome opportunities to work with BCP to secure contributions to deliver off-site active travel and public transport schemes identified in the vicinity of the allocated sites and wards with proposed high growth whether they be cross-boundary or within Hampshire.</p>	<p>Local Plan We welcome cross boundary working on this issue. We are suggesting a modification to Policy T1 to commit to working towards a joined up transport and public rights if way network. align well with the aims and objectives of the Hampshire LTP4. Supports Policy T2.1 and assumes policy is applicable across the county boundary in Hampshire where development impacts from the BCP are anticipated. The County Council would welcome opportunities to work with BCP to secure contributions..</p>				
P7	<p>(130 homes, 20 with permission, 40 new sites, 70 windfall): The level of anticipated windfall sites within these wards bordering Hampshire in addition to the significant scale of previously permitted development, does not appear to have been assessed for cumulative impacts. The lack of a Transport Assessment and evidence base does not allow sufficient determination of what the impacts on the Hampshire highway network will be and what necessary mitigation may be required.</p>	<p>The level of anticipated windfall sites and committed development within wards bordering Hampshire does not appear to have been assessed for cumulative impacts. Transport Assessment needed.</p>	Objection	Modification	<p>The Local Plan evidence base comprises a forecast report using the South East Dorset transport model. An additional transport assessment is not necessary. To assist HCC we have discussed the impacts (see section 4 below). Our evidence shows that trips generated from planned growth in the Draft BCP Local Plan will not have an unacceptable impact upon junctions in Hampshire. We will continue joint working to monitor the situation and suggest this commitment is included as a modification to Policy T1.</p> <p>Action: Add a criterion to Policy T1: '1) working with Dorset Council, Hampshire County Council and National Highways to monitor cross boundary journeys and provide a functioning joined up transport and public rights of way network.'</p>	Noted
P16	<p>(545 dwellings – 135 with permission / 410 windfall): Whilst there are very few specific site allocations in this ward there is a substantial level of windfall growth planned, and the cumulative impacts may be significant. The County Council's experience is that can be difficult to secure S106 contributions towards new strategic infrastructure and mitigation measures from individual windfall sites. The level of anticipated windfall sites within this ward bordering Hampshire is</p>	<p>The level of anticipated windfall sites and committed development within wards bordering Hampshire does not appear to have been assessed for cumulative impacts. Transport Assessment needed.</p>	Objection	Modification	<p>The Local Plan evidence base comprises a forecast report using the South East Dorset transport model. An additional transport assessment is not necessary. To assist HCC we have discussed the impacts (see section 4 below). Our evidence shows that trips generated from planned growth in the Draft BCP Local Plan will not have an unacceptable impact upon junctions in Hampshire. We will continue joint working to monitor the situation and suggest this commitment is included as a modification to Policy T1.</p>	Noted

Plan Ref	Full representation	BCP Summary	Support/ Object	BCP Action	BCP Response	Hampshire CC position
	<p>significant, and whilst the densification of urban areas is supported in principle as a way of increasing demand for public transport, the County Council's concern is that the lack of a Transport Assessment document does not enable a proper determination of the impacts on the Hampshire Road Network and any required mitigation. It is the view of the County Council that the cumulative impact of so many individual windfall sites in one ward could be significant. The County Council notes Strategic Policy P16: Highcliffe and Walkford includes Criteria d. "Exploring opportunities to enhance the public realm and improve pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and safety at/around the following streets, roads and locations (or surrounding routes)"</p> <p>The County Council recommend that an effective way of ensuring windfall sites can contribute towards the delivery of sustainable development is by identifying the need to secure funding from all windfall sites towards the delivery of cross border Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) routes and a high frequency bus corridor than connects Christchurch and New Milton via the A337 through Highcliffe.</p>				<p>Action: Add a criterion to Policy T1: 'l) working with Dorset Council, Hampshire County Council and National Highways to monitor cross boundary journeys and provide a functioning joined up transport and public rights of way network.'</p>	
P20	<p>(1,365 homes, 935 with permission, 110 new allocations, 320 windfall): The level of anticipated windfall sites within these wards bordering Hampshire in addition to the significant scale of previously permitted development, does not appear to have been assessed for cumulative impacts. The lack of a Transport Assessment and evidence base does not allow sufficient determination of what the impacts on the Hampshire highway network will be and what necessary mitigation may be required.</p>	<p>The level of anticipated windfall sites and committed development within wards bordering Hampshire does not appear to have been assessed for cumulative impacts. Transport Assessment needed.</p>	Objection	Modification	<p>The Local Plan evidence base comprises a forecast report using the South East Dorset transport model. An additional transport assessment is not necessary. To assist HCC we have discussed the impacts (see section 4 below). Our evidence shows that trips generated from planned growth in the Draft BCP Local Plan will not have an unacceptable impact upon junctions in Hampshire. We will continue joint working to monitor the situation and suggest this commitment is included as a modification to Policy T1.</p> <p>Action: Add a criterion to Policy T1: 'l) working with Dorset Council, Hampshire County Council and National Highways to monitor cross boundary journeys and provide a functioning joined up transport and public rights of way network.'</p>	Noted
BG.2	<p>The Hilton Admiral railway station is not referenced in this policy or supporting text. The Hilton Admiral railway station is the nearest train station for the residents of the Roeshot Hill strategic development allocation (BG.2). The County Council accepts that the station is just across the border in Hampshire but also considers that access to the station from the proposed site via pedestrian and cycle routes is poor. The Policy criteria XV references securing financial contributions for transport and strategic access maintenance and monitoring. The County Council would therefore welcome discussions with BCP to consider how the Roeshot Hill strategic development allocation (BG.2) policy wording could potentially help secure improvements to Hilton Admiral railway station, and specifically ensuring it can be accessed safely by active travel modes.</p>	<p>The Hilton Admiral railway station is not referenced. Existing pedestrian and cycle access is poor. Roeshot Hill could potentially help secure improvements to Hilton Admiral railway station by active travel modes.</p> <p>The traffic forecast report (September 2023) suggests additional traffic flows on roads in Hampshire. Roeshot Hill could potentially help secure improvements needed to A35 Lymington Road, Ringwood Road and part of Lyndhurst Road A35.</p> <p>Proposed site allocations Roeshot Hill (BG.2), Roeshot Nursery (MSWH.1), and Hoburne Farm Estate fall within the buffer zone of Roeshot Quarry, wording requiring potential mitigation measures and appropriate consideration of the site required.</p>	Objection	Modification	<p>Agree. The Hilton Admiral railway station is referenced in the supporting text but suggest a modification to include reference within the policy. Roeshot Hill (BG.2) already has planning permission and note section 4 below where cross boundary transport impacts are discussed. Amend to reference Roeshot Quarry, provide additional detail about routes for improvement and the function of the River Mude.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <p>Add criterion to Policy P20 1(c):</p> <p>'c. Exploring opportunities to enhance the public realm and improve pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and safety at/around the following streets, roads and locations (or surrounding routes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Between the Roeshot Hill, West Highcliffe and Friars Cliff and The Runway Sustainable Neighbourhoods 	Noted

Plan Ref	Full representation	BCP Summary	Support/ Object	BCP Action	BCP Response	Hampshire CC position
	<p>A35 Lymington Road. The traffic forecast report (September 2023) suggests that the cumulative impacts of growth associated with the BCP Regulation 19 Local Plan spatial development strategy will result in additional traffic flows on roads in Hampshire. The A35 Lymington Road and Ringwood Road are two key roads that lead north out of this ward into Hampshire and the traffic forecast report suggests they will see increased traffic flows. The section of Lyndhurst Road A35 between the BCP boundary and Cat & Fiddle Junction on the A35, where it intersects with Ringwood Road, has a known collision history and the County Council is seeking to deliver road safety improvements along the length of the A35 and at this junction to reduce the frequency and severity of vehicle collisions. The growth associated with the spatial development strategy in the BCP Regulation 19 Local Plan, particularly the growth at the Roeshot Hill strategic development site, will increase vehicle and pedestrian/cycle flows through the junction which will inevitably increase the likelihood of collisions. The County Council would therefore welcome discussions with BCP around future opportunities to potentially secure a funding contribution towards an improvement scheme at this junction.</p> <p>Three draft site allocations within the Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe Ward fall within the safeguarded buffer zone of Roeshot Quarry, a permitted mineral extraction site issued April 2021 within the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Area (application reference 16/10618). Proposed site allocations Roeshot Hill (BG.2), Roeshot Nursery (MSWH.1), and Hoburne Farm Estate (MSWH.3) all fall within the buffer zone of Roeshot Quarry, which is safeguarded under Policy 16: Safeguarding – mineral infrastructure of the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) (HMWP). It does not appear that the Roeshot Quarry site has been taken into consideration with regards to the three proposed allocations. While Roeshot Hill (BG.2) already benefits from outline planning permission, Hampshire County Council would like to see wording requiring potential mitigation measures as part of the proposed site allocation developments (BG.2, MSWH.1 and MSWH.3) and / or contained within the Strategic Policy P20. Under the 'agent of change' principle (para. 193 NPPF), planning policies should ensure new development can be effectively integrated with established operations, in this case Roeshot Quarry. Any potential impacts that Roeshot Quarry may have on the draft allocations whether during development or following occupation will be the responsibility of the developer(s) of the proposed allocations (e.g. to provide suitable mitigation if required). The County Council request that the appropriate consideration of the safeguarded HMWP site and agreed safeguarding wording is included in</p>	<p>The River Mude river crossing must not restrict the flow of the watercourse and will require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Between the Somerford and Mudeford and Stanpit Sustainable Neighbourhoods - Hinton Admiral railway station' <p>Add criterion to Policy P20 4(a) Roeshot Hill (BG.2), (b): Roeshot nursery (MSWH.1) and (d) Hoburne Farm Estate (MSWH.3):</p> <p>'xv. Consider potential impacts on the safeguard minerals and waste site at Roeshot Quarry and, where necessary, provide mitigation measures to ensure the ongoing operation of the site;'</p> <p>Amend criterion Policy P20 4(a)vii (BG.2 Roeshot Hill):</p> <p>'vii. Link the neighbourhoods with a bridge over the River Mude for all traffic, the crossing must not restrict the flow of the watercourse;'</p>	

Plan Ref	Full representation	BCP Summary	Support/ Object	BCP Action	BCP Response	Hampshire CC position
	<p>the BCP Regulation 19 Local Plan to make these three site allocation policies (Bg.2, MSWH.1 and MSWH.3) and Strategic Policy P20 sound. Usually, mitigation measures would need to focus on impacts such as noise, dust, visual impact, odour and traffic movements. They can take a variety of forms, including landscape design, tree planting, barriers, building design and orientation and use of different building materials (such as double glazing for windows). The appropriate mitigation measures are best informed through direct discussions with the operator of the safeguarded site as they will be most aware of operational requirements. These could be held once an operator for the Roeshot Quarry site is confirmed. However, the County Council is also available for further discussions, as well as facilitation, if required. The County Council would like to see wording requiring potential mitigation measures as part of the draft allocation developments contained within Strategic Policy P20, as well as wording requiring consultation with the County Council prior to and as part of the planning application process. In order to discharge the requirements of the County Council's safeguarding policy, Hampshire County Council would expect to see how the safeguarded site has been considered, how operator comments have been taken into account and what impacts that had on the proposed development design. If the details of mitigation are to follow in a future application, the County Council would expect to see a condition requiring such details. In the unlikely event that it is not possible to agree appropriate mitigation measures, the County Council would be seeking evidence that the minerals capacity can be relocated or provided elsewhere and delivered. Further information on safeguarding and the County Council's approach is available in the adopted Minerals and Waste Safeguarding in Hampshire Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>As a neighbouring Lead Local Flood Authority the County Council notes that the River Mude (main river) runs through this site, flowing from Hampshire into the site under the railway line. The railway line is embanked for most of the northern site boundary apart from a large railway bridge over the river. It is likely that river crossings will be needed as part of the development. It is very important that any works to facilitate crossings do not restrict flows within the watercourse as this has the potential to back flows up onto the Hampshire side of the boundary, increasing flood risk in Hampshire. Any works in or near the River Mude channel are also likely to require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency. Additionally, to the comments provided above regarding Roeshot Quarry in Hampshire, the County Council is expecting the operators of the site to submit some variations to the extant consent to change the</p>					

Plan Ref	Full representation	BCP Summary	Support/ Object	BCP Action	BCP Response	Hampshire CC position
	watercourses on the site, which could also potentially impact on this development allocation in the BCP Local Plan area.					
MSWH.1	<p>Three draft site allocations within the Mundeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe Ward fall within the safeguarded buffer zone of Roeshot Quarry, a permitted mineral extraction site issued April 2021 within the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Area (application reference 16/10618). Proposed site allocations Roeshot Hill (BG.2), Roeshot Nursery (MSWH.1), and Hoburne Farm Estate (MSWH.3) all fall within the buffer zone of Roeshot Quarry, which is safeguarded under Policy 16: Safeguarding – mineral infrastructure of the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) (HMWP). It does not appear that the Roeshot Quarry site has been taken into consideration with regards to the three proposed allocations. While Roeshot Hill (BG.2) already benefits from outline planning permission, Hampshire County Council would like to see wording requiring potential mitigation measures as part of the proposed site allocation developments (BG.2, MSWH.1 and MSWH.3) and / or contained within the Strategic Policy P20. Under the ‘agent of change’ principle (para. 193 NPPF), planning policies should ensure new development can be effectively integrated with established operations, in this case Roeshot Quarry. Any potential impacts that Roeshot Quarry may have on the draft allocations whether during development or following occupation will be the responsibility of the developer(s) of the proposed allocations (e.g. to provide suitable mitigation if required). The County Council request that the appropriate consideration of the safeguarded HMWP site and agreed safeguarding wording is included in the BCP Regulation 19 Local Plan to make these three site allocation policies (Bg.2, MSWH.1 and MSWH.3) and Strategic Policy P20 sound. Usually, mitigation measures would need to focus on impacts such as noise, dust, visual impact, odour and traffic movements. They can take a variety of forms, including landscape design, tree planting, barriers, building design and orientation and use of different building materials (such as double glazing for windows). The appropriate mitigation measures are best informed through direct discussions with the operator of the safeguarded site as they will be most aware of operational requirements. These could be held once an operator for the Roeshot Quarry site is confirmed. However, the County Council is also available for further discussions, as well as facilitation, if required. The County Council would like to see wording requiring potential mitigation measures as part of the draft allocation developments contained within Strategic Policy P20, as well as wording requiring consultation with the County Council prior to</p>	<p>Proposed site allocations Roeshot Hill (BG.2), Roeshot Nursery (MSWH.1), and Hoburne Farm Estate fall within the buffer zone of Roeshot Quarry, wording requiring potential mitigation measures and appropriate consideration of the site required.</p>	Objection	Modification	<p>Agree. Amend to reference Roeshot Quarry in policy for sites BG2, MSWH.1 and MSWH.3.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <p>Add criterion to Policy P20 4(a) Roeshot Hill (BG.2), (b): Roeshot nursery (MSWH.1) and (d) Hoburne Farm Estate (MSWH.3):</p> <p>‘xv. Consider potential impacts on the safeguard minerals and waste site at Roeshot Quarry and, where necessary, provide mitigation measures to ensure the ongoing operation of the site;’</p>	Noted

Plan Ref	Full representation	BCP Summary	Support/ Object	BCP Action	BCP Response	Hampshire CC position
	<p>an as part of the planning application process. In order to discharge the requirements of the County Council's safeguarding policy, Hampshire County Council would expect to see how the safeguarded site has been considered, how operator comments have been taken into account and what impacts that had on the proposed development design. If the details of mitigation are to follow in a future application, the County Council would expect to see a condition requiring such details. In the unlikely event that it is not possible to agree appropriate mitigation measures, the County Council would be seeking evidence that the minerals capacity can be relocated or provided elsewhere and delivered. Further information on safeguarding and the County Council's approach is available in the adopted Minerals and Waste Safeguarding in Hampshire Supplementary Planning Document.</p>					
MSWH.3	<p>Three draft site allocations within the Mudeford, Stanpit & West Highcliffe Ward fall within the safeguarded buffer zone of Roeshot Quarry, a permitted mineral extraction site issued April 2021 within the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Area (application reference 16/10618). Proposed site allocations Roeshot Hill (BG.2), Roeshot Nursery (MSWH.1), and Hoburne Farm Estate (MSWH.3) all fall within the buffer zone of Roeshot Quarry, which is safeguarded under Policy 16: Safeguarding – mineral infrastructure of the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) (HMWP). It does not appear that the Roeshot Quarry site has been taken into consideration with regards to the three proposed allocations. While Roeshot Hill (BG.2) already benefits from outline planning permission, Hampshire County Council would like to see wording requiring potential mitigation measures as part of the proposed site allocation developments (BG.2, MSWH.1 and MSWH.3) and / or contained within the Strategic Policy P20. Under the 'agent of change' principle (para. 193 NPPF), planning policies should ensure new development can be effectively integrated with established operations, in this case Roeshot Quarry. Any potential impacts that Roeshot Quarry may have on the draft allocations whether during development or following occupation will be the responsibility of the developer(s) of the proposed allocations (e.g. to provide suitable mitigation if required). The County Council request that the appropriate consideration of the safeguarded HMWP site and agreed safeguarding wording is included in the BCP Regulation 19 Local Plan to make these three site allocation policies (Bg.2, MSWH.1 and MSWH.3) and Strategic Policy P20 sound. Usually, mitigation measures would need to focus on impacts such as noise, dust, visual impact, odour and traffic movements. They can take a variety of forms, including landscape design, tree planting, barriers, building design and orientation and use of different building materials (such as double glazing for</p>	<p>Proposed site allocations Roeshot Hill (BG.2), Roeshot Nursery (MSWH.1), and Hoburne Farm Estate fall within the buffer zone of Roeshot Quarry, wording requiring potential mitigation measures and appropriate consideration of the site required.</p>	Objection	Modification	<p>Agree. Amend to reference Roeshot Quarry in policy for sites BG2, MSWH.1 and MSWH.3.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <p>Add criterion to Policy P20 4(a) Roeshot Hill (BG.2), (b): Roeshot nursery (MSWH.1) and (d) Hoburne Farm Estate (MSWH.3):</p> <p>'xv. Consider potential impacts on the safeguard minerals and waste site at Roeshot Quarry and, where necessary, provide mitigation measures to ensure the ongoing operation of the site;'</p>	Noted

Plan Ref	Full representation	BCP Summary	Support/ Object	BCP Action	BCP Response	Hampshire CC position
	<p>windows). The appropriate mitigation measures are best informed through direct discussions with the operator of the safeguarded site as they will be most aware of operational requirements. These could be held once an operator for the Roeshot Quarry site is confirmed. However, the County Council is also available for further discussions, as well as facilitation, if required. The County Council would like to see wording requiring potential mitigation measures as part of the draft allocation developments contained within Strategic Policy P20, as well as wording requiring consultation with the County Council prior to and as part of the planning application process. In order to discharge the requirements of the County Council's safeguarding policy, Hampshire County Council would expect to see how the safeguarded site has been considered, how operator comments have been taken into account and what impacts that had on the proposed development design. If the details of mitigation are to follow in a future application, the County Council would expect to see a condition requiring such details. In the unlikely event that it is not possible to agree appropriate mitigation measures, the County Council would be seeking evidence that the minerals capacity can be relocated or provided elsewhere and delivered. Further information on safeguarding and the County Council's approach is available in the adopted Minerals and Waste Safeguarding in Hampshire Supplementary Planning Document.</p>					

4. Cross boundary transport impacts

4.1 This section provides further information on discussions between BCP Council and Hampshire County Council about cross boundary traffic flows. Representations on ward policies P7, P16 and P20.

4.2 Hampshire County Council have raised the following concerns through discussion:

1. Lack of impact assessments on key highway junctions close to the boundary with BCP, specifically the Cat & Fiddle Junction of the A35 Lyndhurst Road to address our concerns about potential impacts of increased traffic flows through the junction on safety and queue lengths on Ringwood Road and Station Road.
2. Lack of impact assessment on the Chewton Glen roundabout (Ringwood Road/A337 Lymington Rd/ A337 Christchurch Road) that is within BCP but any delays to this junction will have an impact on the A337 in Hampshire. Whilst this junction may currently operate within capacity, we would like to see some evidence that the growth associated with the BCP spatial strategy will not result in this changing and causing problems on the Hampshire road network.

4.3 BCP Council response:

- Both of these junctions are in the buffer area of the South East Dorset model and are therefore not modelled in detail, so only traffic flows can be extracted from the model (not volume over capacity). Having viewed link flows for the A35 and the A337 in relation to both junctions there was no significant increase in traffic flows when comparing the Do Minimum (DM) 2038 and Do Something (DS)2038 scenarios. Note – Do Something DS2038 includes the Draft BCP Local Plan growth.
- We have looked at the impact of the DS2038 Local Plan scenario on a large neighbouring junction (Somerford Roundabout). The modelling data shows that Somerford roundabout is busy in the DN2023 AM and gets generally busier in the DM2038 AM (TEMPro traffic growth + approved development trips), and again in the DS2038LP AM (TEMPro + Local Plan trips). The South East Dorset model outputs below show the volume over capacity at each arm of Somerford Roundabout.
- There is only one turn where volume over capacity (VOC) reaches 85% or higher (A337 W/B) and the arm reaches capacity during the DM2038 Scenario as a result of background traffic growth. None of the arms approach (100% VOC. With this mind, we would anticipate a similar scenario for the 2 junctions mentioned by Hampshire County Council. We do not therefore consider additional vehicle trips caused by the Draft BCP Local Plan to have an unacceptable impact the Cat and Fiddle junction and Chewton Glen Roundabout. We will continue to work with Hampshire County Council to monitor and mitigate cumulative cross boundary journeys. We are suggesting a modification to Policy T1: Transport Strategy to include a commitment for joint working to plan for a joined up transport network.

