MEDSTEAD & FOUR MARKS

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Regulation 14 Transport Statement





Medstead & Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan

2025 to 2043 – October 2026

Table of Contents

1. Introduction & Strategic Vision 1
   1.1 Purpose of the Statement 1
   1.2 The Neighbourhood Area Vision 1
   1.3 Vision-Led Approach Compliance (Policy TR1) 2
2. National and Local Policy Context 2
   2.1 National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026 Update) 2
   2.2 East Hampshire District Council & Highways Authority Framework 3
   2.3 Community Engagement Insights 4
3. Area-Wide Baseline Assessment 4
   3.1 Existing Highway Network & Key Routes 4
   3.2 DfT Connectivity Tool Integration 5
   3.3 Existing Active Travel Infrastructure 5
   3.4 Rural Passenger Transport Services 6
4. Locational Sustainability & Site Allocation Matrix 6
   4.1 Settlement Boundary Continuity (Policy S4) 6
   4.2 Site-by-Site Accessibility Screening 6
   4.3 Highway Feasibility & Safety (Policy TR6) 8
5. Movement Design & Infrastructure Standards 8
   5.1 Active Travel Priorities (Policy TR4) 8
   5.2 Local Parking Standards (Policy TR2 & EHDC Conformity) 8
   5.3 Servicing, Deliveries, and Emergency Access 9
6. Cumulative Impacts & Mitigation Framework 11
   6.1 Cumulative Impact Assessment & A31 Capacity Reality 11
   6.2 Developer Contributions Priorities (S106 / CIL & LTP4 Alignment) 12
   6.3 Monitoring & Travel Plan Expectations 13
7. Transport Policy 14

7.1 MFM 26 Policy amendment 14
Appendix 1 18
Appendix 2 23
Appendix 3 32
Appendix 4 31

MFMNP TRANSPORT STATEMENT

Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan
Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Evidence Base

1. Introduction & Strategic Vision

1.1 Purpose of the Statement

The Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group has prepared this Transport Statement to serve as a robust, proportionate strategic evidence base supporting the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan.

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) update August 2026, this document moves away from the historical, reactive "predict and provide" model of highway planning. Instead, it proactively sets out the community's spatial framework for transport, accessibility, and movement across the designated Neighbourhood Area for the plan period 2026–2041.

The primary objectives of this statement are to:

- Demonstrate compliance with the sustainable transport mandates of the August 2026 NPPF (Policies TR1 to TR8).
- Justify the locational sustainability of proposed site allocations relative to the existing local highway and active travel networks.
- Establish clear design expectations for future planning applications to ensure new developments seamlessly integrate into local movement patterns.
- Identify infrastructure priorities to be funded through developer contributions (Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy).

1.2 The Neighbourhood Area Vision

The overarching transport vision for the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan is to foster a safe, highly connected, and self-sustaining community where daily reliance on private vehicles is minimised by design.

As a predominantly rural/semi-rural area lacking direct access to high-frequency rapid transit or railway hubs, the community recognises that sustainable mobility must be achieved at the local level. The plan aims to bridge existing connectivity gaps, ensuring that all residents—regardless of age, mobility, or vehicle ownership—can safely navigate the parish.

The core strategic goals underpinning this vision are:

- **1. Prioritising Active Mobility:** Elevating walking, wheeling, and cycling as the natural, preferred choices for short-distance local journeys.
- **2. Enhancing Local Highway Safety:** Mitigating known traffic pinch points, managing rural vehicular speeds, and protecting vulnerable road users.
- **3. Preserving Rural Character:** Ensuring new transport infrastructure and parking provisions reflect the distinct rural aesthetics of the parish while avoiding low-density, car-dependent sprawl.

1.3 Vision-Led Approach Compliance (Policy TR1)

In strict alignment with NPPF Policy TR1 (Vision-Led Transport), the site allocations proposed within this Regulation 14 draft have not been selected based on simple vehicular capacity or where it is easiest to add road space. Instead, a vision-led approach has dictated our spatial strategy.

Development locations have been rigorously screened and selected based on their intrinsic proximity to established village services, shops, and community infrastructure. By embedding this vision from the outset, the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan ensures that the layout and scale of proposed allocations are fundamentally shaped by active travel accessibility. This strategy satisfies the statutory requirements of Chapter 15, ensuring that future growth drives localised network improvements rather than introducing severe, unmitigated residual traffic impacts to our local road network.

2. National and Local Policy Context

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026 Update)

This Transport Statement has been drafted in strict accordance with Chapter 15 (Policies TR1 to TR8) of the August 2026 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The 2026 update establishes a statutory presumption in favour of vision-led, sustainable growth, requiring development proposals to proactively design out private vehicle dependency from the outset.

The Medstead and Four Marks plan area has no direct access to a mainline national railway station (with Alton being the nearest operational rail hub) and contains no designated Green or

Grey Belt land exceptions. Consequently, this statement invokes the specialised compliance tracks set out in the 2026 framework:

- **Policy S4 (Settlement Boundaries):** All proposed allocations are tightly bound to the established Settlement Policy Boundaries (SPBs) for Medstead and Four Marks to prevent low-density, car-dependent rural sprawl into the gap between the settlements and ensure logical extensions to the existing built environment.
- **Policy TR1 & TR4 (Sustainable Mobility Redefined):** In line with current national policy, "sustainable transport" is defined strictly around active travel—walking, wheeling, and cycling. The inclusion of electric or zero-emission private vehicles is no longer accepted as a primary justification for a site's locational sustainability.
- **Policy TR2 (Flexible Parking Standards):** Under the current framework, the previous requirement for "clear and compelling justification" to implement maximum car parking standards has been removed. This enables the Neighbourhood Plan to enforce optimised, density-appropriate parking limits to protect the public realm from vehicle dominance.
- **Policy TR6 (Proportionate Impact Thresholds):** This statement provides the baseline area-wide evidence required to satisfy Policy TR6, ensuring that the cumulative transport impacts of the proposed allocations do not result in unacceptable highway safety impacts or severe residual network impacts.

2.2 East Hampshire District Council & Highways Authority Framework

The policies within the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan must be read in conjunction with the overarching strategic policies of the East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) Local Plan and the statutory Local Transport Plan (LTP4) produced by Hampshire County Council (HCC) as the Highways Authority.

As EHDC is not allocating specific housing sites within the Four Marks and Medstead plan area for the current plan period, the responsibility for identifying, screening, and allocating sustainable development sites rests entirely with this Neighbourhood Plan. Consequently, this Transport Statement serves as the primary strategic evidence base to satisfy the statutory tests of both the Local Planning Authority and the Highways Authority.

This statement ensures general conformity with:

- **EHDC Local Plan Joint Core Strategy Policy CP31 (Transport):** Which mandates that new development must be located where it can minimise the need to travel, reduce car dependency, and mitigate adverse environmental impacts on the local highway network.
- **The Neighbourhood Plan Housing Allocation Strategy:** Ensuring that the specific sites selected by the community—rather than by the district council—meet strict spatial criteria

that align with EHDC's overarching spatial classification of Four Marks as a Primary Sustainable Settlement and Medstead as a rural settlement.

- **Hampshire County Council (HCC) Passenger Transport & Cycling Strategies:** Proving that the community-led allocations can deliver localized solutions to bridge the "first-mile/last-mile" gap, address rural pedestrian connectivity across the A31 corridor, and satisfy standing HCC highway safety and junction visibility advice.

2.3 Community Engagement Insights

A core requirement of the Regulation 14 process is demonstrating how community intelligence has shaped the plan's policies. Early-stage engagement conducted across Medstead and Four Marks and an Electors' meeting held in September 2026 highlighted that transport, road safety, and connectivity are primary concerns for local residents.

The key issues raised by the community, which this statement and its accompanying policies directly address, include:

- **The A31 Severance Effect:** High percentages of respondents noted that the A31 creates a significant physical barrier to continuous, safe active travel (walking and wheeling) between residential areas, local schools, the GP surgery, and village amenities.
- **Vehicular Speeding on Rural Lanes:** Documented concerns regarding vehicle speeds exceeding the posted limits on key winding rural routes entering Medstead, and where rural lanes transition into the built-up environment of Four Marks.
- **Pavement Infrastructure Gaps:** A clear call from residents to bridge missing footway links, particularly along heavily used pedestrian routes to the local primary schools and retail clusters, where narrow or non-existent verges force pedestrians onto the carriageway.

3. Area-Wide Baseline Assessment

3.1 Existing Highway Network & Key Routes

The highway network within the Neighbourhood Area is distinctly defined by two contrasting environments: the strategic corridor of Four Marks and the rural lane network of Medstead.

- **The A31 Corridor:** Running directly through Four Marks, the A31 serves as a major primary route connecting Alton to Winchester. It carries substantial daily volumes of both commuter traffic and heavy goods vehicles (HGVs). While providing excellent external strategic connectivity, it splits the Neighbourhood Area, creating a distinct barrier for internal movements.
- **The Northern Rural Network (Medstead):** Branching north of the A31, the network transitions into a complex web of narrow, winding rural lanes (such as Boyneswood Road,

Telegraph Lane Lymington Bottom, and Trinity Hill). These lanes feature restricted widths, sharp bends, and varying speed limits, and they must accommodate a mix of domestic vehicles, local agricultural machinery, and equestrian users.

- **Key Priority Junctions:** Critical intersection points include the junctions feeding onto the A31 from Lymington Bottom, Telegraph Lane and Boyneswood Road. These junctions experience acute peak-hour pressure as residents from both parishes attempt to join the strategic network.

3.2 DfT Connectivity Tool Integration

To satisfy the baseline objectivity required by NPPF Policy TR1, the steering group has integrated localised spatial data from the Department for Transport's (DfT) Connectivity Tool. Because the plan area lacks a mainline railway station, the baseline connectivity scores reflect a typical rural-edge profile:

- **Macro-Accessibility:** External connectivity to higher-order service centres (such as Alton, Winchester, and Basingstoke) via the A31 and regional bus links scores moderately.
- **Micro-Accessibility:** Internal connectivity scores drop sharply when moving away from the immediate A31 linear settlement. The data highlights a steep decline in public transport viability for properties located deeper within the Medstead settlement boundary, reinforcing the necessity of protecting and improving localised infrastructure to prevent complete car isolation.

3.3 Existing Active Travel Infrastructure

In accordance with the sustainable mobility definitions mandated by NPPF Policy TR4, a comprehensive audit of the area's walking, wheeling, and cycling infrastructure was conducted.

- **The A31 Severance Effect:** The A31 acts as a major physical barrier to active travel. Designated pedestrian crossing points across the A31 are limited, which restricts safe, continuous movement between the residential areas of Medstead/North Four Marks and the primary amenities located south of the highway (such as the primary school, shopping choices, and medical facilities).
- **Footway Infrastructure Gaps:** While the core of Four Marks features established roadside pavements, the footway network linking Medstead village to Four Marks is fragmented. Key pedestrian corridors lack continuous footways, forcing pedestrians onto unprotected grass verges or directly onto the carriage shared with vehicles.
- **Public Rights of Way (PROW):** The parish benefits from an extensive network of footpaths, bridleways, and restricted byways. However, these are predominantly unlit, unpaved recreational routes that do not provide a viable alternative for daily utility trips (e.g., school runs or shopping) during winter months or periods of poor weather.

3.4 Rural Passenger Transport Services

Passenger transport within the plan area is exclusively reliant on the local bus network and voluntary community schemes.

- **Core Bus Routes:** The primary passenger transport service is the regional route operating along the A31 corridor, providing connections eastward to Alton and westward to Winchester.
- **Settlement Penetration:** Bus services routing deeply into Medstead village are infrequent, offering limited timetables that do not align seamlessly with standard employment shift patterns or secondary school commuting times.
- **Infrastructure Condition:** While key stops along the A31 feature shelters and timetables, many secondary stops within the rural parts of the parish consist of simple flags on posts with no raised kerbs, creating accessibility barriers for passengers with reduced mobility or those travelling with pushchairs.

4. Locational Sustainability & Site Allocation Matrix

4.1 Settlement Boundary Continuity (Policy S4)

In accordance with NPPF Policy S4, the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan enforces a strict spatial strategy. To prevent fragmented, car-dependent sprawl into the open countryside or the sensitive landscape gaps between our settlements, a logical sequential approach has been applied to all site assessments:

- **1. Tier 1: Built-Up Continuity:** Sites situated entirely within the established Settlement Policy Boundaries (SPBs) of Four Marks or Medstead.
- **2. Tier 2: Boundary Adjacency:** Sites directly contiguous to the existing SPB that represent a logical, well-contained extension of the built environment.
- **3. Tier 3: Countryside Isolated:** Sites physically detached from the SPB. In compliance with Policy S4, Tier 3 sites are fundamentally excluded from housing allocation due to their inherent car-dependency and conflict with the vision-led spatial strategy.

4.2 Site-by-Site Accessibility Screening

To satisfy the requirements of NPPF Policy TR1 and Policy TR4, every site submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan during the Call for Sites process has been rigorously screened against a localised active travel matrix. Because the plan area lacks direct rail connectivity, "locational sustainability" is measured by a site's real-world walking and wheeling distance to the primary local service nodes shared between the two parishes.

Distances are calculated along safe, walkable routes:

	allocated
	has approval and so allocated
	reserve
	<5
	not allocated
	rejected by NPSG before scoring
	infra structure

Policy	Site	Address	village	LAA	NPSG allocation	transport distance to bus stops 400m to nearest point of site	transport accessibility of A31	transport cycle access	accesibility FM or M service centre <800m	no competing land use	timescale	no Landscape issues	min ecology damage	highway access	Mains sewage possible	Sustainability total
MFM 28	MED-011	Land rear of Junipers, Medstead	Medstead	24	34	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	550
MFM 29	MED-004	Land rear of Woodview Place and Timbers, Boyneswood Road, Medstead	South Medstead	18	16	10	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	700
MFM 30	NPSG LAA 003	Ryecroft, Five Ash Road	South Medstead	17	17	0	0	10	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	550
MFM 31		Land South of Beechlands Road	South Medstead		15	0	0	10	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	550
MFM 32		Land to the rear of 48 Lymington Bottom Road	South Medstead		130	0	0	10	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	550
MFM 33	27000-005	Fairwinds Lymington Bottom road	South Medstead		45											
MFM 34	FM- 013	Land south of Winchester Road,	Four Marks	115	115	10	10	10	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	650
MFM 35	20252-004	Land at 103 and to rear of 97 to 105 Blackberry lane	Four Marks		34											
MFM 36	30800-013	Land rear of 131 winchester road	Four Marks		21											
MFM 37	50216-002	land ajacent to avon lodge alton lane	Four Marks		100											
MFM 38	EHDC-25-0313	Land at 87 Lymington Bottom	Four Marks		65											
MFM 39	EHDC-26-0340	new cressland	Four Marks	45	45	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	650
MFM 40		Land behind Lawrenny Alton Lane	Four Marks		49	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	650
MFM 41	Part FM- 012	Land at New Barn Farm	Four Marks		177	10	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	700
R1	NPSG LAA 001	Stonebridge, Stoney Lane, Medstead GU34 5EL	South Medstead	73	128	10	0	10	0	10	10	10	10	0	10	0
R1	NPSG LAA 002	Land on the north east side of Stoney Lane, Medstead, U34 5EL	South Medstead	28												0
R1	MED-007	Woodlea Farm, Station Approach	South Medstead	24												0
R2	FM002	41-43A blackberry lane	Four Marks		10	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	10	0
R3	Part FM012	balance taylor wimpey New Barn Farm	Four Marks		53	0	0	10	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	550
R4	EHDC-25-0774-OUT	LAND TO THE WEST OF LANDPORT Alton Lane	Four Marks		88	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	400
	MED-020	Southview, Abbey Road, Medstead	Medstead	4												
	MED-031	Alton Radio Site, rear of 21 Abbey Road	Medstead	2												
	MED-034	Cassilanda, Bighton Road	Medstead	4												
	FM-048	Lymington Bottom and Alton Lane	Four Marks	4												
	FM- 003	The Paddock, south of Brislands Lane	Four Marks	4												
	FM- 006	Land at Lymington Bottom (41)	Four Marks	3												
	FM- 007	Land at Uplands Lane	Four Marks	1												
	FM- 009	The Pines, The Shrave, Four Marks	Four Marks	3												
	FM- 014	Little Kitfield, Four Marks	Four Marks	3												
	FM- 017	Woodland at The Shrave, Four Marks	Four Marks	4												
	FM- 019	Reynards Retreat, Four Marks	Four Marks	1												
	FM- 034	Virginia, Lymington Bottom Road	Four Marks	3												
	EHDC-25-1321	Laburnhams	Four Marks	1												
	MED-006	Land rear of Roscommon	Medstead	25		0	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	500
	NPSG LAA 004	Marls Row, Trinity Hill, Medstead, GU34 5LT	Medstead	23		0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	0	0	0
	MED-018	Land north of Wield Road, Medstead	Medstead	22		0	0	0	10	10	10	0	10	10	0	400
	MED-015	Land at Homestead Road, Medstead	Medstead	6		0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	0	0	0
	MED-002	Beverley Farm, Five Ash Road	South Medstead	12		0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	500
	MED-003	Paddock View, Stoney Lane	South Medstead	6		0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	500
	MED-009	Land at Five Ash Crossroads, (Pig Farm)	South Medstead	15		0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	500
	MED-010	The Meadows, Soldridge Road	South Medstead	9		0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	500
	MED-026		South Medstead	101		0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	500
	MED-026		South Medstead	108		0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	500
	MED-016	Land south of Five Ash Road, Medstead (North of CALA)	South Medstead	176		0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	500
	MED-026		South Medstead	265		0	0	0	0	10	10	10	0	10	10	400
	FM- 008	32 Telegraph Lane, Four Marks	Four Marks	14		10	0	10	10	0	10	10	0	0	0	0
	FM- 039	Land at Oak View, Alton Lane	Four Marks	5		0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	0	400
	FM- 025	Land on Alton Lane	Four Marks	37		0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	400
	FM- 002	Land behind 41 to 43a Blackberry Lane	Four Marks	10		10	0	10	10	0	10	10	0	10	10	500
	FM 030		Four Marks	355												
	FM 035		Four Marks	5												
	FM- 038	Copper Beeches, Brislands Lane, Four Marks	Four Marks	2												

4.3 Highway Feasibility & Safety (Policy TR6)

- **Safe Access and Visibility:** Proving that a safe site access junction can be formed onto the public highway in strict conformity with Manual for Streets standards. Visibility splays must be achievable over land fully within the highway boundary or under the direct control of the applicant, matching the 85th percentile wet-weather vehicle speeds of the adjoining road.
- **The A31 Corridor Impact Rule:** For any site allocation feeding traffic onto routes directly intersecting the A31 (such as Lymington Bottom, Telegraph Lane or Boyneswood Road), the development must prove via preliminary junction modeling that its peak-hour trip generation will not cause a severe residual network impact at these critical pinch points.
- **Pedestrian Vulnerability Mitigation:** Where a proposed site allocation is otherwise sustainable but suffers from a local footway gap, allocation is explicitly conditional on the developer funding and delivering a continuous, safe pedestrian connection linking the site entrance to the existing footway network prior to the occupation of the first dwelling.

5. Movement Design & Infrastructure Standards

5.1 Active Travel Priorities (Policy TR4)

In accordance with NPPF Policy TR4, all planning applications submitted for allocated sites within the Four Marks and Medstead Neighbourhood Area must embed active travel layouts from the very first design iteration. Developments must move away from car-centric cul-de-sac layouts, adopting instead highly permeable, pedestrian-first estate layouts.

- **Continuous, Segregated Paths:** Internal footways must be a minimum of 2.0 metres wide, completely barrier-free, and structurally segregated from vehicle traffic along primary estate distribution roads.
- **Desire Line Alignment:** Pedestrian and wheeling routes must follow natural "desire lines" connecting directly to external networks. Winding, circuitous footpaths designed purely to slow down pedestrians will be rejected.
- **Off-Site Highway Integration:** Site access designs must not simply focus on the vehicular junction. Every layout must incorporate smooth, dropped-kerb transitions, tactile paving, and clear pedestrian visibility splays where internal paths meet the existing public highway.

5.2 Local Parking Standards (Policy TR2 & EHDC Conformity)

Operating under the provisions of NPPF Policy TR2, the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan implements a localised parking strategy that ensures general conformity with the EHDC Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Because our plan area lacks direct access to rapid rail hubs and features a high-car-ownership rural-edge

profile, development allocations must provide adequate on-site parking to protect local roads from hazardous overspill while ensuring that vehicle layout design does not dominate the public realm.

In strict alignment with the minimum baselines required by EHDC outside the South Downs National Park, all new residential developments within the Neighbourhood Area must deliver off-street car parking spaces adhering to the following minimum standards:

- **1 Bedroom Dwellings:** A minimum of 1 dedicated off-street space per unit.
- **2–3 Bedroom Dwellings:** A minimum of 2 dedicated off-street spaces per unit.
- **4+ Bedroom Dwellings:** A minimum of 3 dedicated off-street spaces per unit.
- **Visitor Parking Allocation:** For residential developments proposing 5 or more units, unallocated communal visitor parking spaces must be delivered at a ratio of 1 space per 5 dwellings (fractions rounded up).

To prevent developers from counting impractical or undersized spaces toward their statutory allocation, this plan adopts the structural dimensional criteria enforced by EHDC:

- **Standard Parking Bays:** Must measure a minimum of 2.4 metres in width by 4.8 metres in length.
- **Single Garages:** Will only count as a valid parking space toward the on-site requirement if they feature minimum internal dimensions of 3.0 metres in width by 6.0 metres in length to guarantee practical utility for modern family cars.
- **Double Garages:** Must meet minimum internal dimensions of 6.0 metres by 6.0 metres to count as two valid spaces.
- **EV Charging Integration:** In accordance with local sustainability objectives, wall-mounted smart electric vehicle charging infrastructure must be provided for every single dwelling featuring a private drive or garage. For unallocated or court-served layout designs, 10% of visitors' spaces must feature live public-network EV charging interfaces.
- **Cycle Parking Standards:** To actively encourage short-trip modal shift away from vehicles, long-stay secure cycle storage must align with EHDC's mandates: providing a minimum of 1 secure space per 1-bedroom unit and 2 secure spaces for all 2+ bedroom units, accompanied by short-stay visitor hoops at a ratio of 10% for developments of 5 units or more.

5.3 Servicing, Deliveries, and Emergency Access

Given the rapid increase in home deliveries and online logistics, estate layouts must be physically capable of handling large commercial vehicles without gridlocking local lanes or blocking active travel infrastructure.

- **Refuse and Delivery Tracking:** All planning applications for allocated sites must submit detailed computer tracking models (Swept Path Analysis) demonstrating that a standard

Hampshire County Council three-axle refuse vehicle and standard home delivery vans can enter, safely turn around, and exit the site in a forward gear.

- **Emergency Services Encroachment:** Road widths and internal turning heads must be kept clear of speculative visitor parking bays to ensure unobstructed access for emergency fire tenders and ambulances at all times.

6. Cumulative Impacts & Mitigation Framework

6.1 Cumulative Impact Assessment & A31 Capacity Reality

In accordance with NPPF Policy TR6, because this Neighbourhood Plan takes on the sole responsibility for housing allocations in the absence of an East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) allocation framework, we have evaluated the collective transport impacts of all proposed sites combined to be 1188 PCU eastbound on A31 at the AM peak east of Telegraph Lane junction.

The steering group explicitly notes that local traffic modelling demonstrates that the flow rate of the single-carriageway A31 corridor through Four Marks will be just above the capacity of 1149 PCU for a carriageway width of 6.86m of type UAP3 during the peak AM period. Under historical planning regimes, a capacity deficit on a primary route would trigger traditional highway widening.

However, in strict alignment with Hampshire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4), this plan fundamentally rejects the outdated "predict and provide" model of expanding road space to accommodate infinite private vehicle growth. Instead, this statement invokes the statutory LTP4 "Decide and Provide" and "Avoid, Shift, Improve" frameworks.

The cumulative impact of the proposed site allocations will not be mitigated by expanding the A31, but by aggressively reducing vehicle demand at the source:

- **The Speculative Developer Shield:** Because the A31 corridor capacity is exceeded, any speculative, non-allocated housing proposal that routes additional vehicular traffic onto the A31—without providing an unassailable, fully funded scheme to achieve a net-reduction in local car trips—will automatically be deemed to cause an unacceptable highway safety impact and a *severe residual network impact* under NPPF Policy TR6.

- **The Managed Allocation Stream:** Traffic movements generated by the plan's chosen, sustainable allocations will primarily feed into the key priority junctions where Boyneswood Road, Telegraph Lane and Lymington Bottom intersect the A31. To ensure these collective movements remain manageable, allocations are directly linked to a coordinated, area-wide infrastructure mitigation strategy designed to intercept local trips.

6.2 Developer Contributions Priorities (S106 / CIL & LTP4 Alignment)

To mitigate cumulative pressures and satisfy the vision-led mandates of Chapter 15 and HCC LTP4, the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan identifies specific infrastructure targets. Future planning applications approved under this plan will be expected to make proportionate financial contributions via Section 106 agreements or through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) mechanism to fund or co-fund the following prioritised local transport schemes:

Priority 1: A31 Active Travel Crossings & Severance Mitigation (LTP4 'Shift')

- Project Objective: Delivery of enhanced, safe pedestrian and wheeling crossing infrastructure across the A31 corridor to bridge the physical divide between north and south settlements, actively *shifting* local cross-parish trips away from cars.

- Target Infrastructure: Co-funding the installation of a new signal-controlled pedestrian crossing (Puffin/Toucan) or significant structural upgrades to existing traffic-island refuge points to ensure safe active travel access to Four Marks Primary School, the GP surgery, and the commercial core.

Priority 2: Medstead Rural Lane Traffic Calming & Management (LTP4 'Improve')

- Project Objective: Managing vehicular speeds and protecting vulnerable road users along narrow, winding rural lanes heading towards Medstead village to *improve* the safety of the existing network without adding vehicular capacity.

- Target Infrastructure: Developer-funded implementations of passive traffic-calming measures, including high-visibility rural gateway features at settlement entry thresholds, speed indicator devices (SIDs), and localised road narrowing features to naturally reduce vehicle speeds along Boyneswood Road, Telegraph Lane and Lymington Bottom.

Priority 3: Pedestrian Infrastructure Gap Bridging & Intercept Links

- Project Objective: Eliminating fragmented pavement links on primary walking corridors to local schools and community hubs to intercept short-distance utility movements before they ever reach the A31 junctions.

- Target Infrastructure: Directly funding the construction of continuous footway links along key stretches of Boyneswood Road, Telegraph Lane and Lymington Bottom, ensuring a minimum unobstructed path width of 2.0 metres in compliance with the *Manual for Streets*.

6.3 Monitoring & Travel Plan Expectations

To ensure that approved developments maintain their sustainable mobility promises over time, the following individual application thresholds are established under this framework:

- **Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMPs):** Given the restricted physical geometry of Medstead's lane network and the over-saturated profile of the A31, every residential planning application exceeding 5 dwellings must submit a comprehensive CTMP for approval by Hampshire County Council (HCC) as the Highways Authority prior to site commencement. This must explicitly restrict delivery vehicle routing during local school peak pick-up and drop-off windows.

- **Framework Travel Plans:** Any application meeting or exceeding the statutory thresholds set out in the HCC Planning Guidance must deliver a comprehensive, site-specific Travel Plan. These plans must include clear, enforceable targets to encourage walking and cycling, alongside a commitment to participate in localised community car-sharing or voluntary minibus schemes.

7. Transport Policy

7.1 MFM 26 Policy amendment

Purpose & Context

The A31 corridor through Four Marks operates under critical peak-hour constraints. Empirical highway modelling demonstrates that the A31 NE Carriageway possesses a finite capacity threshold of 1,149 Passenger Car Units (PCUs). With an AM peak baseline flow already at 973 PCUs, the network has a residual capacity headroom of only 176 PCUs before reaching structural oversaturation (V/C ≥ 1.00).

In accordance with Policy TR6 of the August 2026 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), this policy establishes clear, quantifiable parameters to determine when a development's traffic generation introduces a significant or legally severe adverse impact on highway capacity, safety, and local junction operations.

Policy Wording

A. Thresholds of Traffic Impact Significance

All residential, commercial, or mixed-use development proposals within the Neighbourhood Plan area that generate vehicular trips during the AM peak hour (08:00–09:00) or PM peak hour (17:00–18:00) will be assessed against a three-tier cumulative capacity framework on the A31 corridor:

- **Tier 1: Sub-Critical Impact (Net increase of 1 to 4 PCUs)**
  Developments within this tier are considered to fall within normal daily network variations. These proposals will be accepted without requiring localised highway capacity interventions, subject to standard sustainable design compliance.
- **Tier 2: Significant Capacity Impact (Net increase of 4 to 176 PCUs)**
  Developments within this tier utilise the remaining physical capacity of the A31 mainline, accelerating the degradation of headway gaps at local side junctions (including Lymington Bottom Road, Telegraph Lane and Boyneswood Road). These proposals will only be permitted where the applicant secures proportionate mitigation under Section B of this policy to absorb or offset their spatial impact.
- **Tier 3: Severe Network Impact (Net increase of 176 PCUs or more)**
  Any development proposal that drives the residual cumulative traffic volume on the A31 NE Carriageway past its 1,149 PCU design limit—or drives any adjacent critical link into a Volume-to-Capacity ratio exceeding 1.00 (V/C > 1.00)—represents a severe adverse impact on the transport network. In line with NPPF Policy TR6, such developments will

be refused planning permission unless comprehensive structural infrastructure changes are fully secured to expand baseline capacity.

B. Mandatory Mitigation Framework

For proposals triggering Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions, developers must demonstrate that their residual cumulative impact has been mitigated below the "severe" threshold. Acceptable mitigation measures must prioritise sustainable transport frameworks, including:

1. Direct financial contributions via Section 106 or CIL agreements toward the *A31 Winchester Road East/West Gateways Active Travel Schemes*.
2. The physical installation or enhancement of dedicated pedestrian and cycle linkages to safely decouple local village trips from the A31 mainline, explicitly safeguarding pedestrian routes to Medstead School and Four Marks School.
3. Robust, legally binding Travel Plans containing measurable targets to actively shift a minimum 15% modal share away from single-occupancy vehicular travel.

C. Highway Safety and Side-Road Protection

Development proposals will be refused where long vehicular delays at minor-arm priority junctions onto the A31 prompt unsafe driver behaviour. Applicants must explicitly model side-road priority egress using time-dependent queueing equations. If a development causes minor-arm queueing delays to scale beyond acceptable historical tolerances, or forces drivers to accept hazardous, sub-critical mainline gaps (gap forcing), it will be deemed to have an unacceptable impact on highway safety under NPPF Policy TR6 and will be refused.

D. Stress-Testing and Multi-Scenario Validation

Transport Assessments supporting planning applications must reject single, optimised future forecasts. To satisfy the statutory test of severity, traffic modelling must be stress-tested across a range of reasonable future scenarios agreed upon with the Highway Authority. This must explicitly incorporate high-growth baselines, seasonal delivery variations, and potential infrastructure rollout delays. If a proposal causes network failure or severe delays across any of these stress-test sensitivities, the development impact will be judged severe.

E. Construction Phase Protections

The criteria for traffic impact significance and severe adverse impacts apply equally to the temporary construction phase as they do to the operational phase. Planning applications for major developments must include an early-stage Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). If construction profiles or heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements push the baseline flow past the Tier 3 threshold, or artificially drop link capacity due to slow acceleration profiles, the application will be refused unless physical phasing constraints are implemented to keep the network stable.

Reasoned Justification

1. **NPPF 2026 Compliance:** This policy updates local neighbourhood guidelines to directly match the terminology, multi-scenario mandates, and construction-phase scopes introduced in the August 2026 NPPF revision (Policy TR6), replacing older, outmoded transport paragraphs.
2. **Preventing Creeping Severity:** While individual small developments may generate seemingly minor volumes of traffic, their cumulative effect rapidly consumes the narrow 176 PCU headroom remaining on the A31. This policy establishes a clear mechanism to prevent "creeping severity" from gridlocking the village.
3. **Protecting Local Junctions:** Mainline congestion directly penalises local residents trying to exit side roads. By tying mainline PCU thresholds to minor-arm gap acceptance limits, this policy protects the connectivity, safety, and liveability of the wider Four Marks community.

Policy Amendment Appendix: Targeted Infrastructure Alignments (East Hampshire District Council)

To ensure **Policy MFM 26** is legally robust and carries full weight at planning appeals, the mitigation frameworks specified in Section B are explicitly harmonised with the **East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) Local Plan** infrastructure priorities and local transport strategies.

Developments falling into **Tier 2 (Significant)** or **Tier 3 (Severe)** must direct their mitigation packages, infrastructure designs, and Section 106/Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions toward the following specific local programs:

---

1. Integration with EHDC Active Travel and Infrastructure Schemes

- **A31 Winchester Road Corridor Active Travel Network:**
  Contributions will be pooled specifically to deliver the dedicated walking and cycling infrastructure identified in the *EHDC Local Plan* and the *Hampshire County Council (HCC) Local Transport Plan (LTP4)*. This focuses on creating a continuous, segregated active travel route running parallel to the A31, linking Four Marks directly to the sustainable transport hub at **Alton Railway Station**.
- **The Four Marks Pedestrian Severance Mitigation Scheme:**
  Funding will be allocated to infrastructure projects designed to safely break the physical barrier created by high A31 traffic volumes. This includes the delivery of signal-controlled pedestrian crossings (Puffin/Toucan) and traffic-calming measures at the intersections of **Lymington Bottom Road, Telegraph Lane** and **Boyneswood Road**, directly supporting EHDC's corporate priority of improving village connectivity and community health.

- **Safe Routes to School Initiative (Medstead Primary & Eggar's School):**
  To offset the loss of safe mainline gaps caused by development traffic, developers must fund specific off-carriageway pedestrian footpaths and cycle rights-of-way. These must connect residential expansion zones south of the A31 to local education feeders, safely decoupling vulnerable road users from the oversaturated NE mainline flow.

2. Compliance with EHDC Local Plan Policy Context

This neighbourhood policy serves as the localised delivery mechanism for the strategic transport mandates set out by the District Council. It operates in direct conformity with:

- **EHDC Local Plan Strategic Policies:** Mirroring strategic policies on sustainable transport, climate change mitigation, and infrastructure delivery.
- **The Hampshire LTP4 Framework:** Utilising the county-level shift toward a "decide and provide" methodology, ensuring development traffic does not degrade local air quality or push village networks into systemic delays.

Appendix 1

Methodology to produce NP allocation traffic impact

1 EHDC Advice

EHDC requested that a transport statement be produced as evidence for the NP allocations. It was suggested that this be carried out using data from recent planning applications to produce a composite impact of all the proposed NP allocations.

All the traffic modelling data from recent applications were compiled into a composite impact model for the NP applications. However, most recent applications had no A31 traffic modelling as this was to be provided by the HCC VISSIM model and was missing. Other applications had erroneous distributions applied or missing, flow diagrams not included or negligible flows stated.

The composite model failed to produce a robust output due to the data errors in the TA's from planning applications and was abandoned in favour of using the Taylor Wimpey TA data which is vision-led and more consistent with the new August 2026 NPPF. Data for trips was then used to produce an A31 impact model. The model was simplified by classifying the trip output as leaving the village in east or west direction on A31 or other. This produced results consistent with current traffic flows measured by DFT, Speedwatch and Lapwing Way trip data. The NP allocations were then added in with destinations from the Taylor Wimpey TA. This produced an additional 215 PCU going east on A31 in AM peak. The impact can't be produced without a road capacity figure; none of the TAs contains this information and the VISSIM data is not yet public.

2 Correspondence with HCC

The A31 road capacity was requested from Hampshire Highways with the following responses from Officers:

> The Landport development on Alton Lane also ran the VISSIM model which now includes Telegraph Lane and there is data available there also, however I don't believe they have yet presented this on the planning portal.

I appreciate why the Neighbourhood Plan group is seeking to identify a maximum traffic capacity figure for the A31 through Four Marks as part of their work on a Transport Statement for the document. However, I am unable to confirm any specific "capacity" threshold in terms of vehicle flow numbers for the section of road in question in the way suggested.

Whilst guidance documents may provide theoretical design capacities for different categories of road, there is no fixed threshold of traffic flow beyond which conditions on a road are automatically considered unacceptable or the implications of accommodating additional traffic will be considered severe. In practice, the assessment of development proposals is based on a range of factors including network operation, journey delay, highway safety and the effectiveness of any mitigation measures, rather than comparison against a single link-capacity figure.

The fact that observed traffic flows may approach or exceed a theoretical design capacity value does not, in itself, demonstrate that the impacts of development would be unacceptable. There are many locations across the highway network where traffic flows exceed theoretical capacities for periods of the day, but where the network continues to operate, albeit with varying levels of delay.

When assessing planning applications, Hampshire County Council considers the evidence presented within Transport Assessments and Statements, including the cumulative impacts on the highway network and highway safety. National planning policy adopts a vision-led approach to transport and movement planning and does not require the highway authority to maximise vehicular capacity. Instead, consideration is given to the overall operation of the network and wider transport policy objectives.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Policy TR6 states that development should only be refused on transport grounds where there would be a severe adverse impact on the transport network or an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Consequently, the key consideration is not whether a particular traffic flow exceeds a theoretical link-capacity figure, but whether the resulting impacts would reach these policy thresholds.

For these reasons, Hampshire County Council is unable to provide or endorse a specific capacity value for the A31 at Telegraph Lane for the purposes of assessing future development proposals. Any assessment of development impacts would need to consider the specific proposal, forecast traffic generation, cumulative effects, network performance and safety implications in accordance with national and local policy requirements.

I hope this response clarifies our position.

3 Capacity Calculation

As HCC were unable to provide a capacity figure one has been calculated using the established method below.

3.1 Road Classification Criteria (TA 79/99 Table 1)

To determine the correct capacity baseline, the A31 through Four Marks must first be classified based on its physical and operational characteristics. It meets the definition of an **Urban All-Purpose Road Type 3 (UAP3)** based on the following statutory criteria:

- **Speed Limit:** 30mph signposted restricted zone.
- **Frontage Access:** High density of direct residential driveways and properties opening straight onto the mainline.
- **Junction Density:** Frequent priority side roads and minor intersections (e.g., Lymington Bottom Road, Telegraph Lane, Boyneswood Road).
- **Pedestrian Activity:** Presence of at-grade pedestrian crossings, traffic islands, and local bus stops that introduce friction into continuous traffic flow.

3.2 Base Capacity Calculation of A31 (TA 79/99 Table 2)

		Two-way Single Carriageway- Busiest direction flow (Assumes a 60/40 directional split)									Dual Carriageway			
		Total number of Lanes									Number of Lanes in each direction			
		2				2-3	3	3-4	4	4+	2		3	4
Carriageway width		6.1m	6.75m	7.3m	9.0m	10.0m	12.3m	13.5m	14.6m	18.0m	6.75m	7.3m	11.0m	14.6m
Road type	**UM**	**Not applicable**										4000	5600	7200
	UAP1	1020	1320	1590	1860	2010	2550	2800	3050	3300	3350	3600	5200	*
	UAP2	1020	1260	1470	1550	1650	1700	1900	2100	2700	2950	3200	4800	*
	UAP3	900	1110	1300	1530	1620	*	*	*	*	2300	2600	3300	*
	UAP4	750	900	1140	1320	1410	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

DRAFT

TA 79/99 Table 2 (Capacities of Two-Way Single Carriageway Urban Roads) provides the maximum one-way hourly flow in the busiest direction. The capacity is directly determined by the width of the carriageway:

The average A31 width, taking into account hatching: 6.86m

Interpolated maximum capacity is 1149 PCU

Justification of Link Capacity Baselines

- To evaluate the structural capacity of the A31 corridor through Four Marks, this Plan relies upon the empirical framework originally established under the Department for Transport's Advice Note TA 79/99 (Traffic Capacity of Urban Roads).

- The Steering Group notes that TA 79/99 was archived by National Highways in March 2020 during a broader structural update to the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). However, because National Highways withdrew the document without introducing a direct replacement standard for single-carriageway link capacity evaluation, TA 79/99 remains the industry-standard methodology utilised by Highways Authorities, traffic engineers, and the Planning Inspectorate.

- This approach directly aligns with established UK planning appeal precedents (e.g., PINS Appeal Reference APP/D2320/W/22/3295556), where inspectors have consistently affirmed that applying the principles of TA 79/99 remains robust and legally sound, as its underlying empirical mechanics remain true.

- Applying the Table 2 parameters for a 6.86-metre wide Urban All-Purpose Road Classification UAP3 based on 30mph limits, localised frontage, and priority side-junction friction, the capacity is established at 1149 PCU (passenger car unit) per direction and the free flow capacity at 0.85 of maximum being 977.

- The capacity numbers have then been used to identify mitigation and policy required to avoid a severe adverse impact.

Appendix 2

Base Data and Model Generation

Medstead and Four Marks from 2021 ONS data had a population of 7832 and 3033 households.

From 2021 ONS data, a multivariate query on the electoral ward for numbers of bedrooms and numbers of cars gives

Households

No Beds	No Cars	1 Car	2 Cars	3 Cars	4 or More	Number of cars	Number of Households	N/HH
1	31	80	22	7	4	161	144	1.12
2	37	242	173	35	7	721	494	1.46
3	56	340	427	142	52	1828	1017	1.80
4	21	194	553	206	104	2334	1078	2.17
5 or more	7	46	246	116	111	1330	526	2.53
Totals	152	902	1421	506	278	6374	3259	1.9558

There were > 5,932 cars, with an average of 1.96 cars per household in 2021. The Four Marks Community Plan of 2010 gave a figure of 1.77, which demonstrates an 11% increase.

The number of cars per household is highly correlated to the number of bedrooms. A housing mix to the recommended 1-3 beds will reduce the number of cars per household to 1.8 from 1.96.

Base data for traffic

DFT (Department for Transport) camera data pre-COVID reports:

	East	West
Chawton roundabout 46341 2019 AM	973	619
Barn Lane 18707 2020 AM	339	347
Chawton roundabout 46341 2019 PM	630	1003
Barn Lane 18707 2020 PM	381	511

At the AM peak, 973 cars are travelling East. A similar pattern happens in reverse at the PM peak with 1003 cars travelling West. If we assume the 2019 and 2020 data are similar, approx. 600 cars join the A31 travelling East in the AM peak.

25256/050 has camera data from 2013, giving a peak of 1,377 travelling East in the AM peak.

Speedwatch data 12/10/2026 for private car units (PCU).

Car = 1 PCU bus/coach = 2 PCU & HGV = 2.3 PCU

	East	West
Telegraph Lane am	973	690
Bishops View am	454	543
Telegraph Lane pm	774	735
Bishops View pm	532	423

The conclusion is that very little has changed since 2019.

The recent Planning application submitted by Taylor Wimpey (EHDC-26-0919-OUT) includes a transport statement (09081-A-TP-RP-0001-D_Transport Assessment) of which Part 1 has been used as a base for trip generation and assignment, as it follows the August 2026 NPPF requirement for a vision-led approach.

09081-A-TP-RP-0001-D_Transport Assessment - Part 1 (1) uses:

HCC Lapwing Way data

	Vehicle Trip Rate (per dwelling)			Vehicle Trips (230 dwellings)		
	Arr	Dep	2-Way	Arr	Dep	2-Way
AM Peak (08:00-09:00)	0.132	0.538	0.670	30	124	154
PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	0.432	0.198	0.630	99	46	145
Daily	2.292	2.292	4.584	527	527	1,054

Census JtW (Journey to work) trip distribution

Place of Work	Driving a Car or Van
Hillingdon	16
Bracknell Forest	17
West Berkshire	30
Reading	14
Wokingham	8
Portsmouth	16
Southampton	33
Basingstoke and Deane	256
East Hampshire	1,141

Eastleigh	25
Fareham	29
Hart	88
Havant	27
Rushmoor	91
Test Valley	7
Winchester	386
Guildford	70
Runnymede	12
Spelthorne	6
Surrey Heath	34
Waverley	157
Woking	10
Chichester	15
Total	**2,488**

Distribution of vehicle Trips – Census JtW

Link	Proportion
Station Approach (North)	1%
Station Approach (East)	1%
Hazel Road	1%
A31 West	19%
Lymington Bottom Road	1%
Boyneswood Road	5%
A31 East	60%
Telegraph Lane	3%
Hawthorn Road	9%
Total	**100%**

To create a traffic demand model (TDM) baseline. Mobile Network Data (MND) is then used to categorise trip types of Employment, Retail/Other and Education and produce

Forecast vehicle trip assignment - TDM base scenario 230 households.

Zone No.	Zone Name	AM Peak		PM Peak	
		Arr	Dep	Arr	Dep
0	Internal LSOA	5	12	12	6
1	Local LSOA	8	16	21	12
2	East Hampshire (north)	12	45	27	15
3	East Hampshire (east) and South Downs	0	2	2	1
4	Hampshire (south), Portsmouth, and South Downs	2	7	8	4
5	Winchester (north) and Southampton	6	25	12	6
6	Basingstoke and West Berks	1	3	3	2
7	Surrey and SE	1	5	4	2
8	Reading, South Ox, Wokingham, and Hart	0	2	1	0
9	SH, BF, and W&M	0	0	0	0
10	BCP, New Forest, and SW	0	0	0	0
11	London	0	1	2	1
12	North	0	0	0	0
13	NE	0	0	0	0
Total		**36**	**117**	**92**	**49**
Total (per peak hour)		**153**		**141**	

Validated by comparing to HCC Lapwing Way

	Total Vehicle Trip Rate (Per Dwelling)	
	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)	PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)
HCC Lapwing Way	0.670	0.630
TDM Base Scenario	0.665	0.613
Difference	-0.005	-0.017
% Difference	0.75%	2.74%

To convert to a vision-led approach, 09081-A-TP-RP-0001-D_Transport Assessment - Part 1 (1) rebalanced the mode shares in anticipation of future modal shift.

The NPSG does not accept that all the rebalancing is correct, specifically the following points:

"5.7.8 Four Marks CE Primary School is located approximately 0.6 miles (1km) from the site. There is a new pedestrian/cycle link proposed at the south corner of the site as part of this Taylor Wimpey application which will emerge onto a new footway provided on the north side of Alton Lane. This footway is proposed to tie-in with the Gleeson's Land development (EHDC-25-0774-OUT) to the southwest and onwards to the existing footway on the approach to the Five Lanes junction. This route will provide safe access between the site and Four Marks CE Primary School.

5.7.9 Vehicle trips for the primary education purpose have therefore been reassigned to active modes (mostly walking)".

Four Marks Primary School Survey Data shows that of parents dropping off children, 84% are on the way to work, which is not local, invalidating 5.7.9 reassignment. **REF**

"5.7.13 Bus stop improvements could see greater uptake of public transport to access nearby secondary schools and further education facilities (especially those in Alton and Winchester). An adjustment has therefore been made by reassigning a proportion of car passenger and car driver trips to public transport for secondary and further education purposes, respectively"

Most secondary school trips are by coach or bus direct to the school **REF**

Four Marks Speedwatch and Department for Transport data show that the A31 traffic rates dominate the behaviour of the A31 priority junctions. The model produced has therefore categorised trips as A31 West of Four Marks, A31 East of Four Marks and others. The primary school error in the modal shift assignment above only affects the "other" category and the secondary school error is considered to be minor. The TDM (Traffic Demand Model) vision scenario data has therefore been used to populate the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan (M&FMNP) Traffic flow model.

From 09081-A-TP-RP-0001-D_Transport Assessment - Part 1

Forecast vehicle trip assignment – TDM vision scenario 230 Households

Zone No.	Zone Name	AM Peak		PM Peak	
		Arr	Dep	Arr	Dep
0	Internal LSOA	1	3	4	2
1	Local LSOA	5	10	13	7
2	East Hampshire (north)	10	37	24	13
3	East Hampshire (east) and South Downs	0	2	2	1
4	Hampshire (south), Portsmouth, and South Downs	2	7	8	4
5	Winchester (north) and Southampton	5	22	11	6
6	Basingstoke and West Berks	1	3	3	2
7	Surrey and SE	1	5	4	2
8	Reading, South Ox, Wokingham, and Hart	0	2	1	0
9	SH, BF, and W&M	0	0	0	0
10	BCP, New Forest, and SW	0	0	0	0
11	London	0	1	2	1
12	North	0	0	0	0
13	NE	0	0	0	0
Total		**27**	**93**	**71**	**37**
Total (per peak hour)		**119**		**109**	

	Total Vehicle Trip Rate (Per Dwelling)	
	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)	PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)
TDM Base Scenario	0.665	0.613
TDM Vision Scenario	0.519	0.473
Difference	-0.146	-0.140
% Difference	24.7%	25.8%

Base and Vision Trip Distribution

TDM	Taylor wimpey 230 HH	AM		PM		1 HH	AM		PM		1HH	AM				AM				PM				PM						
												A31 East	A31 West	other		A31 East	A31 West	other		A31 East	A31 West	other		A31 East	A31 West	other				
zone	name	arr	dep	arr	dep		arr	dep	arr	dep		arr	arr	arr		dep	dep	dep		arr	arr	arr		dep	dep	dep				
0	Internal LSOA	5	12	12	6		0.022	0.052	0.052	0.026				0.022				0.052				0.052				0.026				
1	Local LSOA	8	16	21	12		0.035	0.070	0.091	0.052				0.035				0.070				0.091				0.052				
2	East Hampshire (north)	12	45	27	15		0.052	0.196	0.117	0.065		0.052				0.196				0.117				0.065						
3	East Hampshire East) and South Downs	0	2	2	1		0.000	0.009	0.009	0.004		0.000				0.009				0.009				0.004						
4	Hampshire South Portsmouth Southdowns	2	7	8	4		0.009	0.030	0.035	0.017				0.009				0.030				0.035				0.017				
5	winchester north and southamptton	6	25	12	6		0.026	0.109	0.052	0.026			0.026				0.109				0.052				0.026					
6	basingstoke and west berks	1	3	3	2		0.004	0.013	0.013	0.009				0.004				0.013				0.013				0.009				
7	surrey and SE	1	5	4	2		0.004	0.022	0.017	0.009		0.004				0.022				0.017				0.009						
8	reading south ox wokingham and hart	0	2	1	0		0.000	0.009	0.004	0.000		0.000				0.009				0.004				0.000						
9	SH BF and W&M	0	0	0	0		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000				0.000				0.000				0.000						
10	BCP new forest and SW	0	0	0	0		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000			0.000				0.000				0.000				0.000					
11	london	0	1	2	1		0.000	0.004	0.009	0.004		0.000				0.004				0.009				0.004						
12	north	0	0	0	0		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000				0.000				0.000				0.000						
13	NE	0	0	0	0		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000				0.000				0.000				0.000						
	total	35	118	92	49		0.152	0.513	0.400	0.213		0.057	0.026	0.070		0.239	0.109	0.165		0.157	0.052	0.191		0.083	0.026	0.104				
			153		141			0.665		0.613				0.152				0.513				0.400				0.213				
HH	1										pcu	0.057	0.026	0.070	0.152	0.239	0.109	0.165	0.513	0.157	0.052	0.191	0.400	0.083	0.026	0.104	0.213	1.278		
											delta pcu					0.213	0.052							0.030	-0.130					
										per day per HH																					
	total lapwing data									4.584																				

vision	Taylor wimpey 230 HH	AM		PM		1 HH	AM		PM		1HH	AM				AM				PM				PM						
	0											A31 East	A31 West	other		A31 East	A31 West	other		A31 East	A31 West	other		A31 East	A31 West	other				
zone	name	arr	dep	arr	dep		arr	dep	arr	dep		arr	arr	arr		dep	dep	dep		arr	arr	arr		dep	dep	dep				
0	Internal LSOA	1	3	4	2		0.004	0.013	0.017	0.009				0.004				0.013				0.017				0.009				
1	Local LSOA	5	10	13	7		0.022	0.043	0.057	0.030				0.022				0.043				0.057				0.030				
2	East Hampshire (north)	10	37	24	13		0.043	0.161	0.104	0.057		0.043				0.161				0.104				0.057						
3	East Hampshire East) and South Downs	0	2	2	1		0.000	0.009	0.009	0.004		0.000				0.009				0.009				0.004						
4	Hampshire South Portsmouth Southdowns	2	7	8	4		0.009	0.030	0.035	0.017				0.009				0.030				0.035				0.017				
5	winchester north and southamptton	5	22	11	6		0.022	0.096	0.048	0.026			0.022				0.096				0.048				0.026					
6	basingstoke and west berks	1	3	3	2		0.004	0.013	0.013	0.009				0.004				0.013				0.013				0.009				
7	surrey and SE	1	5	4	2		0.004	0.022	0.017	0.009		0.004				0.022				0.017				0.009						
8	reading south ox wokingham and hart	0	2	1	0		0.000	0.009	0.004	0.000		0.000				0.009				0.004				0.000						
9	SH BF and W&M	0	0	0	0		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000				0.000				0.000				0.000						
10	BCP new forest and SW	0	0	0	0		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000			0.000				0.000				0.000				0.000					
11	london	0	1	2	1		0.000	0.004	0.009	0.004		0.000				0.004				0.009				0.004						
12	north	0	0	0	0		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000				0.000				0.000				0.000						
13	NE	0	0	0	0		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000				0.000				0.000				0.000						
0	total	25	92	72	38		0.109	0.400	0.313	0.165		0.048	0.022	0.039		0.204	0.096	0.100		0.143	0.048	0.122		0.074	0.026	0.065				
			117		110			0.509		0.478				0.109				0.400				0.313				0.165				
											pcu	0.048	0.022	0.039	0.109	0.204	0.096	0.100	0.400	0.143	0.048	0.122	0.313	0.074	0.026	0.065	0.165	0.987		
											delta pcu					0.183	0.048							0.026	-0.117					

Base and Vision AM Peak Cumulative Site Impact PCU

				Destination A31 East of Four Marks								Destination A31 West of Four Marks									
		A31 AM peak delta TDM		Ropley	Barn lane site	131 winchester rd	lymington bottom	boyneswood road	Telegraph Lane	Chawton		Chawton	Telegraph Lane	boyneswood road	lymington bottom	131 winchester rd	Barn lane site	Ropely			
					Exit	Exit	Exit	Exit	Exit				Exit	Exit	Exit	Exit	Exit				
		base	519	453.7			207.560	103.780	207.560	972.600		-147	690		-22.050		-124.950			542.700	
PP	58788/002	Land West of Longbourn Way EHDC-26-0752-RES	95				20.239			20.239							4.957			4.957	
PP	25256/050	Land to the rear of Brackenbury Gardens and, Boyneswood Close,	54					11.504		11.504					2.817					2.817	
MFM 33	27000/005	Land to the rear and including Fair Winds, 61 Lymington Bottom Road,	45				9.587			9.587							2.348			2.348	
PP	55318/001	Land west of Beechlands Road,	62					13.209		13.209					3.235					3.235	
	Four Marks																				
PP	56082/004	MOUNT ROYAL 46 LYMINGTON BOTTOM EHDC-25-0372-RES	59				12.570			12.570							3.078			3.078	
PP	60062	Land Between Conway & Millfield Alton Lane, Four Marks, Alton, Hampshire,	3						0.639	0.639							0.157			0.157	
PP	60040	Land East Of Lanark Cottage Alton Lane,	10						2.130	2.130							0.522			0.522	
MFM 35	20252/004	Land At 103 And To The Rear Of 97 To 105 Blackberry Lane,	34						7.243	7.243							1.774			1.774	
PP	60425/001	LAND TO THE SOUTHEAST OF SEMAPHORE FARM Telegraph Lane,	2						0.426	0.426							0.104			0.104	
MFM 38	EHDC-25-0313-OUT	87 Lymington Bottom,	65				13.848			13.848							3.391			3.391	
MFM 36	30800/013	Land Rear of, 131 Winchester Road	21			4.474				4.474						1.096				1.096	
MFM 37	50216/002	Land West Of Millfield Alton Lane,	100						21.304	21.304					5.217					5.217	
		other	0				0.000			0.000					0.000					0.000	
		o/s small permissions and windfall	29				6.178			6.178					1.513					1.513	
	NPSG SITES																				
	Medstead																				
MFM 28		Land South of Green Stile	34					7.243		7.243					1.774					1.774	
MFM 29		Land to the rear of Woodview Place and Timbers	17					3.622		3.622				0.887						0.887	
MFM 30		Land fronting Beechlands Road	16					3.409		3.409					0.835					0.835	
MFM 31		Land South of Beechlands	15					3.196		3.196					0.783					0.783	
MFM 32		Land to the rear of 48 Lymington Bottom Road	130				27.696			27.696					6.783					6.783	
	Four Marks																				
MFM 34	EHDC-25-0055-OUT	Land South Of Winchester Road	115		24.500					24.500								6.000		6.000	
MFM 39	MFM 39	Land between Blackberry Lane and Alton Lane, Four Marks	45						9.587	9.587					2.348					2.348	
MFM 40		Land behind Lawrenny Alton Lane, Four Marks	49						10.439	10.439					2.557					2.557	
MFM 41	MFM 41	Land at New Barn Farm, Alton Lane, Four Marks	177						37.709	37.709					9.235					9.235	
		total	1177		25	4	90	42	89	251			0	7	47	1	6	61			
		base		453.7	454	454	454	661	661	765	765	973			689.7	690	690	668	668	543	543	543	543	543	
		total +base		453.7	478	478	483	483	780	780	926	926	1223			689.7	690	690	675	675	597	597	598	598	604	

				Destination A31 East of Four Marks								Destination A31 West of Four Marks									
		A31 AM peak delta TDM Vision		Ropley	Barn lane site	131 winchester rd	lymington bottom	boyneswood road	Telegraph Lane	Chawton		Chawton	Telegraph Lane	boyneswood road	lymington bottom	131 winchester rd	Barn lane site	Ropely			
					Exit	Exit	Exit	Exit	Exit				Exit	Exit	Exit	Exit	Exit				
		base	519	453.7			207.560	103.780	207.560	972.600		-147	690		-22.050		-124.950			542.700	
PP	58788/002	Land West of Longbourn Way EHDC-26-0752-RES	95				17.348			17.348							4.543			4.543	
PP	25256/050	Land to the rear of Brackenbury Gardens and, Boyneswood Close,	54					9.861		9.861					2.583					2.583	
MFM 33	27000/005	Land to the rear and including Fair Winds, 61 Lymington Bottom Road,	45				8.217			8.217							2.152			2.152	
PP	55318/001	Land west of Beechlands Road,	62					11.322		11.322					2.965					2.965	
	Four Marks																				
PP	56082/004	MOUNT ROYAL 46 LYMINGTON BOTTOM EHDC-25-0372-RES	59				10.774			10.774							2.822			2.822	
PP	60062	Land Between Conway & Millfield Alton Lane, Four Marks, Alton, Hampshire,	3						0.548	0.548							0.143			0.143	
PP	60040	Land East Of Lanark Cottage Alton Lane,	10						1.826	1.826							0.478			0.478	
MFM 35	20252/004	Land At 103 And To The Rear Of 97 To 105 Blackberry Lane,	34						6.209	6.209							1.626			1.626	
PP	60425/001	LAND TO THE SOUTHEAST OF SEMAPHORE FARM Telegraph Lane,	2						0.365	0.365							0.096			0.096	
MFM 38	EHDC-25-0313-OUT	87 Lymington Bottom,	65				11.870			11.870							3.109			3.109	
MFM 36	30800/013	Land Rear of, 131 Winchester Road	21			3.835				3.835						1.004				1.004	
MFM 37	50216/002	Land West Of Millfield Alton Lane,	100						18.261	18.261					4.783					4.783	
0	0	other	0				0.000			0.000					0.000					0.000	
		o/s small permissions and windfall	29				5.296			5.296					1.387					1.387	
	NPSG SITES																				
	Medstead																				
MFM 28		Land South of Green Stile	34					6.209		6.209					1.626					1.626	
MFM 29		Land to the rear of Woodview Place and Timbers	17					3.104		3.104				0.813						0.813	
MFM 30		Land fronting Beechlands Road	16					2.922		2.922					0.765					0.765	
MFM 31		Land South of Beechlands	15					2.739		2.739					0.717					0.717	
MFM 32		Land to the rear of 48 Lymington Bottom Road	130				23.739			23.739					6.217					6.217	
	Four Marks																				
MFM 34	EHDC-25-0055-OUT	Land South Of Winchester Road	115		21.000					21.000								5.500		5.500	
MFM 39	MFM 39	Land between Blackberry Lane and Alton Lane, Four Marks	45						8.217	8.217					2.152					2.152	
MFM 40		Land behind Lawrenny Alton Lane, Four Marks	49						8.948	8.948					2.343					2.343	
MFM 41	MFM 41	Land at New Barn Farm, Alton Lane, Four Marks	177						32.322	32.322					8.465					8.465	
		total	1177		21	4	77	36	77	215			0	6	43	1	6	56			
		base		453.7	454	454	454	661	661	765	765	973			689.7	690	690	668	668	543	543	543	543	543	
		total +base		453.7	475	475	479	479	763	763	903	903	1188			689.7	690	690	674	674	592	592	593	593	599	

Base and Vision PM Peak Cumulative Site Impact PCU

				Destination A31 East of Four Marks										Destination A31 West of Four Marks									
		A31 PM peak delta TDM		Ropley	Barn lane site		131 winchester rd		lymington bottom		boyneswood road		Telegraph Lane	Chawton		Chawton	Telegraph Lane		boyneswood road		lymington bottom		131 winchester rd		Barn lane site		Ropely
					Exit		Exit		Exit		Exit		Exit				Exit		Exit		Exit		Exit		Exit		
		base	242	532					96.800		48.400		96.800	773.500		-312 735			-46.800		-265.200						423.200
PP	58788/002	Land West of Longbourn Way EHDC-26-0752-RES	95						2.891					2.891		12.391					-12.391						
PP	25256/050	Land to the rear of Brackenbury Gardens and, Boyneswood Close,	54								1.643			1.643		7.043			-7.043								
MFM 33	27000/005	Land to the rear and including Fair Winds, 61 Lymington Bottom Road,	45						1.370					1.370		5.870					-5.870						
PP	55318/001	Land west of Beechlands Road,	62								1.887			1.887		8.087			-8.087								
	Four Marks																										
PP	56082/004	MOUNT ROYAL 46 LYMINGTON BOTTOM EHDC-25-0372-RES	59						1.796					1.796		7.696					-7.696						
PP	60062	Land Between Conway & Millfield Alton Lane, Four Marks, Alton, Hampshire,	3										0.091	0.091		0.391					-0.391						
PP	60040	Land East Of Lanark Cottage Alton Lane,	10										0.304	0.304		1.304					-1.304						
MFM 35	20252/004	Land At 103 And To The Rear Of 97 To 105 Blackberry Lane,	34										1.035	1.035		4.435					-4.435						
PP	60425/001	LAND TO THE SOUTHEAST OF SEMAPHORE FARM Telegraph Lane,	2										0.061	0.061		0.261					-0.261						
MFM 38	EHDC-25-0313-OUT	87 Lymington Bottom,	65						1.978					1.978		8.478					-8.478						
MFM 36	30800/013	Land Rear of, 131 Winchester Road	21				0.639							0.639		2.739							-2.739				
MFM 37	50216/002	Land West Of Millfield Alton Lane,	100										3.043	3.043		13.043					-13.043						
0	0	other	0						0.000					0.000		0.000					0.000						
		o/s small permissions and windfall	29						0.883					0.883		3.783					-3.783						
	NPSG SITES																										
	Medstead																										
MFM 28		Land South of Green Stile	34								1.035			1.035		4.435					-4.435						
MFM 29		Land to the rear of Woodview Place and Timbers	17								0.517			0.517		2.217			-2.217								
MFM 30		Land fronting Beechlands Road	16								0.487			0.487		2.087					-2.087						
MFM 31		Land South of Beechlands	15								0.457			0.457		1.957					-1.957						
MFM 32		Land to the rear of 48 Lymington Bottom Road	130						3.957					3.957		16.957					-16.957						
	Four Marks																										
MFM 34	EHDC-25-0055-OUT	Land South Of Winchester Road	115		3.500									3.500		15.000									-15.000		
MFM 39	MFM 39	Land between Blackberry Lane and Alton Lane, Four Marks	45										1.370	1.370		5.870					-5.870						
MFM 40		Land behind Lawrenny Alton Lane, Four Marks	49										1.491	1.491		6.391					-6.391						
MFM 41	MFM 41	Land at New Barn Farm, Alton Lane, Four Marks	177										5.387	5.387		23.087					-23.087						
		total	1177		4		1		13		6		13	36		154	0		-17		-118		-3		-15		
		base		531.5	532	532	532	532	628	628	677	677	774			735.2	735	735	688	688	423	423	423	423	423		
		total +base		531.5	535	535	536	536	645	645	700	700	809			889	889	889	825	825	441	441	438	438	423		

				Destination A31 East of Four Marks										Destination A31 West of Four Marks									
		A31 PM peak delta TDM Vision		Ropley	Barn lane site		131 winchester rd		lymington bottom		boyneswood road		Telegraph Lane	Chawton		Chawton	Telegraph Lane		boyneswood road		lymington bottom		131 winchester rd		Barn lane site		Ropely
					Exit		Exit		Exit		Exit		Exit				Exit		Exit		Exit		Exit		Exit		
		base	242	532					96.800		48.400		96.800	773.500		-312 735			-46.800		-265.200						423.200
PP	58788/002	Land West of Longbourn Way EHDC-26-0752-RES	95						2.478					2.478		11.152					-11.152						
PP	25256/050	Land to the rear of Brackenbury Gardens and, Boyneswood Close,	54								1.409			1.409		6.339			-6.339								
MFM 33	27000/005	Land to the rear and including Fair Winds, 61 Lymington Bottom Road,	45						1.174					1.174		5.283					-5.283						
PP	55318/001	Land west of Beechlands Road,	62								1.617			1.617		7.278			-7.278								
	Four Marks																										
PP	56082/004	MOUNT ROYAL 46 LYMINGTON BOTTOM EHDC-25-0372-RES	59						1.539					1.539		6.926					-6.926						
PP	60062	Land Between Conway & Millfield Alton Lane, Four Marks, Alton, Hampshire,	3										0.078	0.078		0.352					-0.352						
PP	60040	Land East Of Lanark Cottage Alton Lane,	10										0.261	0.261		1.174					-1.174						
MFM 35	20252/004	Land At 103 And To The Rear Of 97 To 105 Blackberry Lane,	34										0.887	0.887		3.991					-3.991						
PP	60425/001	LAND TO THE SOUTHEAST OF SEMAPHORE FARM Telegraph Lane,	2										0.052	0.052		0.235					-0.235						
MFM 38	EHDC-25-0313-OUT	87 Lymington Bottom,	65						1.696					1.696		7.630					-7.630						
MFM 36	30800/013	Land Rear of, 131 Winchester Road	21				0.548							0.548		2.465							-2.465				
MFM 37	50216/002	Land West Of Millfield Alton Lane,	100										2.609	2.609		11.739					-11.739						
0	0	other	0						0.000					0.000		0.000					0.000						
		o/s small permissions and windfall	29						0.757					0.757		3.404					-3.404						
	NPSG SITES																										
	Medstead																										
MFM 28		Land South of Green Stile	34								0.887			0.887		3.991					-3.991						
MFM 29		Land to the rear of Woodview Place and Timbers	17								0.443			0.443		1.996			-1.996								
MFM 30		Land fronting Beechlands Road	16								0.417			0.417		1.878					-1.878						
MFM 31		Land South of Beechlands	15								0.391			0.391		1.761					-1.761						
MFM 32		Land to the rear of 48 Lymington Bottom Road	130						3.391					3.391		15.261					-15.261						
	Four Marks																										
MFM 34	EHDC-25-0055-OUT	Land South Of Winchester Road	115		3.000									3.000		13.500									-13.500		
MFM 39	MFM 39	Land between Blackberry Lane and Alton Lane, Four Marks	45										1.174	1.174		5.283					-5.283						
MFM 40		Land behind Lawrenny Alton Lane, Four Marks	49										1.278	1.278		5.752					-5.752						
MFM 41	MFM 41	Land at New Barn Farm, Alton Lane, Four Marks	177										4.617	4.617		20.778					-20.778						
		total	1177		3		1		11		5		11	31		138	0		-16		-107		-2		-14		
		base		531.5	532	532	532	532	628	628	677	677	774			735.2	735	735	688	688	423	423	423	423	423		
		total +base		531.5	535	535	535	535	643	643	696	696	804			873	873	873	811	811	439	439	437	437	423		

Appendix 3

Modal Shift Analysis

From 09081-A-TP-RP-0001-D_Transport Assessment - Part 1

Modal shift achieved if measures suggested are implemented

	Total Vehicle Trip Rate (Per Dwelling)	
	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)	PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)
TDM Base Scenario	0.665	0.613
TDM Vision Scenario	0.519	0.473
Difference	-0.146	-0.140
% Difference	24.7%	25.8%

If the same measures are implemented on the NP sites, the effect on the A31 is as follows

Car =1 PCU
Bus/Coach = 2 PCU
HGV = 2.3 PCU

A31 East				A31 West			A31 East			A31 West		
	AM		Modal Shift %	AM		Modal Shift %	PM		Modal Shift %	PM		Modal Shift %
TDM	Ropley	Chawton		Chawton	Ropley		Ropley	Chawton		Chawton	Ropley	
Base	454	973		690	543		532	774		735	423	
Allocations		251			61			36		154		
Total	454	1224		690	604		532	810		889	423	
TDM	Ropley	Chawton					Ropley	Chawton				
Base	454	973		690	543		532	774		735	423	
Allocations		215	**-14**		56	**-8**		31	**-14**	138		**-10**
Total	454	1188		690	599		532	805		873	423	

The modal shift applies predominantly to local journeys where 50% can be achieved, as opposed to longer trips which are not practical by bus, walking or cycling, where only 12% can be achieved on A31 Traffic.

The possible 12% reduction by modal shift on the A31 must be offset by the reduction in capacity of the A31 due to the measures. HCC's current proposals for modal shift implementation are to add additional safe pedestrian crossings and create multimodal footpaths. Removal of bus pull-ins to make room for multimodal paths and additional pedestrian crossings will reduce the A31 capacity, nullifying the modal shift reduction. Further mitigation is therefore needed to allow the A31 to stay within its capacity.

Appendix 4

Connectivity Tool

Site name	M&FMNP
Size	17,949,749.91 sqm | 1,794.97 ha



Overall

Mode of transport	Mean	Maximum	Minimum
Overall (except driving)	27	49	9
Public transport	29	55	9
Walking	22	43	4
Cycling	39	50	25
Driving	70	85	45

Education

Mode of transport	Mean	Maximum	Minimum
Overall (except driving)	21	46	3
Public transport	26	50	5
Walking	16	51	0

Mode of transport	Mean	Maximum	Minimum
Cycling	31	53	7
Driving	50	69	16

Leisure

Mode of transport	Mean	Maximum	Minimum
Overall (except driving)	27	48	11
Public transport	30	56	11
Walking	22	39	5
Cycling	39	54	21
Driving	67	86	34

Health

Mode of transport	Mean	Maximum	Minimum
Overall (except driving)	21	56	0
Public transport	27	68	0
Walking	12	43	0
Cycling	28	58	6
Driving	66	88	30

Shopping

Mode of transport	Mean	Maximum	Minimum
Overall (except driving)	27	64	5
Public transport	30	68	5
Walking	24	58	3
Cycling	38	67	12
Driving	68	90	31

Residential

Mode of transport	Mean	Maximum	Minimum
Overall (except driving)	36	50	15
Public transport	35	49	15
Walking	35	51	6
Cycling	48	54	40
Driving	82	86	76

Workplaces

Mode of transport	Mean	Maximum	Minimum
Overall (except driving)	29	43	11
Public transport	29	46	9
Walking	19	31	0
Cycling	39	45	32
Driving	74	78	67