

## **A342 Working Group**

### **Detailed Response to TVBC Draft Local Plan of June 2025, and associated Infrastructure Development Plan.**

For many years the Parish Councils to the West of Andover on or near the A342 have had concerns regarding the traffic levels and safety of this road, and the roads feeding into it. The publishing of the TVBC Draft Local Plan (DLP), and Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) have significant implications for these roads, and provided the catalyst for the A342 Working Group to be formed. The group came into existence on the 1<sup>st</sup> of August 2025, and its Terms of Reference are –

**“To improve and enhance the A342 corridor within Hampshire for the safety and welfare of all road users, including pedestrians. Thereby minimising any impact on those communities affected by the A342 and the surrounding road network, whilst providing an appropriate transit route for both local and through traffic. The network of surrounding roads and alternative routes to be included, so as to improve safety, road use, and Public Transport through the A342 corridor to the advantage of the local communities in the area. To work with stakeholders and public authorities, so as to bring the highest level of constructive representation possible”**

To date the Parishes of Amport, Appleshaw & Redenham, Fyfield, Kimpton, Monxton, Penton Grafton, Penton Mewsey, and Thruxton are members of the group. It is likely that other communities will join as well.

It is the considered view of this group that the impact on the infrastructure in this area and in particular the A342 and A303 has been significantly underestimated by the DLP and Hampshire County Council. The A342 from Ludgershall to Andover is already a very busy road over which the group has major safety concerns. The influx of the increased traffic as a result of the very significant levels of development proposed will only increase these concerns. We request that TVBC Planning reconsider their infrastructure assessment in the DLP, and IDP, and in particular the effect upon the A342, A303, and their feeder roads by the Draft Local Plan. Our specific concerns (not necessarily comprehensive) are as follows:-

## Concerns regarding the A342

The A342, and side roads will incur additional traffic from Northern Area Policies NA – 7, 8, 13, 16, 19, and 23.

- All side road junctions from the Wiltshire border to the Appleshaw/Dauntsey Drove/Fyfield Lane crossroads present safety concerns for ingress and egress, as well as the delays that will result.
- The current configuration of the Appleshaw.Dauntsey Drove/Fyfield Lane crossroads suffers from traffic speed, poor visibility from the Appleshaw exit, and capacity is inadequate particularly at times of heavy traffic. - NA16 and NA 19 will impact but do not mention this crossroads specifically.
- The junction with Penton Road. Safety concerns with ingress, egress particularly for vehicles turning right on to the A342 from Penton Road.
- Penton Road itself, which is a rat run and with dangerous crossroads at Weyhill Bottom. – NA16
- Fairground roundabout. At peak times traffic queues develop at this bottleneck. Also traffic trying to leave Fairground Road has very poor visibility to the West compounded by traffic from the West approaching the roundabout too fast. Similarly with traffic emerging from Amesbury Road looking to the East.- NA16.
- The Amesbury Road has a number of junctions and the Hillier Garden Centre on it. A large section is still only subject to the National 60 mph limit. A reduction in this limit would benefit the existing community and the proposed developments. – NA 16
- The Rectory Lane/Red Post Lane in Penton Grafton staggered crossroads presents major safety concerns due to traffic speeds and configuration. – NA16
- The traffic Island/Pedestrian refuge adjacent to Red Post Lane is in a very bad state of repair and does not provide adequate traffic calming or pedestrian safety. This is due to successive resurfacing lowering the kerbing of the island. – NA16 (This is an ongoing dispute between HCC Highways and Penton Grafton Parish Council).
- A 30 mph limit through Weyhill. – NA16 (Penton Grafton Parish Council have requested a limit over many years in accordance with Dept of Transport guidance on Village speed limits on major roads, with HCC refusing).
- The A342 through east Weyhill with several side roads plus Weyhill Service Station access. The road needs widening here with a proper central turning area and further traffic calming and pedestrian refuge. – NA16 (This is for the safety of vehicles turning and to support the 30 mph limit proposed above)

- Penton Corner has been identified in the DLP and IDP as requiring improvement. – NA 13
- Reith Way, the access to the Portway Industrial estate. This causes significant problems for ingress and egress particularly for vehicles turning right on to the A342.
- 100 Acre roundabout and its approaches. Significant tailbacks at peak times.
- Pedestrian/Cyclist access and crossing at 100 Acre roundabout from and to the A342 is highly dangerous. Why was the subway network not extended to the West?

### **Concerns Regarding the A303**

The A303 and access points will incur additional traffic from Northern Area Policies NA – 9, 16, and 23

All the roads in the Parishes of Amport and Thruxton that access the A303 do not meet current Highways Agency/Dept of Transport regulations/policy for deceleration and acceleration lanes for leaving and joining a dual carriageway. The fact that these access points are dangerous and a safety concern results in them not being used by many drivers. This creates additional traffic on other junctions and on the A342. These access points all require improvement but none of the policies or plans address this problem. Why? In addition several of these access points are from narrow lanes. Despite some conversations between affected Parish Councils and National Highways (responsible for the A303), no attempt to improve visibility splays or integration of these roads has been undertaken. Why?

### **Policy Concerns:-**

The DLP and IDP refer to a number of policy documents and Assessments. From consulting these documents we would like answers to the following questions.

1. The HCC Local Transport Plan 4 is referred to. This document does not mention the A342. This document lists 9 Core Policies on page 57. Can you please explain how the DLP/IDP meets any of these core policies?
2. The Preliminary Transport Assessment (PTA) produced for the 2024 Regulation Consultation was based on two growth assumptions, both of around 5500 additional homes. The revised DLP is proposing a minimum of 15878 homes and as such the PTA is out of date and a new version must be produced. The A342 Working Group would welcome the opportunity to assist TVBC and their consultants in producing the new version.

3. In making the revised assessment in 4) above current traffic data will be an essential requirement. As HCC Highways have not carried out measurement in this area since 2010 new traffic data will be essential.
4. The lack of required Improvements to the A342 in both the DLP, and IDP implies that TVBC consider the road adequate for this increase in traffic. As TVBC are not a Highway Authority they are not in a position to comment on the capabilities or safety of a highway (A342). Therefore the HCC Highways were presumably consulted over these questions. Can you please provide the questions asked and the answers received?

### **Public Transport**

This is hardly mentioned in the DLP or IDP. There appears to have been no research or assessment of public need, necessary to meet current policies. The DLP will require significant improvement to current services to meet the requirements of both HCC and Government policies. Why has this not been considered?

### **Conclusions**

Most of the concerns, problems, and safety issues identified above apply to the roads and communities to the West of Andover as they currently exist. Should the proposals detailed in the TVBC – DLP and IDP proceed they will create significant problems and degradation of environment and safety for all of these Parishes. There needs to be significant improvements to these roads now and for the future. TVBC needs to carry out a thorough, honest, and effective assessment of the infrastructure and implement improvements, with funding sources identified, before progressing.

On page 120 of the DLP it states in the “Highways, transport and travel” section “The Council undertook transport modelling to inform the draft Local Plan Regulation 18 Stage 2 document. This concluded there was no significant impact from the proposed sites in that document”. The “Recommendations” section of the Transport Assessment of the Local Plan Regulation 18 Stage 2 consultation says “ It is recommended that the following detailed assessment should be considered for the individual and combined sites within the preferred Growth Option:

- Full accessibility study for the individual and combined sites, considering both existing and potential accessibility (in line with the sustainable transport strategy). This would help identify the necessary land uses/facilities and transport infrastructure and services to improve accessibility

- Development of a sustainable transport strategy for the site and combined sites, in line with TVBC and HCC's adopted and emerging policy.
- Travel demand assessment of the detailed development proposals, considering a range of transport scenarios, including a 'Decide & Provide' approach that takes into account emerging travel trends and the proposed transport strategy for the site.
- Further work to identify detailed mitigation measures required for the preferred option, and development of a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (MEP) including triggers for investment in transport infrastructure and services."

The group does not understand how TVBC can reach a conclusion that "There was no significant impact from the proposed sites in that document" when the PTA document included recommendations for "Full studies" and "Further work to be undertaken". Can TVBC explain how they came to their conclusion that "there was no significant impact"?

Nigel Blackmore  
Chair A342 Working Group.

**On behalf of the A342 Working Group**

NMB W/G Response V5