

## Transport – Statement of Common Ground

### Appeal Reference: APP/A172/W/21/3272188

#### 1) Matters Agreed:

- a) Fareham Borough Council has identified the appeal site in the emerging Local Plan. From the previous appeal, the parties agree that the site accessibility and the Inspectors reasoning is captured in paragraphs 78-80 of the Appeal Decision and paragraphs 17-22 of the Costs Decision.
- b) The proposed highway works are based on those identified in local<sup>i</sup> and national<sup>ii</sup> design standards and guidance<sup>iii</sup>.
- c) The highway proposals include a footway on the western side of the Downend Road Railway Bridge. Access to this footway is accommodated with uncontrolled pedestrian crossings north and south of the bridge, including a pedestrian refuge island north.
- d) The highway proposals include a 3.5m (approx.) carriageway with edge of carriageway markings to provide a 3.0m carriageway.
- e) The Highway Design was developed on the basis that cyclists on Downend Road will cycle in the carriageway.
- f) The proposed highway works include potential relaxations and departures from standard, which were advised to HCC as part of the Pre-Application Design Submission (2017) and were accepted in principle by Hampshire County Council.
- g) An independent Stage 1 - Road Safety Audit was completed; relaxations and departures from standard related to the site access were not reported in the latest Audit Brief but were clearly advised to the Auditor through the inclusion of the earlier Road Safety Audit for the Site Access, considered as part of the Audit.
- h) The modelling of the shuttle-working railway bridge has been designed using inter-green times for traffic, as set out in Chapter 6 of the Traffic Signs Manual<sup>iv</sup>. The Distance between the stop lines is 66m.
- i) The Pedestrian Refuge island is 2.0m wide and 1.8m deep, in line with the preferable width and in excess of the minimum identified in Paragraph 15.3.2 of Chapter 6 of the Traffic Signs Manual
- j) Pedestrian visibility at the uncontrolled crossing point north of the bridge is identified on Drawing No. ITB122112-GA-061 Rev A. These visibility splays may/will be (partially) obstructed when traffic is queued at the stop-line or waiting to turn right.
- k) Pedestrian Crossing speeds are defined in Section 18.6.1 of Chapter 6 of the Traffic Signs Manual and have been considered as 1.2 metres/second for the proposed highway works.
- l) Cycle design speeds are detailed in Table 12-1 of Chapter 6 of the Traffic Signs Manual as 20kph (5.55metres per second) both north and southbound.
- m) The gradients on approach to the signal junction are shown on Drawing ITB12212-072A, which demonstrates a northbound gradient of +2.5%, a gradient through the bridge of +/- 2.65% and a southbound gradient on approach to the junction of -3.2%.

## Transport – Statement of Common Ground

### Appeal Reference: APP/A172/W/21/3272188

- n) Fareham Borough Council do not raise any evidence in relation to the impact of the development on the highway network beyond matters related to the Downend Road bridge.
- o) Fareham Borough Council agrees that the previous Inspector considered matters relating to the site access and that the Inspector considered the access to be acceptable.
- p) Fareham Borough Council agree that the delivery of a footway across the Downend Road bridge will provide a significant benefit to the safety and attractiveness of pedestrian movements on Downend Road when compared to the current situation,
- q) Fareham Borough Council agree that in all matters apart from the method of control of traffic across the Downend Road bridge, the improvement proposed as part of the Appeal application is similar to that proposed as part of the Option 3 improvement considered at the earlier Appeal, including in relation to pedestrian provisions and site access arrangements.
- r) It is agreed that LINSIG modelling software is the most appropriate modelling programme to assess the operation of the junction. In that context it is also agreed that:
  - i) The PCU Factors are consistent with Table 7-1 of the Chapter 6 of the Traffic Signs Manual
  - ii) The saturation flows are appropriate / robust, based on RR67 guidance
  - iii) The LINSIG Model represents the proposed scheme as identified in Drawing No ITB2212-GA-051D
  - iv) The phasing and construction of the LINSIG model is appropriate
- s) The application and appeal documents reference a number of different traffic surveys identifying that the peak periods differ between junctions. The peak hours at the bridge are agreed to be 07:30-08:30 and 17:00 – 18:00
- t) The scheme operation has been considered using a future year of 2026, with traffic growth between 2016 and 2026 calculated by use of the TEMPro database
- u) Traffic Speeds on Downend Road have been considered in 5 separate speed surveys, with the survey location and summary results presented on Figure S1 (appended). At the bridge, speeds were observed between 7-13 November 2016 summarised in Table A without weather correction.

Table A – Downend Road Bridge Traffic Speeds

	Average	85 <sup>th</sup> percentile
Southbound (SB)	31.5mph	35.7mph
Northbound (NB)	28.9mph	33.8mph

- v) The Site Access Arrangement was developed in 2016, incorporating potential departures and relaxations from standard. The potential DfS were summarised and presented to Road Safety Audit team and Hampshire County Council. The Inspector considered the access proposals in the previous appeal
- w) Travel Demands on Downend Road bridge for pedestrians and cyclists in peak hours are agreed as outlined in Table B.

## Transport – Statement of Common Ground

### Appeal Reference: APP/A172/W/21/3272188

Table B – Forecast Downend Road Movements (2026)

	Pedestrian				Cycles			
	Existing	Dev*	Existing	Dev	Existing	Dev	Existing	Dev
	SB		NB		SB		NB	
AM Peak (07:30-08:30)	2	5-18	2	0	2	0	6	0
PM Peak (1700-18:00)	1	0	1	3	7	0	1	1

\* Pedestrian demands as a range between Appellant and 2019 Council projections. These were not provided in direction, so assumed to be tidal.

- x) A gap acceptance in line with TSM 13.5.2 for pedestrians to cross a road would be 4-6 seconds in normal urban conditions.
- y) The provision of a pedestrian refuge island allows pedestrians to cross Downend Road in two stages.



## 2) Matters Disputed:

- a) The Council contends that a qualitative/quantitative assessment of pedestrian/cycle routes should have been completed as part of the application; completing such an assessment would identify how existing/proposed infrastructure may comply with the policy tests of CS5/DS40 as set out in the Reason for Refusal.
- b) The proposed highway improvements do not prioritise and encourage safe and reliable journey's by walking, cycling and public transport
- c) Notwithstanding 1a and 2a the Council contends that the site accessibility would adversely affect the potential for future residents to walk, cycle or use public transport which would increase the residual traffic effects of the development.
- d) The proposed highway works adversely affects the safety and operation of the local road network, contrary to policy CS5 as set out in the reason for refusal.
- e) The proposed highway improvements will alter prevailing speeds, but the nature of change is disputed.
- f) The potential relaxations and departures from standard associated with the highway works trigger 'in combination' departures which would adversely affect the safety of highway users.
- g) The measurement of conflict points and thereafter calculation of intergreen periods
- h) The appropriateness of including a cycle intergreen period in the LinSig Model and the method of determining how this should be assessed
- i) That it is desirable or necessary to integrate Advanced Stop-lines into the junction design to integrate bicycle radar within the signal control.

## Transport – Statement of Common Ground

### Appeal Reference: APP/A172/W/21/3272188

- j) The appropriateness and need to include a designated pedestrian crossing phase at the bridge junction
- k) The appropriateness of 2026 as the only forecast design year and the assessment of peak hours only.

	
Alan Lewis C.Eng FIHE CMILT On behalf of Fareham Borough Council	Tim Wall On behalf of Miller Homes

---

i [Technical guidance notes and Manual for Streets | Hampshire County Council \(hants.gov.uk\)](#)

ii [Standards For Highways | Design Manual for Roads and Bridges \(DMRB\)](#)

iii [Manual for Streets 1 and Manual for Streets 2](#)

iv [Traffic Signs Manual – Chapter 6 - Traffic Control \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](#)