

Subject: FW: Downend Road Bridge Alternative Improvement - Inclusion of Pedestrian Facilities
Date: Friday, 20 August 2021 at 15:56:26 British Summer Time
From: Jacqueline Mulliner
To: Richard Wright
CC: lsmith@fareham.gov.uk, Mark Jackson, Tim Wall, John Litton QC, Lindsay Goodyear
Priority: High
Attachments: image004.png, image003.png, image002.png, image001.png, Downend Bridge RS JCT - No Pedestrian Called.lsg3x, Downend Bridge RS JCT - Ped Signals N and S.lsg3x, Downend Bridge RS JCT - No Pedestrian Called.pdf, Downend Bridge RS JCT - Ped Signals N and S.pdf, ITB12212-GA-071B.pdf, ITB12212-GA-081.pdf

Dear Richard

As discussed, please see attached and below information now submitted to Hampshire County as Highways Authority relating to the incorporation of a pedestrian phase within the proposed signals for the shuttle working across Downend Road Bridge. For clarity, this would require a change in the application plans including ref ITB12212-GA-014 and GA-051 to show:

- The removal of the proposed pedestrian refuge crossing
- An extension of the proposed footway located on the southern side of Downend Road, to take the footway to the signals
- A pedestrian signal pole on the northern side of Downend Road, within the existing footpath

Miller would be willing to make these amendments, on a without prejudice basis in terms of its own appeal case, on the understanding that the Council's remaining case (having withdrawn its case on capacity) is focussed on pedestrian safety/crossing. It is therefore anticipated that the amendments could assist FBC in addressing its outstanding substantive concern, therefore enabling it to withdraw its reasons for refusal in totality. As you indicated on our call, this is a matter for the members to consider, but this submission enables FBC to undertake formal consultation with HCC, to confirm that the amendments and associated impacts would be acceptable to the statutory consultee, particularly in terms of highway safety and capacity.

To be clear, the Appellant does not consider these amendments to be necessary and agreeing to make such amendments does not in any way undermine or change its case for the appeal. Further, we would note that the amendments are minor in nature and consider that they should be capable of being accepted through the current appeal process, under the 'Wheatcroft Principles'. We would be grateful for FBC's formal agreement to this position in due course, so that, subject to the member consideration of the matter, the Inspector can be updated accordingly.

Finally, and subject to agreement from HCC (that the amendments are acceptable) and FBC (that the amendments are welcomed and if submitted to the inquiry/appeal, FBC will no longer pursue any of its reasons for refusal), I can confirm that Miller will not pursue a cost application.

Kind regards

Jacqueline

Jacqueline Mulliner MRTPI

Managing Director

07799 472154

You can now follow us on:



From: Tim Wall <tim.wall@i-transport.co.uk>
Date: Friday, 20 August 2021 at 10:19
To: "Gammer, Nick" <Nick.Gammer@hants.gov.uk>, "McCart, Gemma" <Gemma.McCart2@hants.gov.uk>
Cc: "Mundy, Jonathan" <jonathan.mundy@hants.gov.uk>, "Drury, Holly" <holly.drury@hants.gov.uk>, Jacqueline Mulliner <jacqueline.mulliner@torltd.co.uk>
Subject: Downend Road Bridge Alternative Improvement - Inclusion of Pedestrian Facilities

Hi Nick,

As discussed, FBC has requested that Miller Homes consider amendment to the Downend Road bridge improvement to incorporate dedicated pedestrian facilities either side of the bridge.

If this can be satisfactorily achieved, FBC Officers are intending to take a report to their Planning Committee (in the next week) recommending that the remaining elements of their Reason for Refusal have been addressed. Miller Homes is prepared to amend the scheme to incorporate these changes if they would be acceptable to HCC.

On that basis, we have considered the feasibility of delivering dedicated pedestrian facilities in the design, both north and south of the bridge, and on the back of our initial discussion on this matter. This amendment to the scheme is presented without prejudice to our agreed position on the acceptability of the pedestrian refuge island arrangement as submitted.

Please see attached **Drawing ITB12212-GA-071 Rev B** which demonstrates how the inclusion of pedestrian facilities can be achieved. I also attach swept path analysis of the alternative scheme presenting the path of a maximum legal articulated vehicle through the junction (**Drawing ITB12212-GA-081**) and noting that lorry use of Downend Road is very low.

Whilst we have presented pedestrian facilities both north and south of the scheme for completeness, the crossing to the south of the bridge would be likely to be little used, with the only likely crossing demand expected to arise from those (8) properties on the eastern side of Downend Road between the bridge and the Thicket (and perhaps some properties from The Thicket) seeking access to either Paradise Lane or the gym. Crossing demand on the northern facility would be used by residents of the Appeal Site to access the pedestrian facilities that are provided on the western side of Downend Road towards Cams Hill School and Cams Hill Employment area - we estimate crossing demand in the busiest hour of 10-20 pedestrians. For this reason, we have considered these facilities to operate independently in the assessment.

In terms of the impacts of this alternative scheme on the operation of the junction, we have prepared additional modelling assessment which is attached. This is presented for the '2026 + Development' scenario and considers the busiest period at the junction – i.e. 07:30 – 08:30. The following scenarios are presented:

- **Scenario 1** - No call of the pedestrian crossings – i.e. how the junction would operate typically throughout the peak hour and when no pedestrian phase is called
- **Scenario 2** - Calling of the pedestrian crossing to the north of the bridge – Pedestrian crossing flows to the north are estimated as 10-20 movements in the busiest hour, so this would mean that the northern crossing may be called every 3-6 cycles, assuming all pedestrians cross alone. In practice groups of pedestrians are likely to arrive together, reducing the instances of the crossing being called.
- **Scenario 3** - Calling of the pedestrian crossing to the south of the bridge. Demand here will be very low and occasional.
- **Scenario 4** - Calling of both pedestrian crossings at the same time - this is expected to be an extremely irregular scenario because of the limited demand for the southern crossing.

The summary results are presented in the below Table.

Approach	Cycle Time	Degree of Saturation	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Average Delay per PCU (s/pcu)	Practical Reserve Capacity
Scenario 1: No Pedestrian Call					
Downend Road – South (NB)	60s	73.0%	8.3	24.9	+23.3%
Downend Road – North (SB)	60s	71.4%	7.3	29.5	
Scenario 2: Northern Pedestrian Called					
Downend Road – South (NB)	70s	78.6%	10.4	32.5	+14.1%
Downend Road – North (SB)	70s	78.9%	9.1	39.5	
Scenario 3: Southern Pedestrian Called					
Downend Road – South (NB)	70s	78.6%	10.4	32.5	+14.1%
Downend Road – North (SB)	70s	78.9%	9.1	39.5	
Scenario 4: Both Pedestrians Called					
Downend Road – South (NB)	80s	80.6%	12.0	37.5	+11.7%
Downend Road – North (SB)	80s	77.9%	10.0	41.8	

Outside of junction cycles where a pedestrian phase is called, Scenario 1 would represent the likely operation of the junction. The conditions described in Scenarios 2-4 would occur only for those individual cycles, after which operation would return to Scenario 1. The junction will operate on variable cycle timings and pedestrian phases would only be called on demand.

Under all scenarios, the junction would operate within capacity. The impact of the likely crossing scenario (i.e. Scenario 2) is small, adding some 10 seconds to average vehicle delay during that individual cycle.

In view of the Appeal timescales, and the need for FBC to consider this matter at its Planning Committee prior to the resumption of the Inquiry, we would appreciate your urgent attention to this matter and an early response to confirm if this alternative arrangement is acceptable, noting of course that the final details will be subject to confirmation at the S278 detailed design stage.

Kind regards
Tim



Tim Wall

Partner

for i-Transport LLP

E: tim.wall@i-transport.co.uk

W: www.i-transport.co.uk

Basingstoke Office: The Square, Basing View, Basingstoke, RG

T: 01256 637940 M: 07508 413269

Our Basingstoke office has now relocated to central Basingstoke, in Basing View. Please note our new address.

i-Transport is the trading name of i-Transport LLP, which is a limited liability partnership registered in England under number OC311185. Registered Office: 3rd Floor, One London Square, Cross Lanes, GU1 1UN. A list of members is available upon request.

We use the word "partner" to refer to a member of i-Transport LLP or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications.

Please note that the information in this e-mail is confidential and unless you are (or authorised to receive it for) the intended recipient, you must not disclose, copy, circulate or in any way use the information contained. If you have received this e-mail in error please inform us and immediately delete all copies from your system. Whilst it is believed that this e-mail and any attachments are free of any virus or malware, it is your responsibility to ensure that your computer or IT system are not affected and we accept no responsibility for any loss or damage arising.