



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 24 to 26 September 2019

Site visits made on 23, 25 and 26 September 2019

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/W/19/3230015

Land to the east of Downend Road Portchester

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miller Homes against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/18/0005/OA, dated 2 January 2018, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Outline planning application with all matters reserved (except the means of access) for residential development, demolition of existing agricultural buildings and the construction of new buildings providing up to 350 dwellings; the creation of new vehicular access with footways and cycleways; provision of landscaped communal amenity space, including children's play space; creation of public open space; together with associated highways, landscaping, drainage and utilities'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Miller Homes against Fareham Borough Council. That application is the subject of a separate Decision that will follow the appeal decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Inquiry sat for three days between 24 to 26 September 2019. I made what the Planning Inspectorate refers to as an 'access required' visit to the site on 25 September when I was granted access to enter and view the site, rather than being accompanied by representatives for the appellant and the Council. I also made unaccompanied visits to the area within the vicinity of the appeal site on 23 and 26 September.
4. While the Inquiry finished sitting on 26 September, I adjourned it, as opposed to closing it to allow for the submission of: a certified copy of an executed Section 106 agreement (S106); the appellant's and the Council's closing submission in writing; some documents referred to by the parties in evidence (inquiry documents [IDs]); a final version of the inquiry position statement; and the appellant's written application for costs and the Council's response to that application. The Inquiry was closed in writing on 21 October 2019.

5. The S106 was received by the Planning Inspectorate on 3 October 2019 and it contains planning obligations concerning:
- the provision of 40% affordable housing within the development;
 - the implementation of improvements to the Cams bridge;
 - the undertaking of off-site highway works for alterations at the railway bridge in Downend Road and on the A27;
 - the payment of contributions for various off-site highway and transportation improvements and the implementation of an occupiers travel plan;
 - the provision of and the payment of maintenance contributions for public open and play space;
 - the payment of a contribution to mitigate the development's effects on off-site designated habitats; and
 - the payment of a contribution for school facilities in the area.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:
- whether the development would make adequate provision for pedestrian access via Downend Road and the effects of providing pedestrian access on the operation of Downend Road;
 - whether there would be accessibility to local services and facilities for the occupiers of the development by a range of modes of transport; and
 - the effects of the development on the integrity of the Portsmouth Harbour Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site, the Solent and Southampton Special Protection Area and Ramsar site and the Solent and Dorset Coastal Potential Special Protection Area (the designated habitats).

Reasons

Pedestrian access via Downend Road and effects on the operation of Downend Road

7. Having regard to the wording of part a) of the reason for refusal, ie pedestrian use of Downend Road and any subsequent implications for the 'safety' of and 'convenience' of users of this road, and the evidence put to me, there are various matters that come within the scope of the consideration of this main issue. Those matters, which I consider below in turn, being: the pedestrian routes that would be available to occupiers of the development; the pedestrian demand (movements) and the distribution of those movements amongst the pedestrian routes; and the options for and effects of altering the railway bridge in Downend Road to accommodate the pedestrian movements arising from the development.
8. Inevitably there is some overlap between the matters of pedestrian movements and their distribution to be consider under this issue and the

wider accessibility to services and facilities that concerns the second main issue that I have identified.

Proposed pedestrian routes

9. The development would involve the construction of 350 dwellings to the north of a railway line, just beyond part of Portchester's established residential area. The development would have three pedestrian routes to and from it and they would be via: Downend Road, the westernmost of the routes (route A); Cams bridge, the central route (route B); and Upper Cornaway Lane, the easternmost route (route C).
10. Cams bridge crosses the railway line and currently provides access between the site and a small vehicle repair garage and The Thicket, the latter being a residential street. Separately planning permission has been granted for upgrading works to the Cams bridge to facilitate its use as a pedestrian route for occupiers of the appeal development. On the southern side of Cams bridge there is a tarmacked track leading off The Thicket. With the upgrading of Cams bridge route B would be a pedestrian route of an essentially urban character.
11. Route C would in part be reliant on the use of an unsurfaced, one metre wide and 200 metre or so length of a public right of way (footpath PF117), and Upper Cornaway Lane, a street providing access to the crematorium and some chalet type homes. Given the rural character of FP117 and its current suitability only for recreational use, some widening and surfacing works would be undertaken to it to enable it to be used more easily by residents of the proposed development.
12. Downend Road can be characterised as being a local distributor road¹, with a two-way, daily flow of the order of 6,800 vehicles per day². Pedestrians using route A and travelling to and from destinations south of the railway line would have to cross the railway bridge in Downend Road, following some alterations to the bridge being made, which are referred to in more detail below. That railway bridge has variously been described as providing a north/south or east/west crossing of the railway line and I shall hereafter only refer to it as an east/west crossing of the railway line and to drivers making eastbound or westbound crossings of the bridge. On the railway bridge and westbound of it, as far as the junction with the A27, Downend Road is subject to a 30mph speed limit. Immediately eastbound of the railway bridge the speed limit increases to 40mph.
13. In terms of accessing places of work and education, shopping and leisure facilities, public transport (Portchester railway station and bus stops along Portchester Road [A27]) and other services and facilities etc, it is agreed that some occupiers of the development would walk to and from the previously mentioned destinations. However, there is disagreement about the scale of the pedestrian demand and how it would be distributed amongst the three routes.

¹ Paragraph 6.24 of Mrs Lamont's PoE

² Table 2.1 within Mr Wall's proof of evidence and paragraph 41 of Mr Litton's closing submissions for the appellant (ID21)

The pedestrian demand (movements) and the distribution of those movements

14. The appellant's most up to date estimate of the total daily pedestrian demand generated by the development would be nearly 700 movements per day, inclusive of walking trips to access buses and trains, 26.6% or so of all daily trips arising from the development³. By contrast the Council estimates that the number of daily single mode walking trips would be of the order of 284 trips, ie origin to destination trips excluding the use of buses or trains (CD10A). The parties agree for the purposes of estimating the development's pedestrian demand that data from the national travel survey 2018 (NTS2018) should be used to establish all trip generation, mode share and journey purpose. It is further agreed that the 2011 Census data should be used to determine the development's population.
15. However, there is disagreement between the appellant's and the Council's transportation witnesses⁴ as to what flexibility should be used in applying the acceptable walking distance guidance stated by the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) in its guidelines for the 'Provision for journeys on foot' (CIHT2000 [CD25]). There is also a difference of opinion as to whether the mode share for walking to work recorded by the Census, ie 52% of the national level, should be used as a proxy when considering the propensity for all walking trips arising from the development. The consequence of those disagreements being whether local places of work, schools, shopping facilities etc would or would not be within walking range of the development, having regard to the alternatives offered by the three routes.
16. Mr Wall for the appellant is of the view that the suggested acceptable walking distances set out in Table 3.2 of CIHT2000 are dated and are being too rigidly applied by Mrs Lamont for the Council. The guidelines set out Table 3.2 are:

	Town centres (metres)	Commuting/school and sightseeing (metres)	Elsewhere (metres)
Desirable	200	500	400
Acceptable	400	1,000	800
Preferred Maximum	800	2,000	1,200

17. While it has been suggested that the acceptable walking distance guidelines stated in CIHT2000 are dated, given that they are nearly 20 years old, that concern does not seem to be borne out by the information contained within Table NTS0303 contained within NTS2018⁵. That is because between 2002 and 2018 the average walking trip length has remained constant at 0.7 miles (1.12 Km), while walking trips over a mile (1.6 Km) have consistently been of an average length of around 1.4 miles (2.25 km). Those national survey results suggest that individuals' attitudes towards walking trip

³ Page 2 of CD10A and Paragraph 2.3.9b of Mr Wall's PoE

⁴ Mr Wall for the appellant and Mrs Lamont for the Council

⁵ Page 4 Appendix 1 of Mrs Lamont's PoE

lengths have not altered appreciably and that there is no particular issue with the currency of the guidance contained in Table 3.2 of CIHT2000.

18. In any event were the guidelines stated in CIHT2000 thought to be out of date, then I would have expected the CIHT to have revised them, either by issuing an amended version of CIHT2000 or publishing an entirely new document. Neither of those courses of action have been initiated by CIHT, with the publication of its 'Planning for Walking' guidance in 2015 (CD27 – CIHT2015) appearing to have provided an obvious opportunity for replacement acceptable walking distance guidelines to have been introduced. Instead CIHT2015 makes cross references to CIHT2000 in sections 4 and 6, which I consider to be a strong indication that CIHT was of the view that irrespective of the age of its acceptable walking guidelines, they continued to have currency. Mr Wall in giving his oral evidence stated that he was unaware of the CIHT undertaking any current review of CIHT2000.
19. Regardless of a walking trip's purpose the appellant contends that an upper ceiling distance of 2.4 Km (1.5miles) should be used. However, setting such a distance is inconsistent with what is stated in CIHT2000 and the average walking trip lengths reported in the NTS2018 and I therefore consider it should be treated with some caution. The wider disagreement about the overall number of pedestrian movements that would be generated is something I shall return to in providing my reasoning for the second main issue. However, in the context of the consideration of the utility of route A, I consider that the walking trips of most significance would be those to and from Cams Hill Secondary School (the school) and the Cams Hall employment site (CHes). That is because the school and the CHes would or would very nearly meet the 2,000 metre preferred maximum distance guideline for walking journeys for schools and commuting stated in CIHT2000.
20. As it is highly unlikely that route C would be used to get to or from either the school or the CHes, there is no need for me to make any further reference to it in considering this main issue.
21. The parties are now agreed that the development would generate 35 or 36 pedestrian crossings of the Downend Road bridge per day, an increase of between 83% and 86% on the present situation⁶. Of the new crossings there is agreement that 24 would be for the purpose of travelling to and from the school. However, unlike the Council, the appellant contends that no use of route A would be made by commuters walking to or from a place of work⁷.
22. There is some disagreement as to whether the CHes would be 2,000 or 2,100 metres from the development. I consider that a 100 metre (5%) difference would not act as a significant deterrent for pedestrians using route A. That is because the time to walk an extra 100 metres would not be great and for a walker using either routes A or B and it would probably be necessary to time the duration of the alternative walking trips to be aware of any meaningful difference between them. Having walked routes A and B, and presuming that a safe pedestrian crossing for the Downend Road railway bridge would be available, I consider that qualitatively there would be very little to differentiate route A from B. I also consider there would be potential

⁶ Page 5 of CD10A

⁷ In the zero entry against commuting/business trips in the upper table and supporting text on page 3 of CD10A and in Tables 10 and 11 included in Appendix C to Mr Wall's PoE

for commuters walking between the development and the CHes to vary their routes, to avoid monotony, and to use either route A or B. I am therefore not persuaded that route B would automatically be favoured ahead of route A by those walking to and from the CHes.

23. So, unlike the appellant, I consider it incorrect to discount commuters from walking to or from CHes via route A. I therefore consider that there would be potential for more pedestrian use of Downend Road railway bridge than has been allowed for by the appellant. I also consider that as there is access to the circular countryside public footpath route just beyond the railway bridge that there would be potential for additional recreational walkers, originating from the existing built up area, to be drawn to Downend Road resulting in some additional crossings of the bridge. That is because the provision of enhanced pedestrian facilities would make it safer to cross the bridge and the bridge's existing condition may well be acting as a detractor for recreational walkers.

The five options considered at the application stage for altering the Downend Road railway bridge

24. To accommodate additional pedestrian crossings of the railway bridge in Downend Road there is no dispute that alterations would need to be made to this bridge. That is because the existing bridge only provides a very rudimentary refuge for pedestrians, in the form of a very narrow margin, tantamount to a 'virtual footway', that comprises a strip of tarmac demarcated by a white painted line.
25. To address the additional demand for pedestrian crossings of the bridge the appellant when the appealed application was originally submitted put forward three options for alterations (options 1 to 3). Option 1 would involve the introduction of a formalised virtual footway and has been discounted by Hampshire County Council (HCC). Option 2 would involve the provision of a 1.2 metre wide traditional (raised) footway, with a carriageway width of around 4.8 metres. Option 3 would involve the provision of a 2.0 metre wide footway and a reduction in the width of the carriageway to form a single lane of 3.5 metres and would involve the introduction of a shuttle working arrangement, with the signed priority being in favour of the eastbound stream of traffic. HCC in offering its advice to the Council⁸ expressed no preference for either options 2 or 3, with it stating that the final decision on which option should be pursued being deferred until a post planning permission public consultation exercise had been completed.
26. Following the decision of the Council's planning committee to defer the determination of the appealed application in order to enable further consideration to be given to the alteration of the railway bridge, two further options were put forward by the appellant. The first of those, option 4, would be similar to option 3, albeit than in substitution for signed priority vehicles would be controlled by traffic signals. HCC are reported as raising no in principle concern with option 4, albeit it indicated that this option would entail greater driver delay, including unnecessarily during off peak periods, and a maintenance liability, such that options 2 and 3 remained preferable to the highway authority⁹.

⁸ Letter of 29 August 2018 (contained within CD2)

⁹ Paragraph 3.2.6 in the i-Transport Technical Note of 28 February 2019 and entitled 'Downend Road Railway Bridge – Review of Pedestrian Options' (CD29)

27. Option 5 would involve no footway provision, with the carriageway available to vehicles crossing the bridge travelling in opposite directions at the same time being 5.0 metres. There would also be 300mm wide margins to protect the parapets on each side of the bridge¹⁰. Additionally, traffic signals would be installed so that when pedestrians sought to make a bridge crossing they would initiate an all red phase for both eastbound and westbound drivers, making the bridge a pedestrian only area for so long as pedestrians were crossing it. HCC are reported as considering option 5 to be a unique and unsafe means for controlling shuttle working at the bridge and rejected it (CD2¹¹). However, HCC's advice to the Council concerning Option 5 appears to have been on the basis that it would involve shuttle working, as opposed to two way working. In this regard HCC is reported as commenting:

'As such drivers unfamiliar with the site may not expect opposing vehicles to be on the bridge at the same time (both directions on a green signal). This situation is exacerbated by the carriageway width on the bridge which in this controlled situation would encourage drivers to take a more central position in the carriageway. Consequently vehicles may meet each other on the bridge'. (Appendix 2 of committee report of 24 April 2019 [CD2])

However, HCC's comments regarding option 5 appear to have been made on an erroneous basis, with it having put forward as an alternative to shuttle working. It is therefore unclear what HCC's views on option 5 would have been had it not been treated as being an 'unconventional arrangement'¹², given its apparent misunderstanding about what this option would entail. It would also appear that the appellant did nothing to bring this misunderstanding to HCC's attention.

28. The Council's determination of the planning application was therefore based on options 2 and 3 being for its consideration and it contends that option 2 would be unsafe for pedestrians, while option 3 scheme would unacceptably affect the safety and convenience of road users. I now turn to the detailed consideration of options 2 and 3.

Option 2

29. The railway bridge provides poor facilities for pedestrians crossing it. I recognise that in general terms the provision of a 1.2 metre wide footway on the Downend Road bridge under option 2 would represent an improvement in safety terms compared with the prevailing situation, however, I consider that cannot reasonably be said of the post development situation. That is because the development would be a significant new generator of vehicles crossing the bridge, with the parties agreeing that the development would give rise to a 22% increase in traffic flows on the bridge¹³. Those extra bridge crossings is something that needs to be accounted for when considering whether option 2 would provide a safe environment for the existing and prospective pedestrian users of the bridge.

¹⁰ As clearly depicted in the cross section contained in Image 3.2 and drawing ITB12212-GA contained in CD29

¹¹ The summary of HCC's comments to the Council included as Appendix 2 of the Council's committee report of 24 April 2019

¹² Paragraph 3.3.6 in CD29

¹³ Page 5 of CD10A

30. I am of the view that a 1.2 metre wide footway under option 2 would not provide a safe bridge crossing facility for pedestrians, having regard to both the increases in vehicular and pedestrian crossings of the bridge, with the development being a new origin/destination for both categories of travellers, particularly during the peak hours for the making of commuting trips and/or school journeys. It is also likely that the pedestrians using the bridge would be likely to be a mixture of adults and school aged children. Given that the demand for additional bridge crossings would largely come from commuters and school children, I consider that activity would be more likely to coincide with AM and PM peaks and would not be evenly spread throughout the day. In saying that I recognise that working hours can be staggered and out of teaching hours' activities occur at schools, but those activities would only give rise to some walking trips for occupiers of the development outside the core peak hours.
31. Having regard to the guidance on footway widths stated in the Department for Transport LTN1/04 'Policy, Planning and Design for Walking and Cycling'¹⁴ and Manual for Streets (MfS - CD23), a footway of 1.2 metres width would be considerably narrower than the generally preferred minimum 2.0 metres referred to in paragraph 6.3.22 of MfS. While the guidance is not expressed in absolute terms the footway to be provided as part of option 2 would potentially be used by a variety of pedestrians, ie adults, children, with or without any impairment. However, a footway of 1.2 metres in width would only just be wide enough for an adult and a child to walk side by side, but would not accommodate two adults with a push chair walking side by side in the same direction or an adult and a wheelchair user side by side, based on the details provided in figure 6.8 of MfS.
32. Regard also needs to be paid to pedestrians travelling in opposite directions wishing to cross the bridge at the same time. In that regard I recognise that as far as pedestrians travelling from or to the development in the peak hours are concerned the bulk of those users would be travelling in the same direction and that this demand for the footway's use would not generate opposing movements. However, there are already users of the bridge and many of them will be making trips across the bridge in the opposite direction to pedestrians leaving or returning to the development. There would therefore be potential for opposing crossings of the bridge to be made at the same time, creating a conflict situation. I consider it cannot be assumed that when directional conflicts arose that one party would give way to the other and with such a narrow footway that would make the use of the carriageway a possibility, bringing pedestrians into conflict with vehicles.
33. Under the prevailing situation, I observed cars frequently encroaching beyond the centre line on the bridge whether there were or were not any pedestrians on the bridge. My seeing cars crossing over the centre line irrespective of whether pedestrians are crossing the bridge is also consistent with the screenshot images included in the appellant's evidence, for example those in appendix A of the appellant's Technical Note of 28 February 2019. All of which is also consistent with the advisory road signs on either side of the bridge warning of oncoming vehicles being in the middle of the road.

¹⁴ Appendix X to Mr Wall's PoE

34. I therefore find difficult to envisage how that driver behaviour would not continue to be replicated with an increased number of vehicular crossings of the bridge, following a reduction in the carriageway width for vehicles under option 2. That in turn could result in eastbound vehicles needing to mount the footway or their nearside wing mirrors encroaching into the space above the footway. So, under a scenario of vehicles crossing in opposing directions at the same time as pedestrians were also making use of the bridge there would be the potential for the safety of pedestrians to be unacceptably prejudiced.
35. The appellant has sought to justify the provision of a 1.2 metre wide footway, on the basis of having undertaken a 'Fruin' assessment, to judge the level of service this footway would afford its users. However, the extract of the paper written by Mr Fruin submitted at the inquiry (ID5¹⁵) refers to 'channel's (footways) upwards of 1.8 metres (6 feet) in width having been assessed. I therefore consider that the Fruin methodology has very limited applicability to a footway under option 2 that would be two thirds of the width of the footway referred to in ID5. I therefore find this aspect of the appellant's case does not justify the provision of a 1.2 metre wide footway.
36. While other instances of narrow footways at bridges/archways in Hampshire have been drawn to my attention in evidence¹⁶. However, those examples do not appear to be directly comparable with the appeal proposals and in any event it is the acceptability of otherwise of the latter that I need to consider.
37. I also find it surprising that HCC considers a 1.2 metre wide footway would be appropriate on a road subject to around 6,750 daily vehicle movements, when the appellant is intending the main and secondary estate roads within the development would have 2.0 metre footways¹⁷.
38. I therefore consider that option 2 should be discounted as an appropriate alteration to the Downend Road railway bridge for safely accommodating the additional pedestrian use of the bridge that would arise from the development.

Option 3

39. The appellant's modelling of the effect of option 3's operation traffic flows is heavily reliant on the use of the 'ARCADY' software, that software normally being used to assess the operation of roundabouts. In this instance ARCADY has been set up with a 'dummy arm' as a work around to simulate the operation of eastbound priority shuttle working at the railway bridge. Using ARCADY, the appellant has estimated that in the AM peak hour, the average queue length would be 3.3 vehicles amounting to a delay of 23 seconds¹⁸.
40. I have never previously come across ARCADY being used for any purpose other than modelling the operation of roundabouts. I therefore find it surprising that HCC, in providing its comments to the Council (included in CD2), did not question ARCADY's use in assessing the operation of shuttle working at a bridge. I consider it unsurprising that the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL), as the developers/product owner of ARCADY, has cast significant doubt on the suitability of its model for assessing a scenario such

¹⁵ Designing for pedestrians a level of service concept

¹⁶ Appendix X of Mr Wall's PoE and ID11

¹⁷ Paragraph 2.4.2 of the Transport Assessment (CD15)

¹⁸ Page 9 of CD10A

as option 3 because of an issue of dealing with `... the lag times once a vehicle is in the narrowing ...'¹⁹. So, while HCC appears to have voiced no concerns about ARCADY's suitability, I consider that very little weight should be attached to it for the purposes of assessing the effect of option 3 on the safe and free operation of Downend Road. I also consider it of note that TRL has stated that its PICADY modelling tool, which is designed to model the operation of priority junctions, is also unsuitable for modelling option 3, with TRL referring to its TRANSYT traffic signal software as being more suitable²⁰, albeit still something of a work around.

41. In response to the limitations of the appellant's modelling of option 3, the Council has used microsimulation software to assess the operational effects of option 3. That software 'Paramics Discovery Version 22' (PDV22) being a microsimulation model that includes a module, introduced around six months ago²¹, and which has a specific module capable of modelling road narrowings²². As a worst case the Council's running of PDV22 predicts that during the AM peak period queues of up to 36 vehicles might extend back from the westbound vehicle give way point and result in westbound traffic being delayed by up to 17 minutes²³.
42. Given the recent introduction of PDV22 its track record is limited and the appellant has raised concerns about the reliability of PDV22. In that regard it has been argued that the Council's running of PDV22 has not been correctly calibrated for the circumstances of option 3 and that its output results cannot be validated. Mr Wall in cross examination contended that PDV22 appears to have been developed without being informed by driver behaviour. However, producing a model that was incapable of replicating driver behaviour would seem a nonsensical exercise for the product supplier. Given that PDV22 has been developed to assess the operation of a highway under the circumstances of vehicles in one flow giving way to an opposing flow of vehicles at a road narrowing, I consider that very little weight should be attached to the proposition that this software had been developed without regard to driver behaviour.
43. Mr Wall is not a 'modelling expert'²⁴ and has placed some reliance on the findings of a study undertaken by the TRL for the Department of Transport to support his use of ARCADY and to critique the Council's running of PDV22. The findings of the TRL study were reported in 1982 in a paper entitled 'The control of shuttle working on narrow bridges' (TRL712)²⁵. To assist with critiquing the running of PDV22 the appellant has engaged a consultancy specialising in microsimulation modelling, Vectos Microsim Limited (Vectos), and a video file of the model runs Vectos has performed, as well as written advice it has given to the appellant, has been submitted as part of the appellant's evidence²⁶. In response to the critique of PDV22 the Council has supplemented its evidence through the submission of a video file for its

¹⁹ Email from Jim Binning of TRL to Mayer Brown of 23 August 2019, included in Appendix RVL4 appended to Mrs Lamont's rebuttal statement

²⁰ Email from Jim Binning of TRL to Mayer Brown of 9 August 2019, included in Appendix RVL4 appended to Mrs Lamont's rebuttal statement

²¹ Mrs Lamont in during cross examination

²² Matter of agreement stated on page 8 of CD10A

²³ Mrs Lamont's rebuttal statement

²⁴ Email of 23 September 2019 to the Planning Inspectorate from Mrs Mulliner on the appellant's behalf

²⁵ Appendix K to Mr Wall's PoE

²⁶ Appendix P to Mr Wall's Rebuttal Statement, Note from Vectos of September 2019 entitled 'Paramics modelling - comments on Sysra review and Mayer Brown rebuttal', ID12 and ID15

running of PDV22 and written comments from the software's developer, Systra²⁷.

44. For the AM peak period and using PDV22 the appellant estimates that the average westbound queue length would be 6.5 vehicles, with the average delays westbound and eastbound respectively being 43 and 10 seconds²⁸.
45. The disagreement about whether the running of PDV22 has reasonably represented the operation of option 3, essentially revolves around the behavioural response of westbound drivers to the signed priority and whether that response would cause significant queuing and driver delays. In that regard the appellant contends that the signed priority has been modelled too rigidly and would not be reflective of actual driver behaviour. It is therefore argued that the Council's prediction of the severity of the westbound queuing and delay times would be unrealistic. That is because TRL712 records that when signed priority shuttle working is in place drivers that do not have the priority only give some measure of preference to drivers in the opposing stream. That resulting in drivers without the priority experiencing around 65% of any delay, while the opposing drivers experience around 35% of any delay.
46. While the appellant has sought to attach significant weight to the findings reported in TRL712, this report of study provides very little information about the computer modelling that was performed and the frequency and duration of the observations of driver behaviour that was undertaken at the two bridge locations that were used.
47. With respect to the computer model referred to in TRL712, were that model to be of wider utility than just perhaps for conducting this study, I would have expected that it would be known to HCC and could have been drawn to Mr Wall's attention during the pre-application and/or application discussions that took place. I say that because within Hampshire road narrowing at bridges/archway is not uncommon, given the examples cited in Mr Wall's evidence and my own observations in determining various unrelated appeals elsewhere in this county. In a similar vein when the previously mentioned email exchange took place between representatives of the TRL and a colleague of Mrs Lamont about software suitability, if the model used in the 1982 study was of utility today then the TRL could have drawn it to the attention of Mrs Lamont's colleague. Instead of that there is reference to the TRL planning to develop new software to model shuttle working. Whatever form the model used in 1982 took, given the advances in computing that have occurred in the last 37 years, it is unlikely it would bare comparison with modern day software.
48. With respect to the bridge locations used in the 1982 study, in the final paragraph in section 3.2 of TRL712 it is stated that traffic flow rates at the bridges and the proportions of traffic crossing the bridges in each direction were different. Those differences could have had implications for the observed driver behaviour that was used to validate the output from the running of the model used in this study.
49. In the time since TRL712's publication there have been significant changes in vehicle technology, most particularly in terms of braking and engine

²⁷ Mrs Lamont's Rebuttal Statement, including Appendix 3, ID9, ID10 and ID14

²⁸ Page 9 of CD10A

technology, which have implications for acceleration and deceleration rates. Vehicle performance is now very different and would not necessarily be reflected in the modelling undertaken as part of the 1982 study. I am therefore doubtful as to whether the acceleration rates used for the purposes of a study undertaken in 1982 can be relied upon today.

50. With respect to the observance of priority signage, much has been made of the Council's PDV22 model runs being too cautious, with it being argued that the modelled driver behaviour would be more akin to that of 'strictly enforced' priority in the language of TRL712. However, option 3 would entail the installation of 'give way' lines and signage clearly indicating that drivers should give way to on-coming traffic. That signing arrangement would in effect be very similar to what is found in the case of a side road forming part of a 'priority junction' where give way signage and road markings are in place, which are routinely observed without strict enforcement. I consider normal driver behaviour is to observe the instructions or warnings appearing on traffic signs, whether they be of a prohibitive or warning type.
51. I therefore consider it reasonable to expect that westbound drivers faced with priority give way signage would take heed of that signage and thus approach the bridge with caution and would avoid commencing a crossing if there was any doubt that it could not be completed safely. So, on approaching the give way point and when there were no eastbound vehicles on the bridge, a driver would need to decide whether there would be enough time to complete a crossing of the bridge before encountering a vehicle travelling in the opposing direction.
52. There is some disagreement as to how much time a driver would deem necessary to make a safe crossing of the bridge, with it also being argued that in working out the time needed westbound drivers would also make a calculation as to whether their crossing of the bridge would unreasonably delay an eastbound vehicle's crossing of the bridge. It being argued, in line with findings reported in TRL712, that if a westbound driver decided its actions would delay an eastbound vehicle then the former would not proceed.
53. In terms of the decision making to be made by westbound drivers, I consider the normal behaviour would be to decide whether a crossing could safely be made, with any decision making about whether their actions would cause delay for a driver travelling in the opposite direction only being a secondary concern. That is because while a westbound driver would be able to judge how long they would need to cross the bridge, they would be unlikely to be able to make the calculation when precisely an eastbound vehicle would arrive at the point where its driver would want to commence its crossing and what any delay caused to the driver of the eastbound vehicle would be.
54. I recognise that some westbound 'platooning' would be likely to arise. That is one vehicle or a group of vehicles following immediately behind another/other westbound vehicle/vehicles already crossing the bridge, irrespective of whether there might be an eastbound vehicle waiting to make a crossing of the bridge. However, I consider the number of vehicles making crossings during an individual platooning event would not necessarily be as great as argued by the appellant. That is because there would come a point at which a westbound driver would decide to observe the priority signage, rather than continue a sequence of not observing it, given that being behind a line of

crossing vehicles it would not necessarily be possible to see whether an eastbound vehicle with priority was waiting to make a crossing. So, while some platooning would arise and would have the potential to reduce westbound queuing and delays, I am not persuaded its occurrence and delay reducing potential would be of the significance claimed by the appellant.

55. As I have indicated above there is very limited information contained within TRL712 about the precise nature of the observation of drivers at narrow bridges, ie how many times driver observations were undertaken and how long they were. I therefore have concerns about driver delay under option 3 being applied on the basis of 35% and 65% respectively for drivers with and without the signed priority, as per the finding reported in TRL712. That being something the appellant has done in critiquing the Council's running of PDV22 to arrive at its finding that if this software is used then in the AM peak period the average westbound queuing length would be 6.5 vehicles and the delay would be of the order of 43 seconds²⁹. The Council's review of the appellant's running of PDV22 suggests that the average maximum westbound queue length could be around 20 vehicles at 07:50 AM (ID10).
56. However, it appears that an unintended consequence of the appellant's rebalancing of the priority to replicate a 35%/65% delay split, is the build-up of eastbound queuing in the absence of much westbound traffic, as is apparent from the 07:46:25 screenshot contained in ID9B. Additionally, vehicles travelling in opposing directions crossing the bridge at the same time would appear to have arisen, as shown in some of the screenshots contained in ID9B.
57. For all of the reasons given above I am therefore not persuaded that much weight should be attached to the findings reported in TRL712 for the purposes of calibrating or validating runs for either PDV22 or for that matter ARCADY.
58. It is contended that the PDV22 model runs undertaken by the Council have been incorrectly calibrated. However, the review of those runs undertaken by Systra has not highlighted any fundamental errors in the way its model has been built and run on the Council's behalf. I am therefore inclined to attach greater weight to the commentary on the model's running provided by Systra than Vectos. That is because Systra, as software designer, could be expected to know precisely what its model is intended to do and whether its running by a 'client' has been appropriate, when consideration is given to the parameters needed to run the software.
59. While PDV22 is a new model and may well become subject to some refinement as more use is made of it, on the basis of everything put to me in evidence about it, I consider its use is more appropriate to that of ARCADY. That is because PDV22 has been designed to address narrow road situations, ARCADY is intended to model circulatory road movements and the TRL has advised that ARCADY is not an appropriate tool to model the operation of option 3.
60. While the queuing and delays under option 3 predicted by the Council's running of PDV22 may be somewhat exaggerated, I consider no reliance should be placed on the appellant's ARCADY assessments. In practice the effect on the flow of traffic associated with option 3's introduction would be

²⁹ Page 9 of CD10A

likely to somewhere between the range of the results yielded by the appellant's and the Council's running of PDV22. That would be likely to result in queue lengths and driver delay exceeding the AM peak period occurrences that HCC found to be unacceptable when it concluded that the traffic light controlled option 4 would be unacceptable, ie mean maximum queuing of nine vehicles and delays westbound and eastbound respectively of 36.8 and 32.4 seconds³⁰.

61. On the basis of the evidence before me I consider that the introduction of option 3 would result in unacceptable levels of queuing and delay for vehicular users of Downend Road.
62. The Council contends that the visibility splay falling within land within the appellant's control would be inadequate for drivers turning right from the development's access onto Downend Road. While a visibility splay that would be fully compliant with the most recent guidance, ie that contained in ID6³¹, would encroach onto third party land, that land comprises undeveloped land, including a ditch. It is therefore unlikely that any development would arise within the third party land, so close to the edge of the highway, as to affect the visibility for drivers emerging from the development's access. I therefore consider that there would be adequate visibility for drivers turning right out of the development's access and that 'edging out' type movements would be unlikely to cause any significant conflicts between drivers emerging from the site access and westbound road users approaching to the give way point proposed under option 3.
63. Concern has also been raised that the introduction of option 3 would adversely affect the vehicular access used by the occupiers of 38 Downend Road (No 38). No 38 lies immediately to the south of the railway line and has a double width dropped kerb providing access to this dwelling's off-street parking. The visibility for drivers emerging from No 38 is already affected by the railway bridge's parapet.
64. The works associated with the implementation of option 3 would have some implications for the manoeuvring for drivers turning right from No 38. However, I consider the new situation would not be greatly different to the existing one and introducing a shuttle working layout would have very little effect on the forward visibility for vehicles emerging from No 38 because there would be no alterations to the railway bridge's parapet. Regard also needs to be paid to the fact that in any given day the number of vehicle movements associated with No 38's occupation would be quite limited, given this access serves a single property. I consider it of note that the safety auditing that has been undertaken to date has not highlighted any particular safety concerns for vehicles emerging from No 38's access associated with the design of option 3.
65. I am therefore not persuaded that the introduction of option 3 would have any adverse effect on the use of No 38's access.

³⁰ Table 3.1 in CD29

³¹ Junction visibility extract from Design Manual for Road and Bridges CD123 Revision 0 (August 2019)

Conclusions on pedestrian access via Downend Road and effects on the operation of Downend Road

66. For the reasons given above I found that the 1.2 metre wide footway to be provided as part of option 2, would not provide a safe facility for its users.
67. Option 3 through the narrowing of the carriageway to 3.5 metres would provide a safe pedestrian route. However, the narrowing of the carriageway would be likely to result in vehicle queuing and delay during the AM peak period. The precise degree of that queuing and delay is the subject of considerable disagreement, with it having proved quite difficult to model. That is because when Mr Wall prepared the original transport assessment (CD15) there appears to have been no readily available software capable of modelling a road narrowing such as that envisaged under option 3. That led to the use of ARCADY, which as I have explained above, I consider cannot be relied upon, not least because the TRL has stated that it is not suited to modelling shuttle working. In connection with presenting its appeal case the Council has used the comparatively new and not widely tested PDV22, the running of which suggests that considerable vehicle queuing and driver delay could be encountered by westbound vehicular traffic.
68. The appellant has sought to persuade me that the results from the Council's running of PDV22 should not be relied on because it has been set up to run with parameters that are exaggerating vehicle queuing and driver delay because the observation of the signed priority by westbound traffic has been too rigid. The appellant's critique of PDV22 in no small measure relies on computer modelling and behavioural observations at narrow bridges undertaken in connection with the TRL712 study dating back to 1982. However, for the reasons I have given above I have significant reservations about how meaningful the findings reported in TRL712 are today.
69. I recognise that the Council's running of PDV22 may have generated unduly pessimistic queuing lengths and delay times. That said I consider more credence can be attached to the Council's running of PDV22 than either the appellant's running of ARCADY or the appellant's modified running of PDV22, the latter understating the reasonable observance of the signed priority that would underpin the functioning of option 3. The degree of vehicle queuing and driver delay would probably be somewhere between levels estimated through the appellant's and the Council's running of PDV22. Given that the scale of the delay may well exceed that which led HCC to believe that a traffic light variant of option 3, ie option 4, should be discounted. I therefore consider that option 4 may well have been prematurely discounted by HCC. That is because HCC accepted option 3 as being a safe and efficient option, based on modelling reliant on the use of ARCADY.
70. Much has been made of HCC being accepting of both options 2 and 3, but as I have said above, I consider those options have pedestrian safety and capacity shortcomings. I am not persuaded, on the evidence available to me, that I should accept that because HCC has raised no objection to options 2 and 3 then either would be acceptable.
71. A fifth option (option 5) that would retain a two-way traffic flow, without a footway being provided or a narrowing of the carriageway, with an all pedestrian zone activated by traffic lights, on demand by pedestrians wishing to cross the bridge, was put forward prior to the appealed application's

determination. However, option 5 appears to have discounted on safety grounds by HCC on the erroneous premise that it would involve the operation of an unusual form of shuttle working. I therefore consider that option 5 may also have been prematurely discounted by HCC because of a fundamental misunderstanding of the way in which it would function.

72. On this issue I conclude that the development with the implementation of option 2 would make inadequate provision for pedestrian access via Downend Road, while the implementation of option 3, in making adequate provision for pedestrian users of Downend Road, would unacceptably affect the operation of this road because of the vehicle queuing and driver delay that would arise. The development would therefore be contrary to the second criterion of Policy CS5 of the Fareham Core Strategy of 2011 (the Core Strategy) insofar as when the development is taken as a whole it would generate significant demand for travel and were option 2 to be implemented it would not provide a good quality walking facility for its occupiers. The development, were option 3 to be implemented, would also be contrary to Policy CS5 (the second bullet point under the third criterion) because it would adversely affect the operation of Downend Road as a part of the local road network.
73. There would also be conflict with Policy DS40 of the Fareham Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies of 2015 (the DSP) because the implementation of option 3 would have an unacceptable traffic implication.
74. I also consider that there would be conflict with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) because the implementation of option 3 in safeguarding the safety of pedestrians would give rise to a residual cumulative effect, vehicle queuing and driver delay, that would be severe for the road network. The development would also not accord with paragraph 110c) of the Framework because the implementation of option 2 would create a place that would not be safe because of the conflict that there would be between pedestrians and vehicles through the provision of an unduly narrow footway within part of the public highway.

Accessibility to services and facilities

75. The development would be on the edge of Portchester's already quite intensively built up area and it would adjoin an area that is predominantly residential in character. The existing development in the area lies to the south of the M27 and is on either side of the A27 corridor, which essentially follows an east/west alignment.
76. As I have previously indicated there is considerable disagreement about the site's accessibility to local services and facilities by non-private motorised modes of travel. In that regard the appellant is of the view that the development would generate in the region of 650 pedestrian movements per day, while the Council places that figure at a little short of 300 movements. Central to that disagreement is whether the distance there would be between the new homes and places of work and education, shopping, leisure and public transport facilities (the local facilities and services) would be too far as to be accessible by walking trips.
77. Figure T2 in the originally submitted Transport Assessment (page 66 of CD15) identifies where the local services and facilities are relative to the appeal site. Many of those service and facilities are clustered around Portchester's

shopping/district centre. When regard is paid to the various tables within Appendix C of Mr Wall's proof of evidence it is apparent that many of the local services and facilities shown in Figure T2 would be at distances from the development that would exceed the 'acceptable walking distances' referred to in CIHT2000 (CD25).

78. The three proposed pedestrian routes, A, B and C, would variously provide egress and ingress from the development. However, routes A, B and C would be of varying levels of attractiveness. In that regard I consider route C would not be particularly attractive because the section comprising footpath FP117 would be unlit and that would affect its general utility after darkness, particularly for commuters on their return from Portchester railway station. Generally, the use of all three routes would entail walking trips that would exceed the CIHT2000 guidelines for travelling to and from town centres, while the railway stations in Portchester and Fareham would not be within a comfortable walking distances from the development. The access to bus stops in the area would exceed the 400 metre guideline recently reaffirmed by the CIHT in its 'Buses in urban developments' guidance of January 2018 (CD28).
79. So, I think it reasonable to say that the development would fall short of being particularly accessible by transportation modes other than private motor vehicles. In that regard the appellants' estimates for the number of non-private motor vehicle trips may well be quite optimistic. That said this development would be close to many other dwellings in Portchester and the accessibility to local services and facilities would be similar to that for many of the existing residents of the area. Given the existing pattern of development in the area, I consider there would be few opportunities for new housing to be built in Portchester on sites that would be significantly more accessible than the appeal site, something that the maps in Appendix R to Mr Wall's proof of evidence show. In that regard it is of note that the Council is considering allocating this site for development in connection with the preparation of its new local plan.
80. On this issue I therefore conclude that there would not be an unreasonable level of accessibility to local services and facilities for the occupiers of the development by a range of modes of transport. I therefore consider that the development would accord with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy and Policy DSP40 of the DSP because it would not be situated in an inaccessible location and it would be well related to the existing urban settlement boundary for Portchester.

Effects on the designated habitats

81. The appellant, the Council and Natural England (NE) are agreed that the development would be likely to have a significant effect on the designated habitats, namely in-combination effects associated with: increased recreational activity in the Portsmouth Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) and the Solent and Southampton Water SPA; and the increased risk of flooding in the Portsmouth Harbour SPA and Ramsar site and the Solent and Dorset Coast candidate SPA. Additionally, there would be potential for the development to have a significant effect either alone or in combination with other developments arising from nitrogen in waste water being discharged into the designated habitats.

82. Under the provisions of Regulation 63 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the HRs), there is a requirement to undertake a screening assessment to determine whether a development alone or in combination with others would be likely to have a significant effect on integrity of the internationally important interest features that have caused a habitat to be designated. Having regard to the ecological information that is available to me, including the statement of common ground signed by the appellant, the Council and NE (CD13) I find for the purposes of undertaking a screening assessment that this development in combination with others would be likely to have a significant effect on the interest features of the designated habitats through additional recreational activity and the risk of flooding.
83. With respect to the matter of additional nitrogen in waste water being discharged into the designated habitats, I am content, on the basis of the nitrogen balance calculation included as Appendix 4 in CD13, that the development would not give rise to an increased discharge of nitrogen within the designated habitats.
84. Having undertaken a screening assessment and determined that there would be a significant effect on the designated habitats, I am content that mitigation could be provided so that the integrity of the qualifying features of the designated habitats would be safeguarded. The nature of the necessary mitigation has been identified in CD13 and would take the form of the payment of a contribution to fund management measures identified in the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy of 2018 and the imposition of planning conditions to avoid the development causing flooding in the area. The necessary financial contribution forms one of the planning obligations included in the executed S106.
85. In the event of this appeal being allowed I consider the imposition of conditions requiring: the incorporation of a sustainable drainage scheme within the development; the implementation of construction environmental management plan that included measures to preclude the pollution of the waters within the designated habitats during the construction phase; and a limitation on water usage for the occupiers of the development would be necessary and reasonable to safeguard the integrity of the designated habitats.
86. I therefore conclude that the development, with the provision of the mitigation I have referred to above, could be implemented so as to safeguard the integrity of the designated habitats. In that respect the development would accord with Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy and Policies DSP13 and DSP15 of the DSP because important habitats would be protected.

Other Matters

Housing Land Supply

87. The Council cannot currently demonstrate the availability of a five year housing supply (5yrHLS), with it being agreed that the current five year requirement is 2,730 dwellings. However, there is disagreement as to what the quantum of the 5yrHLS shortfall is when regard is paid to the supply of deliverable sites for homes, having regard to the definition for 'deliverable' stated in Annex 2 of the Framework. That definition stating to be considered deliverable:

'... sites for housing should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. In particular: ...
b) where a site has outline planning permission for major development, has been allocated in a development plan, has a grant of permission in principle, or is identified on a brownfield register, it should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years.'

88. The appellant contends that the current deliverable supply of homes is 1,323 dwellings, equivalent to HLS of 2.4 years, while the Council argues that the deliverable supply of homes is 2,544 homes, equivalent to an HLS of 4.66 years³².
89. That difference being attributable to the appellant having deducted 1,221 dwellings from the deliverable supply identified by the Council. That deduction being made up of: 761 dwellings associated with large sites without development plan allocations and not benefiting from a planning permission (inclusive of some with resolutions to approve); 100 dwellings on the brownfield register, but with no submitted application; 70 dwellings concerning allocated sites but only with a resolution for approval; 50 dwellings concerning allocated sites without a planning permission; and 240 dwellings forming part of the Welborne allocation that would not be delivered in the five year period because planning permission for that development has not been issued.
90. The 5yrHLS evidence put before me shows that there are a significant number of dwellings subject to applications with resolutions to grant planning permission that are subject to unresolved matters, including the execution of agreements or unilateral undertakings under Section 106 of the Act. In many instances those resolutions to grant planning permission are 18 or more months old and I consider they cannot be considered as coming within the scope of the Framework's deliverability definition. I therefore consider that the Council's claimed 4.66 years HLS position is too optimistic and that the appellant's figure of 2.4 years better represents the current situation.
91. The development would therefore be capable of making a meaningful contribution to the reduction of the current housing shortfall, with 215 dwellings anticipated to be delivered in the five year period between January 2022 and the end of March 2024³³.

Heritage effects

92. The development would be situated within the extended settings for: Portchester Castle, a Grade I listed building and scheduled monument; Fort Nelson, a Grade II* listed building and scheduled monument; and the Nelson Monument, a Grade II* listed building. The Castle is situated to the south of the site towards the northern extremity of Portsmouth Harbour. Fort Nelson and the Nelson Monument lie to the north of the site, off Portsdown Hill Road.
93. The designated heritage assets are of significance because of their importance to the military history of the local area. However, I consider the effect of the development on the significance of the heritage assets would be less than

³² Having regard to the figures quoted in paragraphs 1.18 and 1.19 in the Housing Land Supply SoCG (CD14)

³³ Table 1 in Mrs Mulliner's PoE

substantial, having regard to the policies stated in section 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the Framework. That is because the development would be read within the context of Portchester's extensive established built up area. Nevertheless, paragraph 193 of the Framework advises '... great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance'. The less than substantial harm I have referred to therefore attracts great weight.

Planning Obligations

94. The S106 would secure the provision of 40% affordable housing within the development to accord with the provisions of Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy. To mitigate the development's off-site effects on the operation of the local highway network and demands on local transport infrastructure the S106 includes various obligations that would require contributions to be paid to fund appropriate works. There are also obligations relating to the, the provision of and the payment of maintenance contributions for public open and play space and the payment of a contribution for school facilities in the area. To minimise dependency on private motor vehicle usage amongst occupiers of the development the S106 includes planning obligations that would require the undertaking of improvements to the Cams bridge and implementation of a travel plan.
95. Those planning obligations would address development plan policy requirements and I consider that they would be: necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. While the planning obligations are necessary, of themselves there is nothing particularly exceptional about them.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

96. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
97. For the reasons given above I have found that the development with the implementation of the option 2 alteration to the Downend Road railway bridge would make inadequate provision for pedestrian access via Downend Road. I have also found that while the implementation of the option 3 alteration to the Downend Road railway bridge would make adequate provision for pedestrian users of Downend Road, the development would unacceptably affect the operation of this road because of the vehicle queuing and driver delay that would arise. I consider those unacceptable effects of the development give rise to conflict with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy and Policy DSP40 of the DSP and paragraphs 109 and 110c). I consider that the elements of Policies CS5 and DSP40 that the development would be in conflict with are consistent with the national policy and are the most important development plan policies for the purposes of the determination of this appeal. I therefore consider that great weight should be attached to the conflict with the development plan that I have identified.

98. I have found that the accessibility to local services and facilities by modes of transportation other than private motor vehicles would not be unreasonable. That is something that weighs for the social benefits of the development. The development would be capable of being implemented in a manner that would safeguard the integrity of the off-site designated habitats and in that regard the development would have a neutral effect on the natural environment. In relation to these main issues there would be compliance with some of the development plan's policies. Nevertheless, the conflicts with the development plan that I have identified are of sufficient importance that the development should be regarded as being in conflict with the development plan as a whole.
99. There would be significant social and economic benefits arising from the construction and occupation of up to 350 dwellings, including the short term boost to the supply of market and affordable homes in the Council's area. There would be some harm to the setting of the nationally designated heritage assets in the area, however, I have found that harm would be less than substantial and I consider that harm would be outweighed by the previously mentioned social and economic benefits arising from the development.
100. I am of the view that the unacceptable harm to pedestrian safety and the operation of the public highway that I have identified could not be addressed through the imposition of reasonable planning conditions. I have assessed all of the other material considerations in this case, including the benefits identified by the Appellant, but in the overall planning balance I consider that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.
101. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

John Litton	Of Queens Counsel instructed by Terence O'Rourke Limited
Tim Wall BA MSc MCIHT CMILT	Associate Partner of i-Transport LLP
Jacqueline Mulliner BA (Hons) BTP (Dist) MRTPI	Director and Head of national planning with Terence O'Rourke Limited

FOR FAREHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL:

David Lintott	Of Counsel instructed by the Council's legal officer
Vera Lamont BEng MICE FCIHT MCMi	Director with Mayer Brown
Andrew Burgess BA (Hons) MRTPI FRSA	Senior consultant with Adams and Hendry Consulting Limited
Richard Wright	Principal Planner (Development Management)

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Councillor Nick Walker	Fareham Borough Council
Councillor Roger Price	Fareham Borough Council
Councillor Shaun Cunningham	Fareham Borough Council
John McClimont	Chairman Fareham Society
Brian Eastop	Local Resident
Anne Brierly	Local Resident

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS (IDs) SUBMITTED AT OR AFTER THE INQUIRY

ID1	Mr Lintott's opening submissions on behalf of Fareham Borough Council
ID2	Mr Litton's opening submissions on behalf of the appellant, with appendices
ID3	Statement of Councillor Walker and Councillor Sue Bell
ID4	Statement of Mr McClimont, Chairman of the Fareham Society

- ID5 Article by John Fruin 'Designing for pedestrians: a level-of-service concept'
- ID6 Junction visibility extract from Design Manual for Road and Bridges CD123 Revision 0 (August 2019)
- ID7 i-Transport drawings ITB12212-TR: 001A; 002A; 003A; 006A; and 007A and ITB12212-GA-104A annotated by Mayer Brown
- ID8 Mayer Brown additional statement of facts
- ID9 Vectos Model re-run by Mayer Brown output data and screen shots
- ID10 Queue Assessment Information (including data sheets) from i-Transport, response to rerun of Vectos Model undertaken by Mayer Brown
- ID11 Annotated services/facilities context maps of the footways at bridges/tunnels examples included in Appendix V of Mr Wall's Proof of Evidence
- ID12 Vectos comments on the Downend Road Railway Bridge Paramics Modelling undertaken by Mayer Brown in September 2019 further to the review comments being made by Systra
- ID13 Councillor's Cunningham's speaking note
- ID14 Mayer Brown Video file for the operation of Downend Road Bridge
- ID15 i-Transport Video file for the operation of Downend Road Bridge
- ID16 Mrs Mulliner's speaking note on housing land supply
- ID17 Copies of development plan policies CS4, DSP13, DSP15
- ID18 Final version of list of suggested planning
- ID19 Certificated copy of the executed Section 106 agreement
- ID20 Final version of the Inquiry Position Statement
- ID21 Mr Lintott's written closing submissions on behalf of Fareham Borough Council
- ID22 Mr Litton's written closing submissions on behalf of the appellant