



Economy, Transport and Environment Department
Elizabeth II Court West, The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD

Tel: 0300 555 1375 (General Enquiries)
0300 555 1388 (Roads and Transport)
0300 555 1389 (Recycling Waste & Planning)
Textphone 0300 555 1390
Fax 01962 847055

www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries to	Nick Gammer	My reference	6/3/10/222
Direct Line	0370 779 4688	Your reference	P/22/0165/OA APP/A1720/W/22/3299739
Date	7 September 2022	Email	Nick.gammer@hants.gov.uk

Land East of Newgate Lane East, Fareham. Outline Application With All Matters Reserved (Except Access) For Residential Development Of Up To 375 Dwellings, Access From Newgate Lane East, Landscaping And Other Associated Infrastructure Works

Dear Tim,

Thank you for providing the Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA) dated 9 August 2022. The aim of the TAA is to address the Highway Authority (HA) concerns raised in the response dated 8 April 2022. The comments below review the TAA and provide the HA's views on the additional information and amended proposals provided.

Access Strategy

Walking and Cycling

Access Points 1 and 2 (North to PROW 76)

Regarding the above, Public Right of Way (PROW) 76 is a surfaced and lit footpath and cycleway. Drawing ITB10353-GA-031A has been provided detailing the location of access point 2 and includes consideration of impacts on adjacent trees and vegetation, demonstrating that the access is achievable without significant tree loss. This drawing also now shows the existing adopted highway. Public highway abuts the application site red line along the length of the northern site boundary, demonstrating delivery of access points 1 and 2 is achievable.

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

Access Point 3 (East to Tukes Avenue via the Service Road)

This access point utilises the existing gated access to the site and the adjoining service road, which is adopted highway. Following the HA's previous comments, this access point has been redesigned. The following information has been provided within the TAA.

- Drawing ITB10353-GA-032 B – General Arrangement
- Drawing ITB10353-GA-038 B – Visibility Assessment
- Drawing ITB10353-GA-046 – Swept Path Analysis (Fire Tender and Panel Van)
- A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA1)
- A survey recording vehicular, cycle and pedestrian usage of the existing service road

It is noted that, should the development come forward, the existing vehicular use would remain (recorded as 48 movements daily), however, the forecast daily pedestrian movements would increase significantly from the current recorded figure of 19 movements to a forecast total of 291 daily movements. As such, the character and use of the service road would naturally become more pedestrian focused.

The use of a differentiated surface material to reinforce the shared nature of the route is included in the latest proposal, as is signage and transitions to the shared surface, highlighting the change in status to a shared surface. The existing bellmouth junction with Tukes Avenue has been amended to a vehicle crossover arrangement to further highlight the presence and priority of pedestrians and cycles. Also, an additional crossing point of Tukes Avenue, directly south of the service road, is now proposed to better accommodate future desire lines. Furthermore, additional wayfinding signage is included to the BRT from this proposed link. It is also noted that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to implement parking restrictions will be progressed if considered necessary post construction; a contribution to fund this TRO if required should be provided.

The extent of shared use surfacing at the eastern end of the service road should be extended to the Tukes Avenue carriageway and the tactile paving denoting the crossing of the service road removed. However, this point can be dealt with at detailed design should the development come forward.

Drawing ITB10353-GA-038B shows the intervisibility between cycles egressing the site and vehicles exiting the access roads to the rear of the existing houses. It is considered suitable visibility can be achieved.

An independent Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA1) has been carried out of the revised Access Point 3 proposals and raised a number of concerns. The design has been updated accordingly to address these concerns and the Safety Auditor has confirmed that the designer's response and amendments to the scheme adequately addresses all matters raised.

Drawing ITB10353-GA-032B includes the adopted highway and shows this abuts the application site red line at the access point. As such, delivery of the access is considered achievable in this regard.

It was previously raised that Access Point 3 is the only access point proposed on the eastern boundary of the site and exploration of additional pedestrian and cycle accesses on the eastern boundary of the site to achieve better connectivity was requested. The Appellant in the TAA has confirmed that no further connections to the east are deliverable within the Applicant's land control. There are some existing facilities located to the east of the site; notably Tukes Avenue Local Centre and some (although not catchment) education facilities. While residents from the southern parcels would have to 'dog leg' to reach these facilities, it is noted the number of amenities is limited and alternatives are available. As such, while disappointing, the lack of additional sustainable mode accesses on the eastern boundary of the site is not considered a severe barrier to appropriate opportunities for access to sustainable transport modes.

Access Points 4 and 5 and Access Points A, B and C (Brookers Lane)

Access points 4 and 5 have been agreed under the Brookers Lane permission (P/19/1260/OA).

Regarding access points A, B and C, these link from the proposed site to the consented Brookers Lane development (P/19/1260/OA) to the south. The three proposed pedestrian and cycle only connections are secured in the Brookers Lane permission under Condition 5. As stated previously, should this application be permitted, delivery of these links should also be secured.

Clarity was requested regarding how links to Brookers Lane cycleway would be provided in the scenario where permission P/19/1260/OA was not implemented. The TAA states that this scenario is unlikely given the efforts to achieve the planning permission and the subsequent submission of a Reserved Matters application. The HA are also in liaison with the developer regarding approval of construction access for this development. The TAA states that the Appellant would accept a suitably worded planning condition to ensure the delivery of adequate connections between the two sites, including restrictions on occupations should these links not be deliverable. Given this and that there is a good level of confidence permission P/19/1260/OA will be constructed, the HA do not consider any further information is necessary in this regard.

Access Point 6 (north-west to Newgate Lane East bus stops)

The works to form Access Point 6 have been considered in the updated RSA1 for the site access proposals; no issues were raised.

The TAA confirms the path from the built area of the proposed development, south of HMS Collingwood sports Pitches and north of the proposed retained western field, will it be lit and surfaced. It is noted that this route is internal to

the site and will therefore be covered by a reserved matters application should the development come forward. As such, provision of a surfaced and lit pedestrian route should be secured by condition.

As raised previously, this route as proposed only accommodates pedestrians. The HA requested consideration of an LTN1/20 compliant cycle route from old Newgate Lane to the built area of the proposed development. The Appellant notes that there are six proposed cycle connections serving the site; two to the south at the eastern and western corners of the site, two to the north, again at the eastern and western site boundaries, to the east to Tukes Avenue and to the west at the proposed access roundabout. The Appellant does not consider upgrading of this route to accommodate cycles to be necessary. The HA note that it would be a more direct route from some proposed dwellings to the existing cycle provision on old Newgate Lane, however, as the alternative routes are now confirmed as deliverable and the distance saving is modest in terms of likely cycling trip lengths, the HA accept that it is not essential Route 6 accommodates cycles.

Access Point 7 (to Newgate Lane via the Proposed Access Roundabout)

The design has been amended following HA comments. An LTN 1/20 compliant segregated cycle route from the proposed site access roundabout into the proposed development has been provided as requested and is shown on drawing ITB10353-GA-102 Rev E. It is assumed this segregate route continues to the built area of the development; as above, this route is internal to the site and will therefore be covered by a reserved matters application should the development come forward. As such, provision of a segregated pedestrian and cycle route to the built area of the development should be secured by condition.

A shared use facility is proposed from the site access roundabout via a short section of old Newgate Lane tying into the exiting on road cycle route on old Newgate Lane; this includes a 0.5m buffer adjacent to shared route as requested. Whilst the arrangement for cyclists leaving the cycle route to old Newgate Lane may require further consideration at the detailed design stage, the pedestrian and cycle access in this location are now considered acceptable in principle.

Vehicular Access

Access Roundabout Design

Matters of principle and design are considered in this section; the operation of the proposed roundabout is considered in the Traffic Impact Assessment Section below.

Table 2.3 of the TAA provides a summary of the HA's previous comments raised and the design response setting out how each matter has been addressed. In summary;

- Speed survey details (including location, weather information and raw data) have been provided.
- Revised SSDs of 130m northbound and 133m southbound are now shown on drawing ITB10353-GA-106C.
- Speed data has been obtained for the Newgate Lane approach and an SSD in accordance with measured speeds of 96m has been demonstrated as achievable.
- A Drainage Strategy Plan has been provided and gives sufficient comfort adequate land is available to provide attenuation for surface water drainage.
- The RSA1 has been updated to take account of the revised scheme with the Auditor confirming no new safety issues arise and that all matters raised have been suitably addressed.

The in principle design of the roundabout as shown on drawing ITB10353-GA-102 Rev E is considered acceptable. The operation of the proposed roundabout based on this acceptable design is reviewed in the Traffic Impact Assessment Section below.

Principle of Access

Regarding the principle of vehicular access to the development site, as stated previously, the County Council is currently preparing its next Local Transport Plan (LTP4), which will provide its primary transport policy to 2050.

Regarding the status of this policy, Hampshire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 is planned to be adopted in early 2023. LTP4 has been through an extensive development, engagement and consultation. It is now being refined and the policy DM2 is set for formal adoption. It is worth noting it has been referred to in many supporting documents of the Appellant, Local Planning and Highway Authorities whilst in its emerging state. Furthermore, it acknowledges that LTP3, its predecessor, is increasingly out of date.

Policy DM2 states the HA will:

*Only support requests for **NEW accesses onto A roads, the principal road network or traffic sensitive streets** where the strategic flow of traffic is prioritised and not compromised and when all other reasonable options (such as taking access from nearby side roads) has been considered;*

I note comment was made on this emerging policy in section 2.5.4 of the TAA. The HA does not agree with the conclusions reached. Taking your points in turn:

- Regarding point a), changing a 3-arm priority junction to a 4-arm roundabout does clearly create a new access to the east onto the existing highway and results in vehicles on Newgate Lane East having to give way to traffic, which currently is not the situation.
- It is noted under point b) that the Appellant accepts Newgate Lane East is a traffic sensitive route.

- Regarding point c), while it is agreed the junction is forecast to operate within capacity, a new access is being formed and priority on Newgate Lane East changed. This is contrary to the purpose of the bypass, and allows traffic from the secondary roads to take priority over traffic on the primary road.
- Finally, considering point d), the HA agree that there are not any other reasonable alternative vehicular access locations to the highway network avoiding Newgate Lane East; however, as noted below, the HA is not satisfied that options which do not impact upon the strategic flow of traffic have been explored.

The HA has two fundamental objections to the proposals in relation to Policy DM2 of LTP4:

- Newgate Lane East is a traffic sensitive road (as accepted by the Appellant) and any form of new access will have a detrimental impact to the Access to Gosport strategy and therefore a severe impact under NPPF.
- The proposals do not give due regard to the policy in that alternative access forms have not been explored or tested under this application that may better accord with policy DM2, for example a left in/ left out junction form that would not change priorities on Newgate Lane East and would cause significantly less delay to through traffic on Newgate Lane East in comparison to the proposed roundabout site access.

It is however noted that Fareham Borough Council has advise the HA this matter will not be pursued in support of Reason for Refusal i).

Emergency Vehicle Access

Given the wording of Condition 5 of the consented Brookers Lane development (19/00516/OUT), further liaison with Fareham Borough Council is required to confirm the acceptability of this emergency access. However, an alternative emergency access is proposed to Tukes Avenue and is considered acceptable. Furthermore, the Hampshire Fire Service were consulted based only on the provision of access to Newgate Lane East (at the site access roundabout) and an emergency access to Tukes Avenue and did not raise any concerns with this arrangement. As such, the HA consider the access arrangements for emergency vehicles are acceptable, regardless of whether the emergency access to the Brookers Lane site is deliverable.

Site Accessibility and Off-Site Improvements

Pedestrian and Cycle Demand

A Sensitivity Test has been carried out to consider an alternative assignment of pedestrian and cycle demand, which considers education provision at the Catchment Schools rather than schools closer to the site. The methodology of this assessment has been reviewed and is considered acceptable. While it is

likely some pupils will attend nearer (non-catchment) schools, there are no plans by HCC Education Department for a change in catchment areas and it is considered the majority of pupils will attend the catchment schools. As such, it is the HA's opinion that the sensitivity assessment (Table 3.3 extracted from the TAA below) provides the most realistic distribution of pedestrian and cycle trips.

Table 3.3 – Pedestrian / Cycle Demand and Assignment (12 Hour Day) – Catchment Schools

	Route A1	Route A2	Route B1	Route B2	Route C	Route D	Total Trips
	Brookers Lane	Woodcote Lane	PROW (West End)	PROW (East End)	Newgate Lane East	Tukes Avenue	
Walking Trips	161	96	66	119	51	241	735
Cycle Trips	6	4	4	8	5	15	42
Total Trips	168	100	69	127	56	256	777
% Trips	22%	13%	9%	16%	7%	33%	22%

Off-Site Pedestrian and Cycle Connectivity

The Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review (WCHAR) has been extended to include routes to the catchment schools as requested by the HA. This also includes the route to the centre of Stubbington. The routes covered within the updated WCHAR, listed below, are considered appropriate.

- 8 – To Fareham Secondary Academy
- 8A – To Wallisdean Infant and Junior Schools
- 9 – To Crofton Secondary School
- 9A – To Crofton Anne Dale Infant and Junior Schools

The WCHAR Extension highlights deficiencies in the cycle network leading to these schools and identifies a series of improvements, in addition to the improvements already previously identified in drawings ITB10353-GA-300-315, to enhance access to local schools.

- Improvements to Longfield Avenue between Newgate Lane and Fort Fareham Road to enhance cycle accessibility (Route 8)
- Improvements to local roads north of Longfield Avenue leading to the local schools to improve pedestrian and cycle provision, comprising cycle protection markings and crossing enhancements (Route 8).
- Improvements between Gosport Road and Crofton Anne Infant and Junior Schools to enhance pedestrian and cycle provisions. This comprises crossing improvements as well as the potential for footway conversion to shared use (Route 9).

To support improvements for cyclists between the Site and the Catchment Schools at Wallisdean Infant and Junior school and Fareham Academy, an improvement on Longfield Avenue (drawing ITB10353-GA-043 Rev A) has been proposed providing an off-road segregated pedestrian and cycle facility. This improvement is considered acceptable in principle. It should be noted that relocation of street lighting will be required.

Beyond Longfield Avenue, improvements for cyclists have been proposed on Fort Fareham Road, Tudor Court and St Michaels Grove (Drawing ITB10353-GA-044 Rev A), comprising of road markings, signage and the upgrading of a pathway to shared use. This design is considered acceptable in principle.

The TAA suggests a contribution towards the delivery of improvements in this location would be appropriate. This is considered acceptable in principle and a cost estimate of these improvements should be provided for review to inform the contribution value.

The proposed improvements to Route 9 (drawing ITB10353-GA-047) consist of improved crossings, providing dropped kerbs and tactile paving where absent and the potential to consider dedicating the widened footway at Bells Lane / Cuckoo Lane as a continuation of the shared footway / cycleway provision already present. The proposals as presented are considered acceptable in principle; however, no cycle improvements to Gosport Road, between Crofton Secondary School and Eric Road are proposed (noted as something that should be explored in the WCHAR); this should be considered further. Moreover, crossing improvements at the junction of Eric Road/ Stubbington Lane/ Bells Lane should be considered. The TAA suggests a contribution towards the delivery of improvements in this location would be appropriate. This is considered acceptable in principle, subject to inclusion of the additional measures mentioned above, and a cost estimate of these improvements being provided and agreed to inform the contribution value.

Tukes Avenue and Wych Lane form a primary link from the site to the BRT As previously stated, Tukes Avenue is considered appropriate for cycling; however, Wych Lane is more heavily trafficked and has potentially higher speeds. Consideration has been given to improvements for cyclists on Wych Road, between Tukes Avenue and the Henry Cort Way (for access to the BRT, which is a cycle route as well as a frequent bus service with cycle storage facilities). Three improvement options have been developed by the Appellant.

Option 1 (drawing ITB10353-GA-039 Rev A), comprising of provision of an off-road shared footway / cycleway between Tukes Avenue and Henry Court Way, is considered the appropriate scheme to take forward. This scheme does involve a reduced width below the standard 3m. Given land constraints this is unavoidable and considered acceptable over this short distance. An RSA1 has been provided and all safety considerations have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Auditor. The principle of this design is considered acceptable.

Options 2 and 3 include sections of on carriageway cycling, which will be less attractive to less confident cyclists.

This section of Wych Lane forms part of the proposed 'Secondary Route 347' within the draft Gosport Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and is targeted for improvement. The Appellant suggests that in view of these emerging plans, a financial contribution towards the delivery of an improvement

in this location would be appropriate. This is considered acceptable in principle and a cost estimate of Option 1 should be provided for review to inform the contribution value.

The HA previously highlighted a missing cycle connection on Redlands Lane, between Henry Cort Way and the Gillies, which provides a designated cycle route to the town centre. The HA do not agree that use of this route would be limited by future residents; this is the shortest (and likely to be considered the most attractive) off carriageway route from all areas of the development to Fareham town centre and rail station. The improvement scheme (drawing ITB10353-GA-042 Rev -) proposed does not remove cyclist from the carriageway and should be reconsidered. The TAA notes this section of Redlands Lane forms part of the proposed 'Primary Route 350' within the draft Fareham LCWIP and is targeted for improvement. The Appellant suggests a financial contribution towards the delivery of an improvement in this location would be appropriate. This is considered acceptable in principle; however a more comprehensive scheme should be considered to inform this contribution.

The HA requested that consideration is given to improved lighting on Brookers Lane and Woodcote Lane to improve the utility of these connections. The Appellants have commissioned a lighting appraisal of the pedestrian and cycle section of Brookers Lane and the section of Woodcot Lane from Newgate Lane East to old Newgate Lane. This submission is not in accordance with HCC requirements as noted in Technical Guidance Note (TG) 13 and a significant level of further design work and amendments will be required at the detailed design stage. For the Appellant to deliver these improvements a section 278 Agreement will be required, including a Road Safety Audit. It is noted that there may be delivery challenges to light Woodcote Lane, specifically around suitable siting of columns to achieve a suitable lighting class and meet the HA's maintenance standards. However, these matters can be considered at detailed design should the development come forward. The TAA states that ecological and arboricultural advisors have not identified any overriding issues that would prevent the proposed scheme from being delivered. The HA believe that, while there are ecological and arboricultural considerations on this route, these can be surmounted by careful design, although Fareham Borough Council may wish to consider the acceptability of these proposals in this regard. Lighting of this route is considered achievable, albeit subject to design amendments, and should be secured for delivery by the developer via section 278 Agreement should the development be permitted.

Regarding the required School Travel Plan contribution of £42,000, the Appellants recognise the need to ensure safe access between the site and local schools and in principle are prepared to contribute. Further detail regarding how the contribution has been calculated, and what it would fund, have been provided separately to the Appellant.

Regarding travel by bus, a contribution of £16,000 towards the provision of RTI was requested and has been agreed by the Appellant. Bus stop enhancement on Newgate Lane East have been proposed by the Appellant and improved

access by cycle to the BRT has been explored on Wych Lane. Providing a suitable contribution value can be agreed for the Wych Lane works as set out above, the HA are satisfied the development will be adequately served by bus.

The previous HA comments confirmed that the local Public Rights of Way (PROW) that were the subject of the WCHAR provide important recreational routes, but in view of the alternative amenity connections (surfaced and lit), no improvements to surface and light the existing PROW are considered necessary. However, the County Council's Countryside Services team should be consulted regarding the impact on PROW network and any mitigation required.

Traffic Impact Assessment

Assessment Methodology

A number of requests for additional information were included in the HA's previous response. The Appellant prepared a Technical Note dated 23 June 2022 which sought agreement on the trip distribution and assignment. This has been reviewed and the revised assumptions for traffic assignment are agreed for the purposes of assessment. Similarly, the additional detail provided on the Census Data, traffic flow diagrams and committed development assumptions for Welbourne address the previous concerns raised. The agreed traffic distribution is provided at Appendix P of the TAA and traffic flow diagrams in Appendix Q. This traffic distribution has been applied in the local junction modelling to consider the operation of the access junction and off-site junction impacts presented within the TAA.

Following review of the submitted Transport Assessment it was unclear as to whether the HGV percentages listed throughout the TA were derived from traffic survey data, or if the applicant had undertaken their own estimates. The TAA provides clarification that the HGV proportions are derived from traffic survey results; this is considered a robust methodology.

It was previously noted by the HA that the study area for junction capacity assessment will be confirmed upon agreement of trip distribution and assignment. Given the distribution and assignment has now been agreed, the study area is considered acceptable.

The TA Addendum provides a model validation summary for each junction model. A comparison with queue data from the 2019 traffic surveys has been made with the baseline model queue length forecasts.

Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East (Existing Junction)

In the TA Addendum junction geometry drawings have been provided for all off-site highway models. Regarding the above junction, the geometries shown in drawing ITB10353-GEOM-100 have been review and are accepted.

In the AM peak period Newgate Lane (north) operates with very limited queuing, as is reflected in the modelling. Newgate Lane (minor arm) observed queues are 0.75 vehicles compared to 14 vehicles in the model results. This is due to the heavy traffic flow on Newgate Lane East reflecting the difficulty in locating suitable gaps in traffic to exit the minor arm. As the forecast queues are significantly greater than observed queues, it suggests that in reality vehicles are accepting smaller gaps to make a turn onto Newgate Lane East. There is limited functionality within the PICADY module to apply capacity adjustments to correct this inconsistency and no corrections have been undertaken, therefore the model is not validated. As such, the forecast results presented in 2037 do not accurately reflect the likely future situation, significantly overestimating future queuing and delay.

However, for the PM peak period the model validates well with very limited queuing in both the observed and modelled results. In the 2037 sensitivity test the base model suggests a 2–3-minute delay for vehicles turning out of Newgate Lane, suggesting that gap acceptance will again be an issue in the 2037 future year under the current junction layout. However, given the AM peak model overestimate queues by a factor of over 18 times due to smaller gaps being accepted, it is reasonable to think the PM future year situation will be similar, with a large overestimation by the modelling of the queuing and delay likely to occur in reality. It should be noted that the junction currently operates without safety issues, including in the AM peak, when drivers are accepting small gaps than the PICADY modelling software can accommodate, leading to much better junction performance than that forecast by the model.

Given the reasons set out above, this model is not considered an accurate forecast of the future year situation in the AM or PM peak hours and the modelling outputs should be disregarded entirely.

Proposed Site Access Roundabout

Regarding confirmation of geometries, drawing ITB10353- GA-105 Rev D has been provided. It is noted that the proposed site access roundabout has been subject to minor modifications to the roundabout design in order to reflect comments in relation to flare lengths and to address the County Council's engineering/ design comments. The modelling geometries reflect these amendments and have been correctly input into the models presented.

The original TA modelling of this junction used a 'flat' profile type; the HA requested that this be changed to a 'one hour' profile in order to reflect a normal distribution of traffic across the peak hour and to present robust modelling. This change has been made in the modelling submitted within the TAA.

It was requested that the Appellant provide a 2037 future year assessment using the ATC flow volumes for Newgate Lane East to confirm that the proposed site access roundabout will still operate within capacity. This was requested given that the ATC total two-way flow recorded higher flows in the AM and PM

peak periods than the Manual Classified Counts (MCC). A sensitivity test has been completed using an uplift of 5% in the AM peak and 15% in the PM peak.

The above has been carried out for the 2037 future year with development scenario, including factoring to reflect the higher recorded ATC flows. The delay per vehicle on each arm of the proposed junction can be seen below (Table 4.7 extracted from the TAA).

Approach	Morning Peak Period			Evening Peak Period		
	RFC	Queue (veh)	Delay (s/veh)	RFC	Queue (veh)	Delay (s/veh)
2037 + Committed Development + Development + ST (Longfield) + ATC Uplift						
Newgate Lane East (N)	0.49	0.9	3.68	0.71	2.4	6.34
Site Access	0.14	0.2	3.78	0.07	0.1	4.41
Newgate Lane East (S)	0.84	5.3	9.39	0.67	2.0	4.37
Newgate Lane	0.17	0.2	13.43	0.08	0.1	6.29

In the 2037 future scenario with uplifted ATC flows, the maximum RFC is 0.84 in the AM peak on Newgate Lane East (South) and 0.71 in the PM peak on Newgate Lane East (North). The maximum delay along Newgate Lane East is 9.4 seconds in the AM peak (northbound movement) and 6.3 seconds in the PM peak (southbound movement). Upon review of the presented site access junction models, the junction model results are considered to accurately reflect the forecast future operation of the proposed site access junction, which operates within capacity.

Regarding the impacts on air quality, the assessment prepared by Tetra Tech (which includes assessment of construction and operation phases) concludes that in the vicinity of the roundabout, there will be negligible impacts in relation to emissions and air quality. The Local Planning Authority may wish to review this report and its findings; this is particularly pertinent given it is understood the Air Quality Management Area to the north of the proposed development is very close to exceeding reasonable levels.

Regarding construction stage impacts, the Appellant states that construction will inevitably include a period of managed disruption, although traffic flow (under traffic management), will be maintained on Newgate Lane East. Construction phasing and Traffic Management can be agreed via the section 278 process should the development come forward.

Newgate Lane East / Brookers Lane – Proposed Toucan Crossing

As raised in the HA's previous response, a financial contribution of £78,160 was secured from application 19/00516/OUT towards pedestrian and cycling improvements at the Brookers Lane crossing of Newgate Lane East. The value of this contribution was based on 50% of the estimated cost of installation of a Toucan crossing, however it is worth noting the contribution secured crossing

improvements, not necessarily installation of a Toucan crossing. The TAA states that the County Council has an aspiration to deliver improvement to the crossing, 'with or without' the development at the Appeal Site and goes on to say that the only realistic improvement would be to deliver a Toucan crossing. This is incorrect. In the absence of the proposed development, it is unlikely the Toucan would be delivered given the HA has neither the aspiration (due to resultant delay impacts) nor sufficient funding secured to provide this. It is the additional movements forecast from the proposed development that necessitate the upgrade of this uncontrolled crossing to a controlled Toucan crossing. The Appellant has agreed to the provision of a financial contribution of £78,160 to deliver this toucan. This will result in additional delay on Newgate Lane East directly as a result of this development proposal.

Further information was requested by the HA comprising of projected crossing demands, a revised distribution of development pedestrian / cycle demand, and an amendment to the LinSig model to increase the intergreen period (from 5 to 6 seconds). The crossing counts carried out at the existing crossing over a three-day period (10-12 May 2022) are mid-week and outside the school holidays and are therefore considered representative. The 'Catchment School ST' crossing demand shown in Table 4.8 of the TAA is considered an acceptable forecast of the future crossing demand. It is accepted that some pedestrians will cross in groups and the number of crossing events of 34 in the AM peak and 15 in the PM peak is acceptable for modelling the future operation of the Toucan crossing.

The Toucan Crossing modelling has been updated to include an intergreen period of 6 seconds as requested; the modelling is considered accurate and forecasts the following:

- 2028 AM Peak delay on Newgate Lane East (South) of 15.7 seconds.
- 2028 AM Peak delay on Newgate Lane East (North) of 5.4 seconds.
- 2028 PM Peak delay on Newgate Lane East (South) of 3.2 seconds.
- 2028 PM Peak delay on Newgate Lane East (North) of 3.9 seconds.

In 2037 the Toucan Crossing is forecast to operate above design capacity in the Morning Peak period (92.9%). The modelling forecasts the following in this future year scenario:

- 2027 AM Peak delay on Newgate Lane East (South) of 21.3 seconds.
- 2037 AM Peak delay on Newgate Lane East (North) of 5.7 seconds.
- 2037 PM Peak delay on Newgate Lane East (South) of 3.4 seconds.
- 2037 PM Peak delay on Newgate Lane East (North) of 4.2 seconds.

The forecast queues would not impact on the operation of the downstream Peel Common roundabout as there is sufficient separation between the roundabout and Toucan to accommodate the maximum forecast queue length.

Whilst the standalone impact of the forecast queuing and delay due to the Toucan crossing is not considered severe, the introduction of this infrastructure which is only required as a result of the development adds delay to Newgate

Lane East, which is acknowledged by the Appellant to be a traffic sensitive route.

Peel Common Roundabout

The assessments have been revised using the updated model as provided by the County Council. However, various issues with the model assumptions and geometry (considered against the as built scheme drawing) were identified, which serve to overestimate capacity issues at the junction. Revised junction modelling has been included within the TAA, reviewed, and is considered acceptable. The junction is forecast to operate within capacity on all arms across all scenarios; the increase in delay due to development traffic is a maximum of 1.2 seconds on Gosport Road and under a second on all other arms of the junction.

HMS Collingwood / Speedfields Park

The comments raised in the HA's previous response related to Stage 2 missing from the modelling, the AM peak period northbound flows had been locked in the lanes, the PM peak southbound flows being evenly split across the lanes (a 60% nearside / 40% offside split is considered more appropriate) and a requirement for models to be validated. These points have all been satisfactorily addressed in the revised modelling and further information submitted.

The 2028 modelling outputs show an increase in delay in both northbound and southbound movements in both the AM and PM peak periods at this junction. All increased in delay are less than one second, with the exception of an increased average delay of 2.8 seconds for northbound traffic on approach to HMS Collingwood in the Morning Peak. The junction continues to operate within capacity in the 2028 future year.

Modelling of the 2037 future year forecasts the junction to operator marginally over capacity in the AM peak with a -0.5% PRC, and a DoS of 90.5% on the northbound approach to HMS Collingwood. This results in slightly longer delays, with a maximum increased average delay due to development traffic of 4.4 seconds for northbound traffic on Newgate Lane East on approach to HMS Collingwood in the Morning Peak (all other delays remain close to or less than 1 additional second due to development traffic).

Longfield Avenue/ Newgate Lane/ Davis Way

Regarding geometries at the above junction shown in drawing g ITB10353-GEOM-101, these have been reviewed and are accepted.

Regarding calibration of base models, the Appellant notes that the Longfield Avenue/ Newgate Lane/ Davis Way model was the same as that agreed by the HA for the West of Newgate Lane appeals. The applicant notes that consideration has been given to the model validation, however the queue survey data identified upstream congestion issues for some time periods which

affected the collection of queue data. It is noted therefore that this does not provide a realistic basis to deviate from the established capacity calculations by the ARCADY Module of Junctions 10. It is agreed that it would not be realistic to adjust the parameters accordingly and the approach taken is considered acceptable.

The junction is forecast to operate slightly over practical capacity of 0.85 RFC, but within theoretical capacity of 1.00. In the 2037 future year scenario with development, committed developments plus a sensitivity test to include the appeal scheme, the RFC reaches a maximum of 0.83 in the AM peak and 0.88 in the PM peak, both along Newgate Lane (south). The impact of the development when comparing the with and without development model results suggests an increase of less than 0.03 RFC. The proposed development impacts are limited, adding 1-2 seconds of average delay to the junction.

Junction Modelling Summary

Agreement has been reached at the above locations in terms of trip distribution, assignment and acceptable model set up and the study area present is considered acceptable. As such, the forecast delays discussed above are considered robust.

Impacts at A32 Gosport Road / Palmerston Road Drive junction

Traffic flow diagrams have been updated to include the Gosport Road/ Palmerston Drive junction and the associated Newgate Lane flyover. It is agreed that, following provision of the more detailed traffic flow diagrams, no capacity assessment of the A32 Gosport Road / Palmerstone Drive Junction is required.

A detailed analysis of the accident records at this location has been provided, concluding the appeal proposals are not forecast to add any turning movements to the priority junctions forming part of this intersection and there is no pattern of accidents on the on the Newgate Lane flyover (to which the development will add traffic) that requires mitigation. It is not considered personal injury accidents would be exacerbated by additional development traffic at the junction of Newgate Lane/ A32 Gosport Road interchange.

Recommendation

The Highway Authority requires further information as summarised below to make a fully informed response and confirm Reason for Refusal i) has been addressed.

- Confirmation that the cycle route from the proposed site access roundabout continues as a segregated across the proposed open space and that this can be secured by Condition.

- Confirmation on site lighting and segregated cycle route can be secured by Condition.
- Provision of cost estimates and agreement of contribution values for the following improvement schemes:
 - WCHAR improvements identified in drawings Drawing ITB10353-GA-300-315.
 - Off-road, segregated pedestrian and cycle route on Longfield Avenue and improvements for cyclists on Fort Fareham Road, Tudor Court and St Michaels Grove.
 - Proposed improvements to Route 9.
 - An off-road shared footway / cycleway on Wych Lane between Tukes Avenue and Henry Court Way
- Consideration of cycle improvements to Gosport Road, between Crofton Secondary School and Eric Road.
- Consideration of crossing improvements at the junction of Eric Road/ Stubbington Lane/ Bells Lane.
- Consideration of more significant improvements to Redlands Lane between Henry Cort Way and the Gillies.
- Confirmation the School Travel Plan contribution of £42,000 is agreed.

I trust that the above is clear, but I would ask you not to hesitate to contact Nick Gammer should you wish to discuss anything further.

Yours faithfully,

Gemma McCart
Team Leader – Highways Development Planning