



Land East of Newgate Lane East, Fareham

Summary to Proof of Evidence of Tim Wall

Client: Miller Homes and Bargate Homes

APP/A1720/W/22/3299739 (P/22/0165/OA)

Date: 13 September 2022

Land East of Newgate Lane East, Fareham  
Summary to Proof of Evidence of Tim Wall  
Client: Miller Homes and Bargate Homes

i-Transport Ref: ITB10353-025c

APP/A1720/W/22/3299739 (P/22/0165/OA)

Date: 13 September 2022

**i-Transport LLP**

Grove House  
Lutyens Close  
Chineham Court  
Basingstoke  
Hampshire  
RG24 8AG

Tel: 01256 338640

Fax: 01256 338644

[www.i-transport.co.uk](http://www.i-transport.co.uk)

**COPYRIGHT**

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of i-Transport LLP

## Summary of Evidence

1.1.1 My name is Tim Wall. I hold degrees in Geography and Transport Planning and Engineering, and I am a Member of the CIHT and a Chartered Member of ILT. I have worked in the transport industry for some 20 years and I am a Partner of i-Transport LLP, who have been advising Miller Homes and Bargate Homes on transport matters throughout the application process.

### 1.2 Context and Scope of Evidence

1.2.1 My evidence addresses the relevant transport parts of the putative RfR; Part i) relating to transport impacts and safety; and Part m) relating to the Travel Plan.

1.2.2 Part i) is the substantive part of the RfR which alleges that it has not been demonstrated that the Appeal Scheme will not result in an unacceptable and severe impact on the highway network.

1.2.3 Since the Appeal was lodged, I have continued to engage with HCC, in its statutory role as Local Highway Authority, and a Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA - CDA.30) was submitted, which provided a comprehensive response to matters raised by HCC in its application response.

1.2.4 On the basis of the TAA, all technical transport matters have been agreed with HCC.

1.2.5 An Agreed Statement of Transport Matters (ASoTM – CDL.2) accompanies my Evidence and summarises the matters of agreement with HCC, which include that:

a In relation to the proposed Site Access roundabout to Newgate Lane East (CDA.26), that:

(i) The roundabout geometry is acceptable and meets design standards, and that matters raised in the Road Safety Audit are suitably addressed.

(ii) In design and safety terms the roundabout is acceptable and would deliver safe and suitable access to the Appeal Site.

(iii) The assessment of the projected operation of the roundabout is accurate and robust, and demonstrates that the roundabout:

a. will operate within design capacity and acceptably, with a Level of Service 'A' depicting Free Flow conditions.

b. forecast delay at the roundabout itself would not constitute a 'Severe' impact (NPPF Para 111).

- b The access strategy delivers safe and suitable access for non-motorised users and prioritises sustainable travel modes, and that this is deliverable and acceptable.
- c That the Appeal Site is in an accessible location; acceptably close to public transport facilities; that the Travel Plan is of a good standard; and that the measures identified and agreed to enhance opportunities for sustainable travel are acceptable.
- d That in relation to off-site transport impacts:
  - (i) The traffic assessments are acceptable and robust and consider the cumulative impacts of development in the area appropriately.
  - (ii) The traffic modelling, using industry standard software, is appropriate and 'fit for purpose', and that the model inputs and parameters are acceptable.
  - (iii) The results of the assessment demonstrate that the Appeal Scheme will not result in a severe residual cumulative impact on the wider transport network.

1.2.6 Whilst agreement with HCC is reached on all technical matters, HCC maintains its objections on a 'Policy' basis, alleging conflict with its draft Policy DM2 of the emerging LTP4.

1.2.7 FBC has subsequently confirmed that, subject to planning conditions and the completion of the planning obligation, and noting the HCC position, Parts i) and m) of its deemed RfR are withdrawn and are not being contested.

1.2.8 Whilst there is no longer a transport element of the RfR, my Evidence addresses transport matters relevant to the key policy requirements (NPPF / CS5 / DSP40), including related to:

- Site Access Strategy
- Accessibility
- Off-site Transport Impacts

### 1.3 **Site Access Strategy**

1.3.1 Active travel connections to the Appeal Site (for walking and cycling) are proposed to Newgate Lane East, to Brookers Lane through the consented scheme to the south, east to Tukes Avenue, and north to the PROW76. All of these points of access have been agreed with HCC as deliverable and collectively will ensure the Appeal Site is very well connected to the local area so to provide for travel by sustainable transport modes to local facilities and services, and to public transport opportunities. The scheme prioritises sustainable movement.

- 1.3.2 In relation to vehicular access, the Appeal proposals include access to Newgate Lane East in the form of an improvement to the existing Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East junction to form a 'normal' roundabout junction.
- 1.3.3 My evidence demonstrates that in design terms the proposed roundabout complies with all relevant standards. An independent road safety audit carried out of the scheme raises no residual safety matters not addressed in the submitted scheme. I therefore conclude that in safety and design terms, the scheme is wholly acceptable, and HCC agree.
- 1.3.4 In operational terms, I have thoroughly and robustly assessed the operation of the junction, taking account of consented development, traffic growth and sensitivity testing for higher background traffic flows on Newgate Lane East. My assessments demonstrate that:
- The junction will operate within design capacity in all scenarios and time periods.
  - That the projected Level of Service is 'A' representing **free flow**, and the highest category of performance.
  - That delays at the junction will be limited, being some 3-6 seconds for traffic travelling on Newgate Lane East, which I conclude to be negligible.
- 1.3.5 Therefore, I conclude that the operation of the junction is acceptable. HCC agree and confirms in the ASoTM (CDL.2) that:
- "It is agreed that the projected operation of the roundabout in capacity terms is acceptable and that the forecast delay at the roundabout would not constitute a 'Severe' impact (i.e. NPPF para 111) itself, noting HCC's concerns about the 'principle of access' explained below."***
- 1.3.6 Despite agreeing that the proposed roundabout will be safe, meet design standards and operate acceptably, HCC maintain its objection in Policy terms, alleging that the roundabout would, by virtue of requiring Newgate Lane East traffic to 'give-way' to circulating traffic at the roundabout, undermine the function of Newgate Lane East. HCC allege conflict with its draft LTP4 DM2 policy.
- 1.3.7 Having carefully considered this matter in detail, I find that there is no conflict with relevant planning policy that should prevent access being formed to Newgate Lane East, particularly that:
- a Policy DM2 is a draft transport policy yet to be adopted, is absent of evidence of need, and where there remain unresolved objections. The final form of the Policy, if taken forward, is unknown and in my opinion, it conflicts with the NPPF in setting a blanket restriction of access to certain roads without any objective or evidence-led assessment.

- b Even if Policy DM2 was to be adopted, it is not a Planning Policy and has not been subject to any independent review or scrutiny. I consider that objective scrutiny of Policy DM2 would find that it is unsound / untenable, and that it should carry no weight.
- c The proposed access junction would comprise a modification to an existing junction, which will provide safety / operational benefits for users of Newgate Lane and does so without materially impacting (or compromising) strategic traffic flows.
- d The roundabout has been designed to ensure that the strategic flow of traffic (i.e. north-south on Newgate Lane East) is not materially affected, with the roundabout forecast to will operate in '**Free Flow**' conditions, and so without material harm.
- e Alternative options for accessing the site, either to the east to Bridgemary, or through alternative forms of access, were considered in the development of the Appeal proposals but discounted due to deliverability, resistance from HCC, and because they presented inferior access solutions than proposed in the Appeal Scheme.

1.3.8 Overall, I conclude that the access strategy is appropriate and acceptable and will deliver safe and suitable access for all modes of travel. FBC does not contest this part of the RfR.

## 1.4 **Accessibility**

1.4.1 My evidence has demonstrated that the Appeal Site comprises a highly sustainable location for development, close to and well-integrated with the existing communities of Bridgemary and Woodcot, and well connected to services and public transport opportunities.

1.4.2 A Sustainable Transport Strategy and Travel Plan support the proposals which demonstrates a package of measures to enhance the accessibility of the site, to prioritise sustainable travel, and to ensure opportunities for sustainable travel are taken up (in line with NPPF Para 110 / DSP40).

1.4.3 Agreement has been reached with HCC in relation to a comprehensive package of measures to improve of-site walking, cycling and public transport connections, presented in Table 1.1 of my Evidence and comprising the delivery of:

- School Travel Planning in the Catchment Schools
- Improvement of the Newgate Lane / Brookers Lane crossing
- Improvement of local bus infrastructure
- Improvement of pedestrian and cycle connections to local schools, services and to the BRT, including at Wych Lane, Longfield Avenue, Redlands Lane and in Stubbington.

#### 1.4.4 My evidence therefore confirms that:

- a The Appeal Site is well located to key facilities and services, including public transport, that will be accessible within reasonable walking / cycling distance for site residents.
- b The Site Access Strategy prioritises movement by sustainable modes, directing access by walking and cycling on key desire lines in all directions of the site, and supporting this with off-site improvements to enhance accessibility and user safety.
- c In response to HCC comments, further improvements have been identified which are deliverable and which will contribute to delivering safe and accessible travel options between the site and key destinations, including education facilities and the BRT.
- d Contributions to enhance public transport accessibility, road safety for pedestrians and cyclists, and school travel planning are proposed to be secured by the Appeal Scheme.
- e Through the Travel Plan, the Appeal Scheme will deliver further measures to offer the greatest opportunity for sustainable travel opportunities to be taken up.
- f The scheme complies with relevant parts of DSP40, CS5 and NPPF.

#### 1.5 Off-Site Transport Impacts

1.5.1 The RfR alleged that insufficient information was presented to demonstrate the Scheme will not result in unacceptable transport impacts, and severe impacts on the local highway network.

1.5.2 FBC has since confirmed that it is to withdraw this RfR part i) on the basis of additional technical work (CDA.30) and HCC's updated Response (CDB.26).

1.5.3 The TAA presents detailed assessment of the impacts of the development proposal. My assessments have been based on credible baseline data, realistic assumptions (for traffic generation, growth, assignment), and have followed industry standard assessment protocols, all agreed with HCC as local highway authority (CDL.2).

1.5.4 The assessments demonstrate that the Appeal development would increase traffic demand on Newgate Lane East by around 2%. Assessing the impacts of the Site at key network junctions, the impacts are negligible, resulting in increased delay of generally a few seconds.

1.5.5 Considered against NPPF para 111 and DSP40 (v), I find there to be no conflict, and importantly no reason that the Appeal Scheme should be dismissed on transport grounds.

## 1.6 Conclusion

1.6.1 My evidence demonstrates that:

- The Appeal site will be accessible and will ensure opportunities to travel by sustainable modes will be taken up. The proposals go beyond simply addressing demands arising from the site and offer a number of wider benefits to the local community;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and
- The residual cumulative transport impacts of the proposals fall short of the “severe” test set by the NPPF and do not result in unacceptable impacts on highway safety.

1.6.2 It is therefore my conclusion that there are no transport grounds for dismissing the appeals.



