



*Basingstoke
and Deane*

APPEAL BY: David Wilson Homes Southern

RE: Land at Marnel Park, Basingstoke

INSPECTORATE REF: APP/H1705/A/12/2188125 & APP/H1705/A/12/2188137

COUNCIL REF: BDB/75761 and 75762

Proof of Evidence by Steven Parsons MCIHT

Document Control Sheet

Proof of Evidence

Marnel Park, Basingstoke

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

This document has been issued and amended as follows:

Date	Issue	Prepared by	Approved by
18-03-2013	1 st Draft	Steve Parsons	SLP
25-03-2013	2 nd Draft	Steve Parsons	SLP
27-03-2013	Final	Steve Parsons	SLP

Motion
232 High Street
Guildford
Surrey
GU1 3JF
T 01483 531300
F 01483 531333
E info@motion-uk.co.uk
W www.motion-uk.co.uk

Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	1
2.0	Baseline Conditions.....	3
3.0	Relevant Guidance.....	12
4.0	Proposals	15
5.0	Assessment	17
6.0	Summary and Conclusions.....	30

Figures

1	Summary of dwellings and parking approved at Marnel Park
2	Local amenities and distance from appeal site
3	Proposed transport mitigation measures
4	Proposed route of bus service
5	Exiting characteristics of site access roads
6	Service vehicle access constraints
7	Photos of streets that could be utilised by a diverted bus service
8	Carpenter's Down photographs

Appendices

A	Baseline Traffic Flow Diagrams
B	Baseline Traffic Analyses of Local Access Roads
C	Rights of Way Map
D	Basingstoke Cycle Map
E	Bus Map and Timetable Information
F	Rail Map
G	Local Amenities Plan
H	On-street Parking Survey Results
I	Traffic Distribution Flow Diagrams
J	Without Development Traffic Flow Diagrams
K	Portion of Dwellings within 300 metres and 400 metres of closest bus stop

1.0 Introduction

Qualifications and Experience

- 1.1 My name is Steven Leslie Parsons. I am a Technical Director of Motion Consultants Limited, a Transport Planning Consultancy based in Guildford, Surrey, where I have been employed for the last 6 years. I hold an H.N.C in Civil Engineering, a Post Graduate Diploma in Transportation Planning and Engineering, and I am a Member of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (M.C.I.H.T). I have 25 years' experience in the field of transport planning, traffic engineering and highway safety.
- 1.2 During my career I have been responsible for assessing the highway and transportation implications of development proposals on behalf of several highway authorities, most recently for Surrey County Council where I was employed as a Principal Transportation Development Control Officer for 6 years before joining Motion. I have particular expertise in appraising the impact of development proposals on the highway network and the acceptability of access arrangements.
- 1.3 I have experience of assessing the highway and transportation implications of large scale residential developments, such as that proposed at Marnel Park, on behalf of; Highway Authorities; Parish Councils/Action Groups; and on behalf of developers. Key projects that are similar in nature to the appeal proposals include:
- ▶ Queen Elizabeth Park, Guildford (525 dwellings);
 - ▶ Elsenham Expansion (circa 3000 dwellings);
 - ▶ Dunsfold Park, Surrey (circa 2600 dwellings); and
 - ▶ Henfield, West Sussex (circa 140 dwellings).
- 1.4 Motion specialises in advising developers and professionals in the development field on all matters concerning transportation, highways and traffic.
- 1.5 I can confirm that I have visited the site on many occasions and I am familiar with the issues pertinent to the appeal.

Scope of Proof of Evidence

- 1.6 I have been appointed by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in respect of conjoined appeals relating to the redevelopment of land north of Marnel Park, Basingstoke. The two appeals relate to an Outline and Full application as follows:
- ▶ Outline Application (Appeal A) (BDBC Ref – BDB/75761) validated on 25 January 2012 with description:

“Outline planning application for up to 450 dwellings, a community centre, a 1 form entry primary school and associated access, open space and landscaping (means of access into the site to be considered, all other matters reserved)”.
 - ▶ Full Application (Appeal B) (BDBC Ref – BDB/75762) validated on 2 February 2012 with description:

“200 dwellings with associated access, open space and landscaping”.
- 1.7 The Outline Application was refused at the BDBC Development Control Committee on 4 July 2012 and the Decision Notice issued on 2 August 2012. The Full Application was refused at the BDBC Development Control Committee on 19 September 2012 and the Decision Notice issued on 1 October 2012.
- 1.8 The reasons for refusal for Appeals A and B are set out within the relevant sections of the Statement of Common Ground.

- 1.9 This proof of evidence specifically provides evidence in support of Reason 4 (Appeal A) and Reason 3 (Appeal B). These two reasons are identical and the reason has been replicated below:

The development as proposed would be unsatisfactory since the roads and pathways leading to and from the site are of inadequate capacity, width and alignment to accommodate safely the cumulative traffic generated from the proposed development in addition to that generated by the existing residential area. The approval of this development and the potential for a bus route to be provided to improve the sustainability of the site could lead to the imposition of parking controls within the existing adjacent residential areas thereby adversely impacting upon existing parking provision and the amenities of existing residents in an area already blighted by parking problems. As such the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policies T1 and T2 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy and Saved Policies E1 and A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

- 1.10 Furthermore this proof of evidence provides highways and transportation evidence in respect to baseline transportation conditions and the accessibility of the site.
- 1.11 This proof of evidence considers the above reason for refusal and; sets out the site's location in respect to travel and transport; assesses the traffic impact implications of the appeal proposals; assesses the suitability of the site in respect to sustainable travel and accessibility; and whether the proposed development has an acceptable impact on the roads and pathways leading to and from the site. Following this introduction the remainder of this proof of evidence is split into five sections, as follows:
- ▶ Section 2 sets out Baseline Conditions. This section sets out details in respect to the existing local road network, accessibility, public transport provision, traffic flow and accident rates.
 - ▶ Section 3 sets out relevant policy and guidance that should be used when assessing the acceptability of the impact of the proposals on the adjoining road network.
 - ▶ Section 4 describes the proposals, focusing on access arrangements and mitigation measures.
 - ▶ Section 5 sets out my assessment of the acceptability of the proposals, having regard to baseline conditions and relevant guidance.
 - ▶ Section 6 provides a summary and conclusions.

2.0 Baseline Conditions

- 2.1 Details of the site and surrounding area, along with a comprehensive summary of the planning policy documents that are considered pertinent to the proposals are included in the Statement of Common Ground and in the proof of evidence prepared by Ms Fiona Jones. This information is therefore not reproduced in my evidence. I have, however, set out matters that are relevant when considering the accessibility of the site, and matters relating to transport and access.

Highway Network

- 2.2 The local highway network in the vicinity of the appeal site is comprised of a number of local access roads and local distributor roads. The site is situated approximately 4.8 kilometres from Basingstoke town centre via the local highway network.

Local Access Roads

- 2.3 Many of the local access roads in the vicinity of the appeal site were constructed as part of the Marnel Park development (pursuant to outline permission BDB/48052), and approved in June 2004 (and subject to a number of subsequent reserved matter applications). These roads provide access to the appeal site and are described in further detail below.
- ▶ Jersey Close leads north off the Barrington Drive / Carpenter's Down roundabout junction and has a carriageway of circa 6 metres in width. A footway of approximately 1.8 metres exists on the eastern side of the street. Parking generally takes place off-street in perpendicular parking bays, although some on-street parking within the carriageway occurs.
 - ▶ Barrington Drive provides one of the main local access roads into the Marnel Park development. The road leads west from the roundabout junction with Carpenter's Down and provides access to Penton Way, Ilsley Road and Cleeve Road before meeting with Appleton Drive. Barrington Drive has a carriageway width of circa 6 metres and benefits from footways of 2.4/2.5 metres on both sides of the carriageway. Off street parking is provided for properties fronting Barrington Drive, although some on-street / footway parking occurs within the street.
 - ▶ Penton Way leads north-west from Barrington Drive and connects with Cleeve Road. The carriageway has a width of 5.1 metres and benefits from 2 metre wide footways on both sides of the carriageway. Some on-street parking takes place on the western side of the road between Barrington Drive and Warner Close. Towards the junction with Cleeve Road, parking is generally provided on driveways / garages.
 - ▶ Cleeve Road leads north off Barrington Drive and connects with Penton Way and Hewitt Road. The carriageway has a width of circa 5 metres and has 2 metre footways on either side. A section of the road in the vicinity of Barrington Drive is block-paved and includes 'rumble strips'. Similarly the staggered Penton Way / Hewitt Road junction is also block-paved in the form of a raised table. Some on-street (and footway) parking takes place generally on the eastern side of the road between Barrington Drive and Penton Way, where parking for dwellings is provided within rear parking courts. Bollards are located on the western side of the road between the Penton Way and Hewitt Road junctions, where parking for existing dwellings is also provided to the rear. Off-street parking (driveways and garages) are provided for properties located to the north of Hewitt Road.
 - ▶ Hewitt Road leads north-west off Cleeve Road and also connects with Gardiner Road and Egerton Drive to the south. The carriageway is circa 5 metres wide and includes 2 metre wide footways on either side. The road includes a 'pinch-point' traffic calming feature between Egerton Drive and Gardiner Road, which restricts the carriageway to 3 metres in width. Parking is provided for existing dwellings on driveways and garages although on-street parking takes place.

- ▶ Appleton Drive also provides a key local access road into the Marnel Park development from Carpenter's Down. The road leads west from Carpenter's Down (measuring circa 6 metres in width with 2 metre wide footways either side) where it continues north to meet Barrington Drive. Appleton Drive then leads west providing access to Gardiner Road and Carter Drive. The section of road from Barrington Drive continues at approximately 6 metres in width with 2.4 to 2.5 metre footways adjoining both sides of the carriageway. Parking along Appleton Drive is provided in a mix of rear parking courts, driveways and garages. On-street parking takes place typically where properties are served by rear parking courts. A number of junctions along Appleton Drive (including, for example, with Carter Drive and Gardiner Road) include block-paved raised tables. Appleton Drive leads south from Carter Drive connecting with Oxford Way and Chineham Lane.
 - ▶ Gardiner Road connects Appleton Drive to Hewitt Road and has a carriageway of circa 5 metres in width. The road also benefits from 2 metre wide footways adjoining both sides of the carriageway. The junctions with Appleton Drive and Egerton Drive include block-paved raised tables. Parking is provided off-street within garages and driveways, whilst on-street parking also occurs.
 - ▶ Carter Drive forms a crescent to the north of Appleton Drive, providing access to Hutchins Way and Gibbons Place. The carriageway is generally 5 metres in width (with 2 metre footways on both sides of the carriageway), although the carriageway widens to circa 6.1 metres to the south of Hutchins Way. Parking is generally provided off-street, although some parking takes place on-street on the adjacent footways.
 - ▶ Hutchins Way is a cul-de-sac located off Carter Drive to the north of Appleton Drive. The carriageway is circa 6 metres in width and includes 2 metre wide footways on either side of the carriageway. Parking for neighbouring properties is provided off-street, in marked bays or garages, whilst on-street and footway parking occurs within the street.
- 2.4 The estate roads constructed as part of the Marnel Park development were built in the late 2000s. It is understood that the outline planning permission (BDB/48052) initially referred to a total of 767 dwellings. However, the total number of dwellings has since been reduced to a total of 751 units through subsequent reserved matters applications. A summary of dwellings approved for the relevant phases of the Marnel Park development and associated parking provision (as understood from an online review of applications relevant to the site) is provided in the table at Figure 1.
- 2.5 Having regard to the table at Figure 1 it is understood that 751 dwellings have been permitted at Marnel Park. These dwellings are served by around 1106 parking spaces in total (although it is accepted that the exact provision may be marginally higher or lower than this). Very broadly speaking therefore, there is an average of circa 1.5 parking spaces per unit across the existing Marnel Park development.
- 2.6 In respect to on-street parking within the development, the Popley Fields 'Design Concept Statement' (March 2006) available on the Council's website states that *"Access roads will widen at bends to accommodate occasional on street parking..."* (paragraph 6.10), which perhaps acknowledges that a provision of 1.5 spaces per unit will be likely to result in demand for on-street parking. However, it is apparent that whilst many of the streets referred to above have a winding, curving layout, there is little evidence of widening on bends, which is usually incorporated to accommodate the swept path of larger vehicles.
- Local Distributor Roads**
- 2.7 Carpenter's Down and Popley Way act as local distributor roads, connecting the local access roads described above to the wider highway network. These streets are described below.

Carpenter's Down

- 2.8 Carpenter's Down connects with Popley Way at a signal controlled junction (to the south), and Reading Road (A33), at a roundabout junction (to the east). These two sections of Carpenter's Down are connected by a roundabout junction in the vicinity of the existing Marnel Park development (at Barrington Drive / Jersey Close).
- 2.9 The carriageway of Carpenter's Down is circa 7.3 metres in width and is subject to a 30 mph speed limit. There are no existing parking or waiting restrictions along the road; however, due to the nature of the street parking does not generally take place on-street.
- 2.10 There is a lit shared footway/cycleway on the eastern side of Carpenter's Down, along the section of Carpenter's Down between Popley Way and Barrington Drive roundabout. The footway on the western side of the road runs between Tobago Close and Barrington Drive. Lit footways continue along Carpenter's Down from Barrington Drive towards Reading Road. The footways are typically generous in width (approximately between 1.4 and 3.1 metres), and in places are set back from the carriageway by grass verges.
- 2.11 The section of Carpenter's Down between Barrington Drive and Reading Road includes some traffic calming in the form of central islands, road markings and signs, as well as the provision of kerbed build-outs with bollards, towards the junction with the A33.

Popley Way

- 2.12 Popley Way provides a local distributor route between the A339 / A340 roundabout junction in the west and Reading Road signalised junction (A33) in the east. The road is circa 7.4 metres in width and is subject to a 30 mph speed limit.
- 2.13 The road is not generally subject to existing parking or waiting restrictions and parking takes place clear of the highway. Popley Way benefits from lit footways (measuring between circa 2.0 and 3.1 metres in width) on both sides of the road for the majority of its length, which in places, are separated from the carriageway by grass verges.

Strategic Highway Network

- 2.14 As previously described, Popley Way and Carpenter's Down connect with the A33 Reading Road to the east. The A33 provides a strategic route between Reading and Basingstoke, as well as a key connection to the M4 motorway to the north and the M3 to the south (via the A339).
- 2.15 Popley Way also connects with the A339 and A340 to the south. The A339 leads northwest towards Newbury to the north and the M3 to the southeast. The A340 links the A339 and Basingstoke in the south with the A4 to the north of Aldermaston.

Base Traffic Flows

- 2.16 In accordance with paragraph 4.18 of the Department for Transport '*Guidance on Transport Assessment*' (March 2007), the Appellant established the baseline traffic conditions within a study area agreed with the local highway authority (Hampshire County Council) by way of Manual Classified Turning Count (MCTC) surveys. As is typical with residential developments such as that proposed, the MCTC surveys recorded vehicular activity during the morning and evening peak periods at the following junctions:
- ▶ Barrington Drive/Jersey Close/Carpenter's Down roundabout
 - ▶ Carpenter's Down/Popley Way signals
 - ▶ Popley Way/Reading Road signals
 - ▶ Crockford Roundabout (Carpenter's Down/Reading Road/Crockford Lane)
 - ▶ Chineham Lane/Popley Way signals

- ▶ Sherborne Road/Popley Way signals
 - ▶ Ringway/Aldermaston Road/Popley Way/Oakridge Road signalised grade separated roundabout
 - ▶ Ringway East/Churchill Way East gyratory
 - ▶ Black Dam roundabout (A30 London Road/Ringway South/Ringway East)
 - ▶ M3 Junction 6
- 2.17 The results of the surveys are presented at Figures 1 and 2 of the Hydrock Transport Assessment that was submitted in support of the Outline Application, which are included at **Appendix A** of my evidence for completeness. The results of these surveys have formed the basis of detailed junction assessments, which have established that the cumulative effects of the proposals and other committed developments in the local area would have an adverse effect upon highway capacity. In this regard, the Appellant has agreed to provide financial contributions towards a package of capacity improvement measures that have been identified by Hampshire County Council and Basingstoke and Dean District Council in the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan dated February 2012. Further details of the mitigation measures proposed by the Appellant are set out at Section 4 of my evidence.
- 2.18 Whilst the Appellant has agreed to provide financial contributions to offset the impact of the proposed development at several of the above junctions, the impact of the proposals upon the local roads has not been quantified. This is particularly relevant when considering Basingstoke and Dean Borough Council has concerns about the suitability of these roads to accommodate the traffic associated with the appeal proposals, including larger vehicles such as buses. I have therefore undertaken my own analyses having regard to the information collated by the Appellant to establish the levels of traffic that currently use Barrington Drive and Carpenter's Down (between the Barrington Drive/Jersey Close and Crockford roundabouts).
- 2.19 A summary of the levels of traffic that currently use these roads, and Jersey Close, is provided at Table 2.2. For the avoidance of doubt these flows relate to the information presented at Figures 1 and 2 of the Hydrock Transport Assessment that was submitted in support of the Outline Application and reflect the sum of all vehicles shown entering and exiting Barrington Drive, Carpenter's Down and Jersey Close via the Barrington Drive/Jersey Close/Carpenter's Down roundabout.

Road	AM Peak	PM Peak
Barrington Drive	163	144
Carpenter's Down	443	442
Jersey Close	69	62

Table 2.2 – Baseline Traffic Flows on Barrington Drive, Carpenter's Down and Jersey Close

- 2.20 Table 2.2 demonstrates that in 2010 circa 150 vehicle movements were recorded along Barrington Drive during the AM and PM peak periods, which equates to between 2 and 3 vehicles per minute on average, and that vehicular activity along Jersey Road equates to circa 1 vehicle per minute. The same table also shows that circa 440 movements were recorded along Carpenter's Down, which equates to approximately 7 vehicles per minute on average. These disparities can be explained on the basis that Carpenter's Down performs an important function as a local distributor road that connects the existing residential areas of North Basingstoke with the wider highway network via the A33; whereas, Barrington Drive and Jersey Road are primarily residential access roads. Indeed, it is my view that the primary requirement of Carpenter's Down is one of 'movement', whereas Barrington Drive and Jersey Road perform a variety of 'place' functions. These include (amongst others) residents parking and providing pedestrian connectivity to local community facilities, such as the children's play area and public open space on Barrington Drive.

- 2.21 Notwithstanding the above, it is evident from the flow diagrams provided at **Appendix A** that the Appellant has not undertaken any traffic surveys on Carter Drive, Cleeve Road, Hewitt Road or Hutchins Way. Given that it is intended these roads will form part of the access strategy for the proposed development, I have undertaken further analyses to establish how many vehicles are likely to use these roads at present. As part of my analyses I have made reference to the number of dwellings that are accessed from these roads and the trip rates that have been referred to in the Hydrock Transport Assessment.
- 2.22 Copies of my calculations are provided at **Appendix B**, with a summary of the results provided at Table 2.3.

Road	AM Peak	PM Peak
Carter Drive	26	29
Cleeve Road	31	34
Hewitt Road	22	24
Hutchins Way	6	7

Table 2.3 – Baseline Traffic Flows on Carter Drive, Cleeve Road, Hewitt Road and Hutchins Way

- 2.23 On the basis of the information presented at Table 2.3, it is evident that the levels of traffic that currently use Carter Drive, Cleeve Road, Hewitt Road and Hutchins Way range between circa 6 and 34 vehicles per hour. This is clearly a very low level of vehicular activity, which is as to be expected given that these roads are currently cul-de-sacs that serve a relatively small number of residential dwellings and thus do not attract through traffic. As with Barrington Drive, Carpenter's Down and Jersey Road, the design of these roads reflects the low levels of vehicular activity that use them on a day-to-day basis, and highlights its importance as a 'place' rather than a 'link'.

Road Safety

- 2.24 A summary of road safety, based on personal injury accident data obtained from Hampshire Police, is contained within the Transport Assessments submitted in support of the outline and full planning applications. This data covers the 5 year period ending 31 March 2011, within a defined study area, which includes:
- ▶ A339 Ringway / A340 Aldermaston Road / A33 Reading Road (including key junctions);
 - ▶ Carpenter's Down and Popley Way; and
 - ▶ Residential roads from the north of the A339 ring-road and west of A33 Reading Road, including Marnel Park.
- 2.25 A total of 126 personal injury accidents were recorded between January 2006 and 31 March 2011, with 107 classified as slight in severity, 18 recorded as serious and 1 fatality.
- 2.26 Of these incidents, two injury accidents were recorded on the internal local access roads leading to the appeal site, which are summarised in the table below.

	PIA: 80546121 06/12/2008 / SLIGHT	PIA: 100436557 14/10/2010 / SERIOUS
Location	Penton Way / Warner Close	Jersey Road / Guernsey Close
Causation Factors	Unknown vehicle 2 (car) travelling south-west along Warner Close failed to give way to vehicle 1 (car) travelling south-east along Penton Way. Vehicle 2 pulled out to turn left and collided with nearside of vehicle 1	Vehicle 2 (mini moto) travelling west along Guernsey Close failed to give way and crossed Jersey Close colliding with off-side of vehicle 1 (car) travelling north along Jersey Close
Additional Info	Failed to look properly; disobeyed give-way or stop sign markings	Disobeyed give-way or stop sign markings; travelling too fast for conditions; failed to look properly; inexperienced or learner driver/rider

Table 2.4 – Personal Injury Accidents Recorded on Local Access Roads

Accessibility

- 2.27 It is generally accepted that walking and cycling provide important alternatives to the private car, and should be encouraged to form part of longer journeys via public transport.
- 2.28 The Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) has prepared several guidance documents that provide advice with respect to the provision of sustainable travel in conjunction with new development, which suggest that:
- ▶ The maximum walk distance for commuting is 2 kilometres (Providing for Journeys on Foot, 2000);
 - ▶ Reasonably fit people can comfortably cycle 8 kilometres (Cycle Friendly Infrastructure, 1996); and
 - ▶ Walking distances to a bus stop should not exceed 400 metres (Planning for Public Transport in Development, 1999).
- 2.29 In addition, the Department for Transport's publication, Manual for Streets (March 2007) refers to 'walkable neighbourhoods', which are:
- "... typically characterised by having a range of facilities within 10 minutes' (up to about 800 metres) walking distance of residential areas which residents may access comfortably on foot."*
- 2.30 The following paragraphs consider the accessibility of the appeal site in relation to walking, cycling and public transport provision.

Walk Accessibility

- 2.31 The residential roads in the vicinity of the appeal site (namely those within the recent Marnel Park development) have been constructed to a high standard and provide lit footways as well as areas of shared surfacing.
- 2.32 Lit footways also exist along Carpenter's Down, which leads south to Popley Way and some existing local shops. In places, these footways are separated from the carriageway with grass verge. To the east, Carpenter's Down leads towards Reading Road (A33) and Popley Fields Community Centre. Similarly, the footways along Carpenter's Down leading towards Reading Road are generally set back from the carriageway.
- 2.33 There are a number of kerbed pedestrian islands provided along Carpenter's Down to assist pedestrians crossing the road. There is also an underpass on the east/west section of the road.

- 2.34 Jersey Close benefits from lit footways on the eastern side of the road, leading into existing residential areas to the east of the site and north of Carpenter's Down.
- 2.35 There are a number of existing footpaths in the vicinity of the site, including:
- ▶ Footpath 17b runs through the appeal site north-west towards Sherborne Saint John;
 - ▶ Footpath 17c adjoins the southern part of the site along the northern boundary of the recent Marnel Park development;
 - ▶ Footpath 18 is located to the north of the site and leads through Spier's Copse;
 - ▶ Footpath 19 runs along the eastern boundary of the appeal site towards Vyne Road to the north; and
 - ▶ Footpath 21 leads east from footpath 19 through Carpenter's Down Wood to Crockford Lane.
- 2.36 These footpaths connect into an extensive rights of way network providing recreational opportunities and alternative pedestrian routes to adjoining residential areas. A map illustrating these rights of way (from Hampshire County Council online map) is included within **Appendix C**.

Cycle Accessibility

- 2.37 A number of existing residential roads within the vicinity of the appeal site (such as Carpenter's Down and Popley Way) are identified on the Basingstoke Cycle Network map as 'off road / shared uses' cycle routes. These connect to other routes identified as suitable for cyclists, including on-road and other quiet / traffic calmed links. Together, these links (illustrated on the map within **Appendix D**) provide a cycle network around Basingstoke.
- 2.38 Part of the National Cycle Network (route 23), which runs between Reading and Southampton is located approximately 2.7 kilometres to the east of the site. The route leads south of Basingstoke onto Alresford, Winchester and Eastleigh.

Bus Accessibility

- 2.39 There are 3 bus stops located within 400 metres of the south-eastern corner of the site (as the crow flies). Two of these stops are located on the east/west section of Carpenter's Down (some 200-300 metres to the east of the Barrington Drive roundabout), with the third stop, the Popley, Montserrat Road (Northbound) bus stop, being situated approximately 50 metres to the south of the existing Barrington Drive roundabout, on Carpenter's Down. These bus stops typically include bus shelters, seating, timetable information and raised kerbs for level access. The stops on the east/west section of Carpenter's Down also include bus lay-bys. The bus stops mentioned above do not benefit from real time information.
- 2.40 The above mentioned stops are served by existing bus routes Jazz 3 and service 4. The Jazz 3 and service 4 (westbound) services can be accessed from the closest bus stop (located to the south of the Barrington Drive roundabout). The service 4 (westbound) service must be accessed from the bus stop located on the south side of Carpenter's Down, circa 300 metres to the east of the Barrington Drive roundabout.
- 2.41 Jazz 3 provides a high frequency service to the town centre, while route 4 provides connections to the town centre, hospital and Chineham centre. Map and timetable information for these services, which has been downloaded from the Stagecoach website, is available within **Appendix E**.
- 2.42 It is understood that service 4, running from the east through the top of Popley to the hospital (Basingstoke and North Hampshire Hospital), will benefit from a more frequent service throughout the day from April 2013.

Rail Accessibility

- 2.43 The nearest rail station is Basingstoke, located circa 5.3 kilometres to the south of the appeal site via Carpenter's Down, A33 Reading Road, A339 and A3010 Churchill Way (or 4.6 kilometres via Popley Way / Darlington Road or 3.5 kilometres on foot via South View).
- 2.44 Basingstoke is on the South West Mainline and benefits from regular services between the south coast (Southampton and Bournemouth) and London Waterloo (via Woking). A map of rail services and guide on train frequency and journey times are available in **Appendix F**.

Local Amenities

- 2.45 Basingstoke town centre is located approximately 4.8 kilometres south from the appeal site (via Popley Way / South View, or 4 kilometres on foot via South View to New Street). The town provides a range of high street shops and eating establishments, as well as leisure activities. Festival Place is the main shopping mall within the town. A leisure park is situated to the north of the town (on Churchill Way West), which provides further leisure activities such as a swimming pool, bowling, cinema and ice rink.
- 2.46 The table provided at Figure 2 identifies the distance of key educational, health and community services and facilities from the appeal site. The plan within **Appendix G** further illustrates these local amenities in relation to the site.

Accessibility Summary

- 2.47 The above sets out the accessibility of the appeal site, both in respect to the sites accessibility to alternative modes of transport and the sites accessibility to local facilities. It is apparent that local facilities are generally in excess of the 800 metre walkable neighbourhood suggested in Manual for Streets, whilst the closest bus stops are in excess of 400 metres from both appeal sites. Further comments on the accessibility of the appeal sites are included within Section 5 of this proof.

Parking Review

- 2.48 The existing local access roads, previously described, are currently not adopted and are not subject to existing waiting restrictions. As such, parking can take place on-street and the local access roads are subject to on-street parking.
- 2.49 The existing local distributor roads of Carpenter's Down and Popley Way, also described above, are wider than the local access estate roads within the Marnel Park development. These local distributor roads have little direct frontage access and, in general, there is no evidence of on-street parking on either road.
- 2.50 In order to understand the existing level of parking that takes place on the local access roads, an on-street parking survey was commissioned. Streetwise (an independent traffic survey company) were instructed to undertake a survey of the local access roads within Marnel Park, including:
- ▶ Jersey Close;
 - ▶ Barrington Drive;
 - ▶ Penton Way;
 - ▶ Cleeve Road;
 - ▶ Hewitt Road;
 - ▶ Appleton Drive;
 - ▶ Gardiner Road;
 - ▶ Carter Drive; and

▶ Hutchins Way.

- 2.51 The survey sought to identify the occurrence of on-street parking, record the level of vehicles parked on-street, duration of stay and vehicle turnover (arrivals and departures). The survey was undertaken on Thursday 7 March 2013 between 07:00 and 21:00 hours.
- 2.52 A map illustrating the extent of the survey area and the parking survey results are provided in **Appendix H**. In summary, the results of the parking survey demonstrate that parking takes place on-street on all existing local access roads within Marnel Park during the day and evening.

3.0 Relevant Guidance

- 3.1 National, regional and local policy, and relevant guidance that has been used to assess the acceptability of the development proposals, have been set out below.

Planning Policy

- 3.2 The development plan, for the purposes of the determination of planning applications, consists of:
- ▶ The National Planning Policy Framework; and
 - ▶ The 'saved' policies of the Adopted Local Plan (1996 – 2011).
- 3.3 The Council is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan (previously known as the Local Development Framework). This Local Plan will include a spatial strategy setting out the future development of the borough as well as a number of local planning policies and strategic site allocations. The new plan is at an early stage of preparation, and is not due to be adopted until spring 2014.
- 3.4 The remainder of this section introduces the policies relevant to the appeal proposals having regard to policies cited in the reasons for refusal pertaining to the adequacy of the local road network (reason 3 of the full application and reason 4 of the outline application). It also makes reference to other local guidance prepared by the Council for considering applications (such as parking standards).

National Planning Policy Framework

- 3.5 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published at the end of March 2012 largely replaces previous policy set out in the various Planning Policy Guidance notes / Statements. With regard to transport, the NPPF replaces policy contained within PPG13 (Transport).
- 3.6 The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development that recognises the importance of transport policies in facilitating such development. One of the core planning principles of the NPPF identifies that planning should:
- "... actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable."*
- 3.7 In considering development proposals, paragraph 32 of the NPPF states:
- "All Developments that generate significant amounts of movements should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:*
- ▶ *The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;*
 - ▶ *Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and*
 - ▶ *Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe."*
- 3.8 In terms of the location of development, paragraph 34 states:
- "Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movements are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised."*

- 3.9 In this regard, the document goes on to indicate (at paragraph 35) that, among other criteria, development should be located and designed to:
- ▶ *Give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities; and*
 - ▶ *Create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians, avoiding street clutter and where appropriate establishing home zones.*
- 3.10 In relation to large scale residential development, the NPPF seeks to ensure developments provide opportunities for completing day-to-day activities within the site, and that key amenities, which future residents are likely to require access to (such as local shops, schools), are available within walking distance of most dwellings (paragraph 38).
- 3.11 With regard to local parking standards, the NPPF indicates that local authorities should take account of a number of factors if setting such standards (for both residential and non-residential development), including:
- ▶ *"The accessibility of the development;*
 - ▶ *The type, mix and use of the development;*
 - ▶ *The availability of and opportunities for public transport;*
 - ▶ *Local car ownership levels; and*
 - ▶ *An overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles."*

Adopted Local Plan

- 3.12 An officer report to the Portfolio Holder for Planning (June 2012) identifies the weight to be attached in planning decisions to the saved Adopted Local Plan policies, in light of the NPPF. 'Saved' policies E1 (development control) and A2 (encouraging walking, cycling and the use of public transport) are cited in the Council's reason for refusal relevant to the adequacy of local roads leading to the site. The officer report identifies that these policies are consistent with the NPPF and as such will continue to be applied in determining planning applications.
- 3.13 Local Plan policy E1 (development control) states:
- "Proposals for new development will be permitted provided that they are of a high standard of design, make efficient use of land, respect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, and do not result in inappropriate traffic generation or compromise highway safety."*
- 3.14 The policy goes on to identify a number of criteria, which proposals should satisfy, including the requirement that proposals should:
- ▶ *"Not generate traffic of a type or amount inappropriate for roads, properties or settlements in the locality, and provide safe and convenient access for all potential users, integrating into existing movement networks and open spaces."*
- 3.15 For developments that will give rise to vehicular and pedestrian movements, Local Plan policy A2 (encouraging walking, cycling and the use of public transport) indicates that planning permission will only be granted where:
- ▶ *"Cycling and walking infrastructure are integrated with the development and linked with surrounding networks; and*
 - ▶ *Development takes account of the needs of public transport."*

Parking Standards

- 3.16 In July 2008 the Borough Council adopted a supplementary planning document on Residential Parking Standards. This guidance supports 'saved' policy A1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 1996 – 2011 and replaces the residential element of the Council's previous supplementary planning guidance on parking (dated January 2003).
- 3.17 The following residential standards are relevant to the proposals (where 'outer urban area' is defined as beyond the town centre ring road):

Type	Car Parking: Outer Urban & Rural Settlements		Cycle Parking	
	With more than 50% spaces unallocated	With between 20% and 50% spaces unallocated	Long-stay	Short-stay
1 bedroom	1.0	1.25	1.0	1.0
2 or 3 bedroom	1.5	1.75	2.0	1.0
4 or more bedrooms	2.5	2.75	2.0	1.0

Table 3.1 – Residential Car and Cycle Parking Standards

Relevant Guidance

- 3.18 The following documents have been referred to, which provide relevant guidance in respect to access, highway design, street layout and passenger transport provision.
- ▶ Manual for Streets (Department for Transport)
 - ▶ Manual for Streets 2 – Wider Application of the Principles (Chartered Institute of Highways & Transportation)
 - ▶ Companion Document to Manual for Streets (Hampshire County Council)
 - ▶ Guidelines for Planning for Public Transport in Development (Institute of Highways and Transportation)
 - ▶ Institute of Environmental Assessment (IEA) publication entitled Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic

4.0 Proposals

4.1 In November 2012 Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council received the following two applications that are subject to this appeal:

- ▶ Outline application (BDB/75761) for 450 dwellings for Phases 1 and 2 (Appeal A); and
- ▶ Full application (BDB/75762) for 200 dwellings for Phase 1 (Appeal B).

4.2 Phase 1 comprises 200 dwellings located to the south of the site (closest to the existing Marnel park development). Phase 2 is located to the north of the site and accommodates the remainder of the development (i.e. up to 250 dwellings, a community centre and primary school).

Access Arrangements

4.3 Four points of access are proposed. Primary access to Phase 1 would be from Hutchins Way, with secondary access taken from Hewitt Road. Primary access to Phase 2 would be taken from Jersey Close, with secondary access from Cleeve Road. The two primary access points would be connected via an internal primary street (referred to within the planning drawings as 'Link Road A') across Vyne Brook. A designated pedestrian / cycleway is also proposed off Gibbons Place.

Development Traffic

4.4 The Appellant has undertaken analyses to establish the levels of traffic that are likely to be attracted to the proposed development. A summary of these are provided at Table 4.1 for completeness.

Phase	Time Period	Arrivals	Departures	Two-way
Phase 1	AM Peak	27	73	100
	PM Peak	67	41	108
Phase 2	AM Peak	93	131	224
	PM Peak	90	56	146
TOTAL	AM Peak	120	204	324
	PM Peak	157	97	254

Table 4.1 – Development Traffic Flows

4.5 Further analyses have also been undertaken to establish how the above traffic flows will be distributed across the highway network, with the results presented on several flow diagrams prepared by Hydrock. For completeness copies of these are provided at **Appendix I** of my evidence. On the basis of the information presented at **Appendix I** it is possible to establish how traffic flows will increase along the roads outlined in Section 2, a summary of which is provided below at Table 4.2:

Road	Phase 1		Phase 1 and Phase 2	
	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
Barrington Drive	74	76	203	159
Carpenter's Down	58	51	196	150
Carter Drive	65	71	88	94
Cleeve Road	35	37	172	97
Hewitt Road	35	37	47	50
Hutchins Way	65	71	88	94
Jersey Road	0	0	56	61

Table 4.2 – Development Traffic Flow Distribution Profiles

- 4.6 The above table demonstrates that the increases in vehicular activity on surrounding roads are anticipated to vary between circa 35 movements per hour in Phase 1 up to circa 200 movements when all of the proposed development is operational. The effects that these increases are likely to have upon the local highway network are explored at Section 5 of my evidence.

Transport Contributions

- 4.7 A financial contribution has been proposed by the Appellant to satisfy the local highway authority's (Hampshire County Council) policies with regard to mitigation measures related to transport.
- 4.8 The table provided at Figure 3 summarises the proposed measures to be secured by Section 106 Agreement relevant to transport. In addition, a Travel Plan is proposed as part of the Section 106 obligation.

Bus Service Enhancements

- 4.9 It is understood from the Officer Report relating to the appeal proposals that the County Council is currently working with local bus operators to provide public transport services along the principal route through the existing Marnel Park development (leading west from Barrington Drive, south-west along Appleton Drive towards Chineham Lane). It is understood from the Officer Report that the local bus operator is supportive of diverting a bus along this route once the development is complete.
- 4.10 However, the Transport Assessment submitted in support of the appeal proposals makes no reference to correspondence with Stagecoach as to the acceptability of diverting bus services through the appeal site and no correspondence is provided within the Transport Assessment or Appendices relating to the proposed diversion of buses. It appears from the Transport Assessment that the Appellant has merely consulted Stagecoach about the size of buses to consider in swept path analysis. It is noted from the outline grounds of appeal (paragraph 33) that the bus operator has a preference for one-way bus operation through the appeal site.
- 4.11 The Transport Assessment indicates the most appropriate route through the appeal site for buses is between the proposed access points off Hutchins Way and Jersey Close. This is illustrated on drawing '400m walking distance bus route through development site' (drawing number HBH10090/D400.2 Revision A) submitted in support of the outline appeal proposals. An extract of this drawing is provided at Figure 4.

5.0 Assessment

- 5.1 Planning applications BDB/75761 (Appeal A) and BDB/75761 (Appeal B) were both refused for the following reasons:

The development as proposed would be unsatisfactory since the roads and pathways leading to and from the site are of inadequate capacity, width and alignment to accommodate safely the cumulative traffic generated from the proposed development in addition to that generated by the existing residential area. The approval of this development and the potential for a bus route to be provided to improve the sustainability of the site could lead to the imposition of parking controls within the existing adjacent residential areas thereby adversely impacting upon existing parking provision and the amenities of existing residents in an area already blighted by parking problems. As such the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policies T1 and T2 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy and Saved Policies E1 and A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

- 5.2 This section of the proof of evidence considers the above reason for refusal and assesses the acceptability of the development proposals (as set out within Section 4 of this proof of evidence) against policy and guidance (as set out within Section 3).

Development Impact

- 5.3 Having regard to the highways and transportation reason for refusal, I have identified the following issues:

- i) Issue 1: What level of traffic will be generated by Appeal A and Appeal B and how will this be distributed on existing neighbouring streets that provide access to the development?
- ii) Issue 2: Whether the roads and pathways leading to and from the appeal site are suitable to accommodate the cumulative traffic generated by the appeal proposals, in addition to that already generated by the existing residential area.
- iii) Issue 3: Whether it is necessary to make provision for a bus route to improve the sustainability of the site, to provide a real alternative to the private car.
- iv) Issue 4: Whether the adjoining highway network is suitable to accommodate a bus service (if required) and whether any such service would be likely to require the imposition of waiting restrictions to restrict or prevent on-street parking, and whether such parking controls would adversely impact on the amenities of existing local residents.
- v) Issue 5: Whether appropriate measures are proposed to mitigate any adverse highway impacts (if any) and whether the residual impact of the appeal proposals are considered to be 'severe'.

- 5.4 Whilst I consider each of the above issues separately in the following text, my proof of evidence should be read in conjunction with the evidence prepared by Fiona Jones.

Issue 1: What level of traffic will be generated by Appeal A and Appeal B and how will this be distributed on existing neighbouring streets that provide access to the development?

- 5.5 As set out at Section 3 of my evidence, National and Local planning policies indicate that the cumulative effects of new developments should not lead to any serious harm from a traffic perspective. Indeed, Local Plan Policy E1 states:

"Proposals for new development will be permitted provided that they are of a high standard of design, make efficient use of land, respect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, and do not result in inappropriate traffic generation or compromise highway safety" [my emphasis].

5.6 The same policy also notes proposals should:

"Not generate traffic of a type or amount inappropriate for roads, properties or settlements in the locality, and provide safe and convenient access for all potential users, integrating into existing movement networks and open spaces." [my emphasis]

5.7 When considering development proposals that generate significant amounts of development, paragraph 32 of the NPPF states:

"All Developments that generate significant amounts of movements should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:

- ▶ *The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;*
- ▶ *Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and*
- ▶ *Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe."*

5.8 Having regard to the above, I have reviewed the traffic impact sections of the Transport Assessments prepared in support of the Outline and Detailed planning applications. On the basis of my review I have established that the following scenarios have been considered by the Appellant when evaluating the traffic impacts of the proposed development:

- ▶ 2019 Without Development
- ▶ 2019 With Development
- ▶ 2026 Without Development
- ▶ 2026 With Development

5.9 As is normal practice when assessing the impact of developments such as that proposed, growth rates extracted from the industry standards database Temprow have been applied to the baseline traffic data that was introduced in Section 2 of my evidence when establishing the 2019 and 2026 'Without Development' scenarios. Copies of the 'without development' traffic flow diagrams prepared by Hydrock are provided at **Appendix J** for completeness. It is important to note that when preparing the flow diagrams at **Appendix J**, traffic flows associated with the following committed developments have also been taken into account:

- ▶ Land at Popley Way;
- ▶ Land North of Popley Way;
- ▶ Park Prewett Hospital;
- ▶ Faroe Close; and
- ▶ John Hunt of Everest School.

5.10 In order to establish the effects that the proposed development is likely to have upon Barrington Road and Carpenter's Down, I have combined the development traffic flows provided at Table 4.2 to the 'without development' flows set out on the figures prepared by Hydrock at **Appendix J**. I have undertaken similar calculations when establishing the net increases in vehicles that are anticipated to use Carter Drive, Cleeve Road, Hewitt Road, Hutchins Way and Jersey Close having regard to the baseline flows presented at Section 2 of my evidence. It should be noted that I have not applied any growth to the base year flows that I have established with respect to these roads on the basis that they are residential cul-de-sacs and therefore are unlikely to experience any significant increases in vehicle trips between now and the assessment years.

- 5.11 The results of my calculations are presented below at Tables 5.1 to 5.4. The numbers in brackets relate to the percentage increases in vehicular traffic that are attributable to the proposed development.

Road	2019 Without Development		2019 With Development (Phase 1)	
	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
Barrington Drive	501	502	575 (14.8%)	578 (15.1%)
Carpenter's Down	780	793	838 (7.4%)	844 (6.4%)
Carter Drive	26	29	91 (350%)	100 (348.8%)
Cleeve Road	31	34	66 (212.9%)	71 (208.8%)
Hewitt Road	22	24	57 (259.1%)	61 (254.2%)
Hutchins Way	6	7	71 (1183.3%)	78 (1114.3%)
Jersey Road	69	62	69 (0%)	62 (0%)

Table 5.1 – Development Traffic Flow Distribution Profiles

Road	2026 Without Development		2026 With Development (Phase 1)	
	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
Barrington Drive	524	522	598 (14.1%)	598 (14.6%)
Carpenter's Down	844	851	902 (6.9%)	902 (6%)
Carter Drive	26	29	91 (350%)	100 (348.8%)
Cleeve Road	31	34	66 (212.9%)	71 (208.8%)
Hewitt Road	22	24	57 (259.1%)	61 (254.2%)
Hutchins Way	6	7	71 (1183.3%)	78 (1114.3%)
Jersey Road	69	62	69 (0%)	62 (0%)

Table 5.2 – Development Traffic Flow Distribution Profiles

Road	2019 Without Development		2019 With Development (Phase 1&2)	
	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
Barrington Drive	501	502	704 (40.5%)	653 (30.1%)
Carpenter's Down	780	793	976 (25.1%)	952 (20.1%)
Carter Drive	26	29	114 (438.5%)	123 (424.1%)
Cleeve Road	31	34	203 (654.8%)	131 (385.3%)
Hewitt Road	22	24	69 (313.6%)	74 (308.3%)
Hutchins Way	6	7	94 (1556.7%)	101 (1442.9%)
Jersey Road	69	62	125 (81.2%)	123 (98.4%)

Table 5.3 – Development Traffic Flow Distribution Profiles

Road	2026 Without Development		2026 With Development (Phase 1&2)	
	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
Barrington Drive	524	522	727 (38.7%)	673 (28.9%)
Carpenter's Down	844	851	1040 (23.2%)	1010 (18.7%)
Carter Drive	26	29	114 (438.5%)	123 (424.1%)
Cleeve Road	31	34	203 (654.8%)	131 (385.3%)
Hewitt Road	22	24	69 (313.6%)	74 (308.3%)
Hutchins Way	6	7	94 (1556.7%)	101 (1442.9%)
Jersey Road	69	62	125 (81.2%)	123 (98.4%)

Table 5.4 – Development Traffic Flow Distribution Profiles

- 5.12 The above Tables indicate that traffic flows along Barrington Drive and Carpenter's Down are anticipated to increase by between 6% and 40% during the assessment periods as a result of the proposed development. Similarly, increases in traffic using Carter Drive, Cleeve Road, Hewitt Road and Hutchins Way are likely to experience increases of between 200% and 1,600%. Clearly these are very large increases that will significantly alter the character of the local area. I am aware that the baseline position is relatively low, on Carter Drive, Cleeve Road, Hewitt Road and Hutchins Way where I contend traffic flows reach circa 35 movements in the peak travel periods (see Section 2). In this regard, I have prepared the following table that shows traffic flows recorded in 2010 alongside those predicted for the 2019 'with development' scenarios associated with Phase 1 and Phases 1&2.

Road	2010 Flows		2019 With Development (Phase 1)		2019 With Development (Phase 1 & 2)	
	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
Barrington Drive	163	144	575	578	704	661
Carpenter's Down	443	442	838	844	976	943
Carter Drive	26	29	91	100	114	123
Cleeve Road	31	34	66	71	203	131
Hewitt Road	22	24	57	61	69	74
Hutchins Way	6	7	71	78	94	101
Jersey Road	69	62	69	62	125	123

Table 5.5 – Development Traffic Flow Distribution Profiles

- 5.13 Whilst the 2019 traffic flows presented at Table 5.5 incorporate traffic flows associated with the various committed developments outlined above, they provide further evidence that the character of the local area will be subject to significant changes as a result of the proposed development. Indeed, it is evident from the above comparison that the anticipated increases in traffic will result in:

- ▶ Traffic flows during Phase 1 of the proposals will be circa 600 vehicles along Barrington Drive, which equates to circa 10 vehicles per minute, whereas traffic flows on Carpenter's Down (a local distributor road) were recorded as being 7 vehicles per minute in 2010;
- ▶ Barrington Drive accommodating over 50% more traffic following Phase 2, (circa 700 vehicles) than was recorded on Carpenter's Down in 2010 (circa 440 vehicles);
- ▶ Traffic flows along Cleeve Road following Phase 2 will exceed those recorded along Barrington Drive in 2010 with circa 4 vehicles per minute using this road in the AM Peak, compared with 1 vehicle every 2 minutes at present; and

- ▶ Vehicular activity increasing to between 1 and 2 vehicles per minute on Hutchins Way following Phase 2, which is comparable with the existing conditions on Barrington Drive. At present, traffic flows on Hutchins Way equate to 1 vehicle movement every 10 minutes on average.

5.14 I have quantified the likely traffic impacts that both Appeal A and Appeal B will result in and how this additional traffic will be distributed on existing streets that provide access to and from the appeal sites. I contend that the increases in traffic will be severe and I have considered the implications of this below.

Issue 2: Whether the roads and pathways leading to and from the appeal site are suitable to accommodate the cumulative traffic generated by the appeal proposals, in addition to that already generated by the existing residential area.

5.15 I have identified, under issue 1, what level of traffic will be generated by Appeal A and Appeal B and how will this be distributed on existing neighbouring streets that provide access to the development. I shall now consider how the identified impacts will affect the neighbouring streets, and whether the roads and pathways leading to and from the appeal site are suitable to accommodate the cumulative traffic generated by the appeal proposals, in addition to that already generated by the existing residential area.

5.16 A useful reference document when considering the traffic impacts of a proposed development is the Institute of Environmental Assessment (IEA) publication entitled *Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic*. Of particular relevance is paragraph 3.15 of this guidance as it sets out the thresholds above which detailed consideration should be given to the environmental effects of a proposed development. These include:

Rule 1: include highway links where traffic flows will increase by more than 30% (or the number of heavy goods vehicles will increase by more than 30%); and

Rule 2: include any other specifically sensitive areas where traffic flows have increased by 10% or more.

5.17 Having reviewed the Transport Assessments prepared in support of the respective applications, it is my view that the Appellant has failed to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the significant increases in traffic, outlined above at Tables 5.1 to 5.4, will not have any demonstrable harm upon existing residents or other users of these roads. For example, the effects of the increases in traffic upon pedestrian amenity levels and community severance have not been evaluated. This is particularly evident given that guidance contained within the *Transport in the Urban Environment* published by the Institute of Highways and Transportation (June 1997) notes:

"...the environmental capacity for an access road or local distributor lies, typically, in the range 300—600 vehicles per hour, demonstrating that the maximum traffic flow compatible with a good environment will be substantially lower than the traffic capacity determined merely by the width and alignment of the carriageway or the intersections and other constraints along its length." (Section 32.4)

5.18 The same guidance also states traffic flows on access roads should be limited:

"...to levels compatible with acceptable environmental standards and providing safe and attractive routes for pedestrians and cyclists."

5.19 As the traffic flow diagrams prepared by the Appellant demonstrate traffic flows along Barrington Drive are likely to be comparable with the maximum environmental capacity identified by the IHT during Phase 1, and that it will be exceeded in the event Phase 1 and 2 are both constructed, the environment for existing residents will be subject to significant changes. It is therefore my view that these changes fail to respect the amenities of neighbouring residents, and the development results in traffic generation that is inappropriate for roads, properties or settlements in the locality (contrary to Local Plan Policy E1 and the NPPF), and represents a severe impact from a highways and transportation perspective.

- 5.20 Similarly, as the increases in traffic along Cleeve Road, Carter Drive, Hewitt Road and Hutchins Way will be substantial, it is my view that pedestrian amenity levels will be reduced and that this has the potential to discourage walking to the detriment of a cohesive community. Indeed, given that the Appellant does not intend to provide new or upgrade existing pedestrian crossing points, I consider that these increases are likely to result in the existing and future communities being subject to severance issues. This is particularly evident when considered in conjunction with the increases in traffic that are predicted along Barrington Drive. Indeed, it is important to reiterate that the increases will result in traffic flows on this road being comparable (or in excess of) with those associated with Carpenter's Down, which includes pedestrian crossing points that incorporate pedestrian refuge islands. As a result, I contend that this provides further evidence to support the conclusion that the proposals are contrary to Local Plan Policy E1 and policies contained within the NPPF.
- 5.21 In reaching these conclusions I have had regard to the guiding principles of Manual for Streets (MfS) and Manual for Streets 2 (MfS2), which place an emphasis upon streets having a 'Place' function as well as being channels for movement (i.e. a 'Link'). Indeed, it recommends that a more balanced approach to street planning and design should be taken:
- "...that recognises their role in creating places that work for all members of the community."* (MfS, page 7).
- 5.22 In this regard, MfS goes on to suggest on page 12 that:
- "It is important that designers place a high priority on meeting the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users, so that growth in these modes of travel is encouraged."*
- 5.23 MfS and MfS 2 also acknowledge that there is a need to consider that the primary requirements of a 'Link' will be to ensure users can pass through a street network in a timely manner with limited disruption. Whereas, a street that performs a 'Place' function will see the street as a destination in its own right for a variety of activities. Whilst these typically include walking/cycling to shops, local community facilities such as schools/recreation areas, it is important to note that some 'Place'-related activities also occur within and adjacent to the carriageway, such as loading/unloading, parking by residents and buses/taxis stopping to drop off and pick up passengers.
- 5.24 On the basis of the above it is my view that the increases in traffic will result in the current function of Barrington Drive, Cleeve Road, Hewitt Road and Hutchins Way being more consistent with a 'Link' than a 'Place'. In this regard, the attractiveness of walking/cycling will be reduced, not only to the detriment of future residents, but also the wider community as a whole. This is particularly evident when considering that the IEA suggests:
- Paragraph 4.39 *"a tentative threshold for judging the significance of changes in pedestrian amenity would be where the traffic flow (or its lorry component) is halved or doubled."*
- Paragraph 4.31 *"Changes in traffic flow of 30%, 60% and 90% are regarded as producing "slight", "moderate" and "substantial" changes in severance respectively".*
- 5.25 Furthermore, it is apparent that many of the existing streets that provide access to the site are designed as low key access roads that are subject to narrow carriageways and traffic calming and were intended to give priority to movement by foot and bicycle. Whilst it may have been the aim of the developer to avoid a 'car dominated development' the streets are characterised by on-street parking. It is notable that the on-street parking that currently occurs compromises the pedestrian environment, including footways leading to and from the site. On-street parking currently takes place within the carriageway, but also on adjacent footways to avoid obstructing vehicles using the carriageway. Clearly the very significant increased levels of traffic, as a result of the appeal proposals, will increase the propensity for residents to park on the footway which will further compromise pedestrian facilities, the use of streets as a place and reduce the attractiveness of walking as a mode of transport. Photographs that demonstrate the existing characteristics of streets that provide access to the appeal site are included at Figure 5.

- 5.26 I have demonstrated that roads such as Hewitt Road, Cleeve Road, Barrington Drive and Hutchins Way will all be subject to a substantial increase in vehicular movements, as a result of both Appeal A and Appeal B. Such increases are also likely to be experienced in other neighbouring and connected streets, such as Appleton Drive, Penton Way, Gardiner Close and Carter Drive.
- 5.27 Hewitt Road, Gardiner Road, Cleeve Road, Penton Way and Carter Drive are all roads that are designed with tight highway geometry, traffic calming and low vehicle speeds in mind, in accordance with the principles of Manual for Streets. They are designed as access roads that are 'places' where social interaction is encouraged and residents feel safe to walk or cycle, thus encouraging these modes of sustainable travel. All of these streets have carriageway widths of circa 5.0 metres, (with the exception of Carter Drive, between Appleton Drive and Hutchins Way), which is insufficient for two service vehicles to pass (refer Figure 7.1, MfS). Additionally due to the alignment of the carriageway it is likely that in some situations a private car will not be able to pass a service vehicle. This final point is demonstrated with images from 'Google Earth' at Figure 6, which shows a refuse vehicle in Carter Drive (5.0 metre wide carriageway) where insufficient space exists for vehicles to pass. Such occurrences can result in vehicles driving over footways further diminishing the quality and the safety of the environment for residents. As has been demonstrated, the appeal proposals will increase vehicular movements within these streets, which will increase conflict between vehicles; at existing pinch points; or where on-street parking occurs; or when service vehicles are present. Furthermore, there will be an increase in service vehicles, which will increase the likelihood of two service vehicles meeting within streets that are unable to accommodate the passing of such vehicles.
- 5.28 Having considered the likely impact of Appeal A and Appeal B, it is clear that either appeal (if permitted) would result in a significant increase in vehicular activity in streets that are inappropriately designed to accommodate such increases. The higher levels of vehicular traffic will result in increased conflict between vehicles and will harm both the pedestrian and cyclist environment, further detracting from the attractiveness of these modes of transport.
- 5.29 I conclude that the increases in traffic associated with the appeal proposals will amount to a 'severe' impact, which will result in traffic generation that is inappropriate for the streets that provide access to the appeal sites. As such I conclude that on the basis of the identified impact, the Council were right to refuse both applications due to the unacceptable impact on existing residential streets and that the development proposals, set out as Appeal A and Appeal B, are contrary to Local Plan Policy E1 and the NPPF.

Issue 3: Whether it is necessary to make provision for a bus route to improve the sustainability of the site, to provide a real alternative to the private car.

- 5.30 As set out at Section 3 of my evidence, national and local planning policies indicate that the new developments should encourage sustainable travel and take account of the needs of public transport.
- 5.31 For developments that will give rise to vehicular and pedestrian movements, Local Plan policy A2 (encouraging walking, cycling and the use of public transport) indicates that planning permission will only be granted where:
- ▶ *"Cycling and walking infrastructure are integrated with the development and linked with surrounding networks; and*
 - ▶ *Development takes account of the needs of public transport."*
- 5.32 One of the core planning principles of the NPPF identifies that planning should:
- "... actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable."*
- 5.33 In considering development proposals, paragraph 32 of the NPPF states: *"Plans and decisions should take account of whether:*
- ▶ *The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure"*.

5.34 In terms of the location of development, paragraph 34 states:

"Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movements are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised."

5.35 I have considered the above policy and have reviewed the accessibility of the appeal site within Section 2 of this report. I have commented further within this section on the proximity of bus services to the appeal sites and whether, having regard to relevant guidance and policy, it is either necessary or desirable to divert bus services through the appeal site.

5.36 As set out within Section 2 of this report the closest bus stop to the site is the Popley, Montserrat Road (Northbound) bus stop, which is located within Carpenter's Down, just to the south of the Carpenter's Down / Barrington Drive Roundabout. This bus stop can be used to access the Jazz 3 bus services.

5.37 Passengers using service 4 (which provides access to North Hampshire Hospital and Winklebury) can also use the Popley, Montserrat Road (Northbound) bus stop to alight the bus (from North Hampshire Hospital/Winklebury) or to board the service 4 to the Chineham centre. It should be noted, however, that for passengers to board a westbound service 4 bus, towards North Hampshire Hospital/Winklebury, it is necessary to use the Popley, Falkland Road bus stop(NW-bound), which is located within Carpenter's Down some 300 metres to the east of the Carpenter's Down/Barrington Drive roundabout.

5.38 Having regard to the Illustrative Master Plan (Appeal A), it is apparent that when walking via Jersey Close and the proposed site access, the closest bus stop (i.e. the Popley, Montserrat Road (Northbound) bus stop), is some 250 metre walk distance from the closest dwelling within the Appeal A site. Furthermore, the location of the school building is a circa 400 metre walk distance (via Jersey Close), and the community building would be in excess of a 400 metre walk distance. When walking via the secondary access from Cleeve Road, the closest dwellings are a circa 325 metre walk distance from the Popley, Montserrat Road (Northbound) bus stop. I have attached a drawing at **Appendix K** which demonstrates the portion of dwellings within the site that would be within a 400 metre (maximum) and 300 metre (preferable) walk distance to the closest bus stop. It should be noted that all dwellings within the Appeal B site are in excess of a 400 metre walk distance to the closest bus stop. Dwellings within the Appeal A site are within a 250 metre to 900 metre walk distance, with the majority of properties in excess of a 400 metre walk distance. The Popley, Falkland Road (NW-bound) bus stop will be in excess of a 400 metre walk distance from any dwellings, whilst the walk distance from some parts of the site would be in excess of 1 kilometre to this bus stop.

5.39 It is my view that when dealing with a significant development such as that being proposed as Appeal A and Appeal B, it is necessary to ensure that suitable access to public transport services can be achieved to meet the sustainable travel objectives that are set out within the NPPF and Local Policy. The appeal sites are located on the outskirts of Basingstoke and the location does little to encourage walking to the town centre (whilst cycling may offer limited opportunities) and there is no opportunity to travel to the town centre by rail. As such, the accessibility of the site relies heavily on public transport in the form of bus services.

5.40 Guidance within MfS states that walkable neighbourhoods are generally up to 800 metres, whilst guidance within PPTD states that *"Bus stops are located to minimise passengers' walking distances to their final destinations. The maximum walking distance to a bus stop should not exceed 400m and preferably be no more than 300m."*

- 5.41 When considering walk distances to the nearest bus stop I am mindful that virtually all dwellings (as shown on the indicative Master Plan) would be outside the preferable 300 metre walk distance, and few would be within the 400 metre walk distance. Some parts of the Appeal A site would be in excess of an 800 metre walk distance, whilst some bus services (Service 4 west bound) would require an even greater walk distance. Furthermore, the school and the community centre are on the fringe, or in excess of a 400 metre walk distance. Such distances are in excess of the maximum walk distance recommended within the PPTD and will do little to encourage travel by bus to these facilities. Whilst MfS refers to a walkable neighbourhood being within a 10 minute or 800 metre walk distance, I consider that prospective passengers are unlikely to walk for 10 minutes to gain access to public transport for such a relative short trip (to the town centre). By comparison, a diverted Jazz 4 service that penetrates the site and passes the 1FE school and community centre, would bring virtually all properties within the preferable 300 metre walk distance and would provide a convenient, high frequency and attractive mode of transport, particularly for travel to and from the town centre.
- 5.42 With excessive walk distances to bus stops, and without adequate bus services penetrating the site to ensure convenient access to bus services, it is contended that the accessibility of the appeal sites to public transport facilities is inadequate and inappropriate when considering the scale, location and nature of the appeal proposals.
- 5.43 Furthermore, Appeal A includes a 1FE Primary School and it is desirable to allow for a bus service to stop in close proximity to the school to encourage and provide a viable sustainable travel option for staff and/or parents travelling with school children. This is supported by MfS which states that "*[Bus] Stops should be provided close to specific passenger destinations (schools, shops etc.)*".
- 5.44 Having considered accessibility to existing bus stops as well as the location and nature of the site and the surrounding area, the appeal proposals will do little to encourage sustainable travel by public transport. Buses provide the most viable mode of travel to encourage travel by sustainable measures or indeed the only measure available when considering travel by public transport. For these reasons it is crucial to secure a diverted high frequency bus service through the appeal sites, without which I am of the view that the appeal proposals fail to satisfy policy in respect to accessibility to public transport facilities.
- 5.45 Having regard to the accessibility study, the nature of the appeal proposals, the walk distances to existing bus stops and the non-availability of alternative public transport, I consider that it is necessary to make provision for a bus service that penetrates the appeal sites.

Issue 4: Whether the adjoining highway network is suitable to accommodate a bus service (if required) and whether any such service would be likely to require the imposition of waiting restrictions to restrict or prevent on-street parking, and whether such parking controls would adversely impact on the amenities of existing local residents.

- 5.46 It is accepted that the Appellant's Transport Consultant has explored the potential for diverting a bus service through the site. This perhaps acknowledges the need to secure enhanced bus services/routing to secure appropriate access to bus services.
- 5.47 When considering the suitability of the adjoining highway network to accommodate buses I have had regard to the indicative bus route set out within the Appellants drawing HBH10090/D400.2 Rev A, which sets out the route buses would take through the development site, should the diversion of a bus route(s) be secured.
- 5.48 I have stated why I feel this is necessary to ensure the site has appropriate accessibility to public transport facilities and that I consider it necessary to divert a bus service to enable new residents' convenient access to public transport. I have set out below my consideration of whether the streets that would be likely to be utilised for access by a diverted bus service are appropriate for access by buses and indeed whether the layout and design of the streets is likely to encourage bus service providers to divert services to the route suggested by the Appellant.

- 5.49 I have reviewed drawing HBH10090/D400.2 Rev A, which sets out the route buses would take through the development site, should the diversion of a bus route be secured. It is noted that the route as indicated above would involve buses travelling via Appleton Drive and Hutchins Way (to the south of Appeal B site) and via Jersey Close (to the east of Appeal A site). Whilst the suggested route is noted, it is considered possible that the bus route could be diverted in such a way, that buses utilise Barrington Drive to access the site. Furthermore, Appeal A includes a 1FE Primary School, which includes facilities for coach parking, and may attract coaches and/or mini-buses. The Appellant may have little control over the routes used by these vehicles. As such whilst my appraisal focuses on the suitability of Appleton Drive, Hutchins Way and Jersey Close, it also considers the potential impact of buses on other streets that could be used to access the site.
- 5.50 Having visited the site and surrounding area it is apparent that the neighbouring streets are subject to on-street parking. To fully assess this a survey of on-street and off-street parking was carried out on Thursday 7 March 2013. The results of the survey are presented within Section 2 (baseline conditions); however, the survey confirms that there is a regular occurrence of on-street parking within Appleton Drive, Barrington Drive, Hutchins Way, Gardiner Road, Hewitt Road, Cleeve Road and Penton Way. All of these roads can be described as 'new' streets with carriageways of either circa 5.0 metres or 6.0 metres wide, with footways either side. Whilst most properties benefit from off street parking, there remains a clear demand for on-street parking, which typically occurs throughout the day when bus services will be operating. Importantly, the on-street parking is not accommodated in separate parking bays or lay-bys but is accommodated within the carriageway or in some cases on the footway. Jersey Close differs in nature from the streets mention above. Jersey Close is an existing street with a circa 6.0 metre wide carriageway and a footway on the east side only. It has perpendicular parking bays to cater for on-street parking, whilst some parking occurs within the carriageway. Carpenter's Down differs again being a more strategic local distributor road, in nature, which has a carriageway that is 7.3 metres wide, separate footway provision and little or no on-street parking.
- 5.51 When assessing the appropriateness of existing streets to accommodate the movement of buses I am mindful of advice and guidance set out within Manual for Streets, Manual for Streets 2 and Planning for Public Transport in Developments. I have set out relevant guidance below:

Manual for Streets

- 5.52 Manual for Streets states at paragraph 6.5.5:

"In order to design for long-term viability, the following should be considered:

- ▶ *Streets serving bus routes should be reasonably straight [my emphasis]. Straight routes also help passenger demand through reduced journey times and better visibility. Straight streets may, however, lead to excessive speeds. Where it is necessary to introduce traffic-calming features, designers should consider their potential effects on buses and bus passengers; and*
- ▶ *Layouts designed with strong connections to the local highway network, and which avoid long one-way loops or long distances without passenger catchments, are likely to be more viable."*

- 5.53 Paragraph 6.5.7 states *"Using a residential street as a bus route need not require restrictions on direct vehicular access to housing. Detailed requirements for streets designated as bus routes can be determined in consultation with local public transport operators. Streets on bus routes should not generally be less than 6.0m wide (although this could be reduced on short sections with good inter-visibility between opposing flows). The presence and arrangement of on-street parking, and the manner of its provision, will affect width requirements" [my emphasis].*
- 5.54 Paragraph 6.5.8 clarifies that *"Swept-path analysis can be used to determine the ability of streets to accommodate large vehicles. Bus routes in residential areas are likely to require a more generous swept path to allow efficient operation. While it would be acceptable for the occasional lorry to have to negotiate a particular junction with care, buses need to be able to do so with relative ease. The level of provision required for the movement of buses should consider the frequency and the likelihood of two buses travelling in opposite directions meeting each other on a route" [my emphasis].*

Manual for Streets 2 – Wider Application of the Principles

5.55 Manual for Streets 2 repeats much of the advice that is set out in MfS. Paragraph 7.1.2 of MFS2 clarifies that:

- ▶ Bus routes and stops should form key elements within walkable neighbourhoods [my emphasis]. Bus services are most viable when they follow direct and reasonably straight routes, avoiding long one-way loops or long distances without passenger catchments.
- ▶ Bus stops should be high-quality places that are safe and comfortable to use and highly accessible by all people, ideally from more than one route. Stops should be provided close to specific passenger destinations (schools, shops etc.) [my emphasis].
- ▶ Carriageway on bus routes should not generally be less than 6.0m wide, although this could be reduced on short sections with good inter-visibility between opposing flows.
- ▶ Buses can help to control the speed of cars at peak times by preventing overtaking.

Planning for Public Transport in Developments (PPTD) – (I.H.T)

5.56 The above document was produced by the I.H.T. in 1999 to set out best practice in linking developments to the existing public transport networks and in providing for public transport within existing and new developments. I have set out below some relevant extracts that should be considered when reviewing the acceptability of the existing streets to accommodate buses.

5.57 In respect to residential areas PPTD states at paragraph 6.45:

"Places, Streets and Movement recommend that bus routes in residential areas require roads that are 6.0m wide (DETR, 1998b). These roads must be kept almost completely clear of parked vehicles."

5.58 Paragraph 7.3 of PPTD states:

"Lane widths for roads to carry large buses should be 3.65m wide. In residential developments, roads of 6.0m (two 3.0m lane widths) should be used for buses routes providing parked vehicles can be excluded. Narrow roads can be used if services are limited to midi and min-buses. These widths require ample off-street parking, and may need bus gates to stop through traffic and road narrowing or chicanes to limit traffic speeds. At corners, buses sweep a wider path, as described in section 6.4 and illustrated in Figures 6.10 and 6.11."

5.59 Having considered the above guidance it is noted that the identified 'bus corridors' that would serve the appeal sites, namely Appleton Drive, Hutchins Way and Jersey Close, benefit from carriageways of circa 6.0 metres. In this respect they accord with the minimum carriageway width required to facilitate access by buses, which is set out within MfS, MFS2 and PPTD. However, I am also mindful that the guidance set out within these documents refers to a 6.0 metre wide carriageway as a minimum width. Reference is made within MfS that *"The presence and arrangement of on-street parking, and the manner of its provision, will affect width requirements."* and that *"Streets serving bus routes should be reasonably straight"*. Furthermore the guidance contained within PPTD is clearer stating that streets that accommodate buses and that are 6.0 metres wide *"must be kept almost completely clear of parked vehicles."*

5.60 I consider guidance is clear in that a 6.0 metre wide carriageway is the minimum carriageway width of a street that is designed to accommodate buses, but that such streets must be designed in a manner that ensures on-street parking does not routinely take place and that consideration must be given to the alignment of the streets and the greater swept path required by buses. I consider the key point here is that if 6.0 metre wide streets are subject to on-street parking then this may lead to situations where it is difficult for a bus to manoeuvre along the street, such as when 'chicanes' are created by on-street parking on opposite sides of the streets. Furthermore, on-street parking can obstruct the forward visibility between approaching vehicles and restrict or prevent turning movements, where parking occurs at, or close to, a junction.

- 5.61 This leads onto the consideration of guidance relating to the geometry and alignment of streets that are designed or intended for use by buses. MfS states that "*Streets serving bus routes should be reasonably straight*" and that "*Bus routes in residential areas are likely to require a more generous swept path to allow efficient operation. While it would be acceptable for the occasional lorry to have to negotiate a particular junction with care, buses need to be able to do so with relative ease. The level of provision required for the movement of buses should consider the frequency and the likelihood of two buses travelling in opposite directions meeting each other on a route*". PPTD confirms that "*At corners, buses sweep a wider path.*"
- 5.62 It is apparent from the guidance that a key consideration when deciding the suitability of a street to accommodate buses is not simply the width of the carriageway and the presence of parked vehicles, but also the alignment of the carriageway, along the route, and the greater swept path required by buses. Further consideration may be the ability of a bus to safely pass a cyclist and the attractiveness of a route to users of the service, which will be reduced if the service is subject to delays caused by the inability for a bus to manoeuvre 'with relative ease' along a particular corridor.
- 5.63 In considering the suitability of a bus route to serve both the Appeal A site and Appeal B site I am mindful of the intended bus route and of the results of the on-street parking study commissioned by Motion. What is clear to me is that the streets that would be utilised by a bus service (if this were secured, which I believe is necessary to ensure the development complies with sustainable travel policy), are typically 6.0 metres wide, subject to regular on-street parking (within the carriageway), are not straight in nature, are subject to bends within the carriageway that do not benefit from localised widening (as may be incorporated at bends to accommodate the wider swept path of larger vehicles) and are subject to traffic calming features.
- 5.64 I have set out photos below which demonstrate the nature of streets that may be subject to a diverted bus route at Figure 7.
- 5.65 By comparison, existing bus services run along Carpenter's Down, which allows existing bus services to penetrate the existing residential areas. As set out within Section 2 of this evidence, Carpenter's Down differs in nature from the streets that would provide access, for buses, to the appeal site. Carpenter's Down has a carriageway that is 7.3 metres wide (exceeding the recommended minimum width of 6.0 metres) and is a local distributor road in nature. As such its function is more associated with 'movement' rather than 'place' and as a consequence little or no on-street parking takes place. Furthermore, the road is generally straight with little deviation from the desired route, further adding to the 'movement' function. It is my opinion that Carpenter's Down is typical of a street that is suitable for bus access, where bus services can operate without being influenced by the local conditions that may exist in such roads as Appleton Drive, Barrington Drive, Hutchins Way or Jersey Close. I have included some photos of the conditions that exist with Carpenter's Down at Figure 8.
- 5.66 As such, I see little that would encourage a bus operator to take a long term commitment to running bus services through the appeal sites. Even if this were to be secured I suspect that the local conditions would detract from the quality and attractiveness of the bus service and there would be increased demand to prevent on-street parking to facilitate access by bus.
- 5.67 Having considered the relevant guidance I am of the view that the existing streets are not suitable, in their current format, to accommodate a frequent bus service such as the Jazz 3 service. As such I consider that should bus services operate via the route proposed by the Appellant, that the services would be compromised by the nature of the streets, which would detract from the viability and attractiveness of the service. Furthermore, the highway authority would be likely to come under increasing pressure (assuming streets are eventually adopted) to prevent on-street parking within these areas, through the introduction of waiting restrictions. As such, the appeal proposals would impact on the highway amenity currently enjoyed by existing residents.
- 5.68 For developments that will give rise to vehicular and pedestrian movements, Local Plan policy A2 makes it clear that the Borough Council will only grant planning permission for developments with vehicular and pedestrian generation implications where:

- ▶ Cycling and walking infrastructure are integrated with the development and linked with surrounding networks; and
- ▶ Development takes account of the needs of public transport [my emphasis].

5.69 Furthermore the NPPF sets out that developments should “*make the fullest possible use of public transport*” and that “*The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up*” and “*developments that generate significant movements are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.*”

5.70 In summary, I conclude that the appeal proposals do not sufficiently take into account the needs of public transport, fail to make the fullest use of public transport and fail to maximise the use of sustainable transport. Furthermore, I find that the appeal proposals and the potential for a bus route to be provided to improve the sustainability of the site, could lead to the imposition of parking controls within the existing adjacent residential areas thereby adversely impacting upon existing parking provision and the amenities of existing residents. As such, I find that the appeal proposals are contrary to Saved Policy A2 and E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011 and policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Issue 5: Whether appropriate measures are proposed to mitigate any adverse highway impacts (if any) and whether the residual impact of the appeal proposals are considered to be 'severe'.

5.71 Having considered the issues above, I have identified that both Appeal A and Appeal B Will result in a severe impact on roads and pathways leading to the appeal sites. I have demonstrated that the increased level of traffic associated with the appeal proposals will result in significant increase in traffic flows within streets such as Hutchins Way, Hewitt Drive, Barrington Drive and Cleeve Road which will change the nature of these streets, from streets that can be considered as ‘places’, to streets that are principally used for movement. Furthermore, I have identified that it will be necessary to divert bus services to penetrate the appeal sites to provide a level of accessibility to public transport services that would be acceptable.

5.72 Having considered the streets that the diverted bus service would be likely to use I have found that these streets are not suitable to accommodate buses. As a result, should bus services be diverted to improve accessibility of the appeal sites, I find that the use of these streets by buses along with the predicted increases in traffic, would result in a demonstrable impact on the streets leading to and from the appeal sites. I find that it would be likely to be necessary to restrict parking within these existing streets (such as Appleton Drive, Hutchins Way, Barrington Drive) to enable a bus service to operate with a degree of reliability and ease of access.

5.73 Measures that are proposed to mitigate the impact of the appeal proposals are set out within Section 2 of this proof of evidence. Having reviewed the proposed mitigation measures it is apparent that they target the wider highway impact as well as the need for improved passenger transport facilities. No mitigation measures are proposed that seek to mitigate the severe impact that the appeal proposals will undoubtedly have on streets that provide access to the appeal sites.

5.74 I conclude that the appeal proposals will have an unacceptable and severe impact on streets that provide access to the appeal site, and that this has not been adequately addressed or mitigated. I conclude that the appeal proposals are contrary to Saved Policy A2 and E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011 and contrary to policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. As such, I conclude that the Borough Council were right to refuse both applications for Reason 4 (Appeal A) and Reason 3 (Appeal B).

6.0 Summary and Conclusions

6.1 I have been appointed by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in respect of conjoined appeals relating to the redevelopment of land north of Marnel Park, Basingstoke. The two appeals relate to an Outline and Full application as follows:

- ▶ Outline Application (Appeal A) (BDBC Ref – BDB/75761) validated on 25 January 2012 with description:

Outline planning application for up to 450 dwellings, a community centre, a 1 form entry primary school and associated access, open space and landscaping (means of access into the site to be considered, all other matters reserved).

- ▶ Full Application (Appeal B) (BDBC Ref – BDB/75762) validated on 2 February 2012 with description:

200 dwellings with associated access, open space and landscaping.

6.2 The Outline Application was refused at the BDBC Development Control Committee on 4 July 2012 and the Decision Notice issued on 2 August 2012. The Full Application was refused at the BDBC Development Control Committee on 19 September 2012 and the Decision Notice issued on 1 October 2012.

6.3 The reasons for refusal for Appeals A and B are set out within the relevant sections of the Statement of Common Ground.

6.4 This proof of evidence specifically provides evidence in support of Reason 4 (Appeal A) and Reason 3 (Appeal B). These two reasons are identical and the reason has been replicated below:

The development as proposed would be unsatisfactory since the roads and pathways leading to and from the site are of inadequate capacity, width and alignment to accommodate safely the cumulative traffic generated from the proposed development in addition to that generated by the existing residential area. The approval of this development and the potential for a bus route to be provided to improve the sustainability of the site could lead to the imposition of parking controls within the existing adjacent residential areas thereby adversely impacting upon existing parking provision and the amenities of existing residents in an area already blighted by parking problems. As such the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policies T1 and T2 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy and Saved Policies E1 and A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

6.5 In assessing the appeal proposals I have given consideration to following issues:

- ▶ Issue 1: What level of traffic will be generated by Appeal A and Appeal B and how will this be distributed on existing neighbouring streets that provide access to the development?
- ▶ Issue 2: Whether the roads and pathways leading to and from the appeal site are suitable to accommodate the cumulative traffic generated by the appeal proposals, in addition to that already generated by the existing residential area.
- ▶ Issue 3: Whether it is necessary to make provision for a bus route to improve the sustainability of the site, to provide a real alternative to the private car.
- ▶ Issue 4: Whether the adjoining highway network is suitable to accommodate a bus service (if required) and whether any such service would be likely to require the imposition of waiting restrictions to restrict or prevent on-street parking, and whether such parking controls would adversely impact on the amenities of existing local residents.
- ▶ Issue 5: Whether appropriate measures are proposed to mitigate any adverse highway impacts (if any) and whether the residual impact of the appeal proposals are considered to be 'severe'.

- 6.6 I have quantified the likely traffic impacts that both Appeal A and Appeal B will result in and how this additional traffic will be distributed on existing streets that provide access to and from the appeal sites.
- 6.7 Having considered the likely impact of Appeal A and Appeal B it is clear that either appeal (if permitted) would result in a significant increase in vehicular activity in streets the provide access to the appeal sites.
- 6.8 National and local planning policies indicate that the cumulative effects of new developments should not lead to any serious harm from a traffic perspective. Local Plan Policy E1 states:
- "Proposals for new development will be permitted provided that they are of a high standard of design, make efficient use of land, respect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, and do not result in inappropriate traffic generation or compromise highway safety" [my emphasis].*
- 6.9 The same policy also notes proposals should:
- "Not generate traffic of a type or amount inappropriate for roads, properties or settlements in the locality, and provide safe and convenient access for all potential users, integrating into existing movement networks and open spaces." [my emphasis]*
- 6.10 When considering development proposals that generate significant amounts of development, paragraph 32 of the NPPF states:
- "All Developments that generate significant amounts of movements should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:*
- ▶ The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;*
 - ▶ Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and*
 - ▶ Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe."*
- 6.11 Having considered the likely impact of Appeal A and Appeal B, it is clear that either appeal (if permitted) would result in a significant increase in vehicular activity in streets that are inappropriately designed to accommodate such increases. The higher levels of vehicular traffic will result in increased conflict between vehicles and will harm both the pedestrian and cyclist environment, further detracting from the attractiveness of these modes of transport.
- 6.12 I conclude that the increases in traffic associated with the appeal proposals will amount to a 'severe' impact, which will result in traffic generation that is inappropriate for the streets that provide access to the appeal site. As such I conclude that on the basis of the identified impact, the Council were right to refuse both applications due to the unacceptable impact on existing residential streets and that the development proposals, set out as Appeal A and Appeal B, are contrary to Local Plan Policy E1 and the NPPF.
- 6.13 Having considered accessibility to existing bus stops as well as the location and nature of the site and the surrounding area, I find that the appeal proposals will do little to encourage sustainable travel by public transport. Buses provide the most viable mode of travel to encourage travel by sustainable measures or indeed the only measure available when considering travel by public transport. Having regard to the accessibility study, the nature of the appeal proposals, the walk distances to existing bus stops and the non-availability of alternative public transport, I consider that it is necessary to make provision for a bus service that penetrates the appeal sites.
- 6.14 I conclude that it is crucial to secure a diverted high frequency bus service through the appeal sites, without which I am of the view that the appeal proposals fail to satisfy policy in respect to accessibility to public transport facilities.

- 6.15 Having considered the relevant guidance I am of the view that the existing streets are not suitable to accommodate a frequent bus service such as the Jazz 3 service. As such I consider that should bus services operate via the route proposed by the Appellant, that the services would be compromised by the nature of the streets, which would detract from the viability and attractiveness of the service. Furthermore, the highway authority would be likely to come under increasing pressure (assuming the existing streets are eventually adopted) to prevent on-street parking within these areas, through the introduction of waiting restrictions. As such, the appeal proposals would impact on the highway amenity currently enjoyed by existing residents.
- 6.16 For developments that will give rise to vehicular and pedestrian movements, Local Plan policy A2 makes it clear that the Borough Council will only grant planning permission for developments with vehicular and pedestrian generation implications where:
- ▶ Cycling and walking infrastructure are integrated with the development and linked with surrounding networks; and
 - ▶ Development takes account of the needs of public transport [my emphasis].
- 6.17 Furthermore the NPPF sets out that developments should “*make the fullest possible use of public transport*” and that “*The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up*” and “*developments that generate significant movements are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.*”
- 6.18 In summary, I conclude that the appeal proposals do not sufficiently take into account the needs of public transport, fail to make the fullest use of public transport and fail to maximise the use of sustainable transport. Furthermore, I find that the appeal proposals and the potential for a bus route to be provided to improve the sustainability of the site, could lead to the imposition of parking controls within the existing adjacent residential areas thereby adversely impacting upon existing parking provision and the amenities of existing residents. As such, I find that the appeal proposals are contrary to Saved Policy A2 and E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011 and policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 6.19 Having reviewed the proposed mitigation measures it is apparent that these target the wider highway impact as well as the need for improved passenger transport facilities. No mitigation measures are proposed that seek to mitigate the impact that either of the appeal proposals will undoubtedly have on streets that provide access to the appeal sites.
- 6.20 I conclude that the appeal proposals will have an unacceptable and severe impact on streets that provide access to the appeal site and that the impact has not been adequately addressed or mitigated. I conclude that the Borough Council were right to refuse the application for Reason 4 (Appeal A) and Reason 3 (Appeal B).

Figures

Figure 1: Summary of dwellings and parking approved at Marnel Park

Phase	Reference	Dwellings Proposed	Approved	Parking Provision
1	BDB/60256	226 dwellings (28 of which amended by appn BDB/65767)	May 2005 (amended units approved June 2007)	Officer report refers to 1.56 spaces per dwelling across the site
2	BDB/62527	274 dwellings (280 originally approved, reduced by 6 in appn BDB/69655)	April 2006 (21 units as opposed to 27 approved in December 2008)	Appn forms indicate total of 453 spaces for 280 units (the amended 21 dwellings provided with 28 resident + 8 visitor spaces)
3 & 4A	BDB/70699	98 dwellings (originally 90 under appn BDB/68215)	August 2009	Provision included within Phase 4C below (was 180 resident + 2 visitor under appn BDB/68215)
4B	BDB/69274	49 dwellings	December 2008	Officer report refers to 52 resident + 26 visitor spaces
4C	BDB/70699	104 dwellings (originally 128 dwellings granted under appn BDB/69835)	August 2009	Officer report refers to 179 resident + 43 visitor spaces

Figure 2: Local amenities and distance from appeal site

Type of Amenity	Amenity/Location	Approximate Walking Distance (km)	
		Appeal Site A (Outline)	Appeal Site B (Full)
EDUCATION			
Primary School	St Bede’s Catholic Primary School (RG24 9DX)	1.3	1.1
	Marnel Infant School (RG24 9PT)	1.1	1.2
	Marnel Community Junior School (RG24 9PT)	1.1	1.1
	Merton Infant School (RG24 9HB)	1.8	1.6
	Merton Junior School (RG24 9HB)	1.8	1.6
	Oakridge County Infant School (RG21 5RR)	2.6	2.2
	Oakridge Junior School (RG21 5RR)	2.6	2.2
	Sherborne St John Church of England Primary School (RG24 9HT)	2.6	2.0
	South View Infant School (RG21 5LL)	2.7	2.8
	South View Junior School (RG21 5LL)	2.7	2.8
	Great Binfields Primary School (RG24 8AJ)	3.0	3.2
	Four Lanes Infant School (RG24 8PQ)	3.2	3.5
Secondary School	Everest Community Academy/College (RG24 9UP)	1.6	1.1
	The Vyne Community School (RG21 5PB)	3.7	3.0
	Fort Hill Community School (RG23 8JQ)	5.0	4.6
Higher Education	Basingstoke College of Technology (RG21 8TN)	4.8	4.5
HEALTH			
GP	Shakespeare House Health Centre (RG24 9DT)	1.6	1.7
	Hampshire Healthcare Centre (RG24 9NA)	2.9	2.4
	Chineham Medical Centre (RG24 8ND)	2.6	2.7
	Park Prewett Medical Centre (RG24 9RG)	3.7	3.4
Dentists	ADP Shakespeare Popley (RG24 9DS)	1.6	1.7
	Hampshire Healthcare Centre (RG24 9NA)	2.9	2.4
	Chineham Dental Surgery (RG24 8LT)	2.6	2.7
Hospital	Basingstoke & North Hampshire Hospital (RG24 9NA)	2.9	2.4
COMMUNITY			
Local shops	Popley - Tesco Express & Fish Bar (RG24 9DR)	0.6	0.7
	Shakespeare - Lloyds Pharmacy (RG24 9DT) & One-Stop Community Store (RG24 9DH)	1.6	1.7
	Melrose – Martin’s newsagent / Post Office (RG24 9ES)	1.8	1.6
	Sherborne St John - Post Office (RG24 9HP)	2.4	2.0
Community Centre	Popley Fields Community Centre (RG24 9AE)	1.0	1.1
	Bermuda Community Centre (RG24 9PE)	0.8	0.9
	Melrose Community Centre (RG24 9ES)	1.8	1.6
Social Club	Sherborne St John Social Club (RG24 9HP)	2.4	2.1
Pub/Restaurant	The Swan, Sherborne St John (RG24 9HS)	2.3	1.9
TRANSPORT			
Bus Stops	Montserrat Road, Popley (North-bound)	0.5	0.6
	Falkland Road, Popley (Southeast-bound)	0.6	0.7
	Falkland Road, Popley (Northwest-bound)	0.6	0.7

Note on how distances calculated to include in appeal statement:

The distances included in the table above are measured from the centre of each appeal site, using the shortest available walking route to each amenity having regard to the various proposed access points.

Figure 3: Proposed transport mitigation measures

Location	Proposed Works
<u>Highway Infrastructure:</u>	
A33 Reading Road / Carpenter's Down / Crockford Lane roundabout	Junction improvement including full signalisation, additional flaring and widening of circulatory carriageway to facilitate operation of junction under signal control.
A33 / Great Binfields Road roundabout	Junction improvement including full signalisation, additional flaring and widening of circulatory carriageway to facilitate operation of junction under signal control.
A339 Ringway North / A340 Aldermaston Road / Popley Way / Oakridge Road roundabout	Junction improvement including additional flaring on approaches and circulatory carriageway, and amendments to signal timings to improve junction operation.
A339 Ringway East / A339 Ringway North / A33 Reading Road roundabout	Junction improvement including additional flaring on approaches and circulatory carriageway, and amendments to signal timings to improve junction operation.
Popley Way / Chineham Lane signal junction	Junction improvement to enhance operation through provision of left turn flare on Chineham Lane.
<u>Public Transport Infrastructure:</u>	
Basingstoke Bus Station	Access enhancements to station forecourt and provision of bus priority measures in vicinity of station to improve access.
Basingstoke Rail Station	Improve public transport information provision.
Alencon Link Interchange	Provision of improved waiting facilities and additional bus waiting bays to accommodate new bus services linked with new development in the town (including Marnel Park).
<u>Walking and Cycling Infrastructure:</u>	
A33 Reading Road and Kingsland Business Park	Provision of crossing point on A33 linking to Kingsland Business Park via Bilton Road.
Crockford Lane, Hanmore Road and Chineham Business Park	Provision of crossing point on Crockford Lane and associated links to Hanmore Road, plus continuation of cycle facilities along Crockford Lane into Chineham Business Park.
Shakespeare Road	Enhancements to environment of subway, new off-road facilities for cyclists along Shakespeare Road and on-road facilities along Oakridge Road.
A339 Footbridges	Improvements to potentially raise the bridge parapets to address perceived safety concerns.
Houndsmill's Industrial Estate and hospital	Improvements to pedestrian infrastructure providing access between appeal site and Houndsmill's Industrial Estate and hospital, including upgrading the hospital footpath, Priestly Road subway, Abbey Road subway and footpath and Kingsclere Road subway.

Figure 4: Proposed route of bus service



Extract of drawing HBH10090/D400.2 Revision A - 400m walking distance bus route through development site

Figure 5: Existing characteristics of site access streets



Figure 6: Service vehicle access constraints



(Source: Google Earth)

Figure 7: Characteristics of streets that could be utilised by buses





Figure 8: Carpenter's Down photographs



