vectos.

REPORT

Bloor Homes and the Sandleford Farm Partnership

Sandleford Park

07/04/2021

Planning Reference: 20/01238/OUTMAJ

APP/7 Proof of Evidence of David Bird
On Transport Issues (Text)

Contents

Volume 1 Text

Volume 2 – Figures and Appendices

Figures

Figure 1	–	Strategic Site Location Plan
Figure 2	-	Local Context Plan
Figure 3	-	Existing Walking Routes
Figure 4	-	Existing Cycle Routes
Figure 5	-	Existing Bus Services
Figure 6	-	Proposed Pedestrian Network
Figure 7	-	Proposed Cycling Network
Figure 8	-	Phased Bus Strategy
Figure 9	-	Potential Diversion of A339 Bus Service
Figure 10	-	Highways Mitigation Plan
Figure 11	-	Walking Distance to Proposed Bus Stop Locations

Appendices

Appendix A	–	Bus Timetables
Appendix B	-	Drawing 172985/A/07.1 Monks Lane Eastern Access
Appendix C	-	Drawing 172895/A/08 Rev A Monks Lane Western Access
Appendix D	-	Drawing 4768-SK-100 Rev B A339 College Access
Appendix E	-	Drawing 172985/A/15 A339 Emergency Access Route Plan
Appendix F	-	Correspondence with West Berkshire Fire Service
Appendix G	-	Drawing 172985/A/19 Emergency Access Distance Plan
Appendix H	-	Drawing 172985/A/01 Rev C A339/Pinchington Lane Junction Highway Improvement
Appendix I	-	Drawing 172985/A/12 St Johns Road Highway Improvement Plan
Appendix J	-	Drawing 81311-041-108 Swan Roundabout Improvement Plan
Appendix K	-	Drawings of highway mitigation to be secured for development of remainder of SSSA
Appendix L	-	Drawing 17295/A/21 Pedestrian Improvements to Rupert Road/Wendan Road
Appendix M	-	Phase 1 Bus Strategy Timetable

1 Introduction

1.1 This is the proof of evidence of David Robert Bird. I am a Chartered Engineer and a member of the Institution of Civil Engineers. I am a founding Director of Vectos, a firm of transport consultants specialising in the assessment of all forms of development. I was previously a Director at Savell, Bird and Axon for 17 years. I have over 30 years' experience specialising in the transport effects of development on behalf of both private sector clients and local authorities. I undertake work for a range of major companies in the transport, housing, retail, energy and commercial sectors, and have extensive experience of presenting evidence at Public Inquiries.

1.2 Vectos has particular expertise and experience of dealing with development sites and currently acts for a broad range of clients including Berkeley Group, Taylor Wimpey, Hammerson, Stanhope, Prologis, Land Securities, Places for People, Persimmon, J Sainsbury, National Grid Property, British Land as well as local planning authorities. I assisted with the drafting of the transport section of the original NPPF.

1.3 I have wide experience of assessing residential developments and am currently acting on a number of major schemes including those at Hemel Hempstead Garden Community (circa 10,000 units); Gilston Park Garden Community, north of Harlow (10,000 units); Toads Hole Valley, Brighton (circa 800 units); Land West of Great Dunmow (1,200 units); Easton Park (circa 10,000 units); Tey Green (circa 1,200 units) and Southall Gasworks (circa 4,000 units).

1.4 I am retained by Bloor Homes and the Sandleford Farm Partnership to provide transport and highways advice in relation to this site. I have visited the appeal site, and the area within which it is located, on numerous occasions.

Engagement with Stakeholders

1.5 I and colleagues have sought to engage pro-actively with West Berkshire Council (WBC) as transport and highway authority before and after submission of the planning application. This has been a helpful exercise and a good level of agreement has been reached. This is encapsulated in the Statement of Common Ground (CD 9.1) and, in more detail, in a Transport Agreed Statement.

1.6 I have also engaged with Hampshire County Council and Highways England on issues that are of interest to them.

Scope of Evidence

1.7 In this proof of evidence, I will:

i) Describe the location of the appeal site from a transport perspective;

ii) Provide a summary of the relevant transport policies;

iii) Explain the transport measures that form part of the proposals;

iv) Set out the Sustainable Transport Strategy for the site;

v) Demonstrate that the proposals have an acceptable impact on the local highway network;

vi) Consider the Reasons for Refusal

vii) Address third party objections; and

viii) Summarise and conclude my evidence.

Declaration

1.8 The evidence which I have prepared and provide for this appeal (in this proof of evidence) is true and has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institution and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

David Bird 

2 Existing Situation

2.1 In this section I give a brief description of the Appeal Site and its location focussing on the transport aspects. Whilst I give a brief description of the existing walking, cycling and public transport provision, I provide further details on these aspects within the Sustainable Transport Strategy section of the proof (Section 5).

Site Location

2.2 The site location is shown in **Figure 1** and a more detailed location plan is shown in **Figure 2**.

2.3 As stated at paragraph 5.2 of the Statement of Common Ground (CD 9.1), the site is located in a highly accessible location, to the south of Monks Lane, to the west of A339 and to the east of A343, approximately 2km from Newbury town centre.

Highway Network

2.4 The site is located to the south of Monks Lane, which is subject to a 30mph speed limit and has an east-west alignment. To the east, Monks Lane forms a 4-arm roundabout junction with Newtown Road and Newbury College access.

2.5 Further to the east, Monks Lane forms a 4-arm roundabout with A339 and Pinchington Lane. To the north of this point the A339 forms the main route into Newbury town centre. To the south, the route connects to Greenham Business Park and then on to Basingstoke. The A34 and thereby the M4 can be reached via the A339 and B4640.

2.6 To the west, Monks Lane forms a 4-arm double mini roundabout with Andover Road (A343) and Essex Street. The A343 provides access to the A339 to the north and to the A34 to the south.

Accessibility by Non-Car Modes

Pedestrians

2.7 **Figure 3** shows the main walking routes within the vicinity of the site. The key routes are in an east/west direction and in a north/south direction, particularly towards the town centre.

2.8 In an east/west direction the main connections are via Monks Lane where there are footways on both sides of the road which benefit from street lighting. In some places, these footways are separated from the carriageway by grass verges.

2.9 Signalised pedestrian crossing points are located along Monks Lane near its junction with Rupert Road and access to Newbury Rugby Club, respectively. These crossing facilities provide a link to the existing residential area located to the north of Monks Lane. Dropped kerbs with tactile paving are provided at both crossings.

2.10 There are two primary waking routes towards the town centre from the site. These are along Rupert Road and Newtown Road. From the northern entrances to the site to the town centre is approximately 1.9km and the rail station circa 2km.

2.11 To the west of the site, Monks Lane provides walking access to a local health centre, leisure facilities and the local centre adjacent to the Andover Road/Essex Street roundabout, where pedestrian crossings in the form of pedestrian refuges and zebra crossings are provided.

2.12 Approximately 500 metres to the east of the site, the footways along Monks Lane connect into the footways located along Pinchington Lane providing a continuous pedestrian route to the nearby Tesco supermarket and retail park on the other side of the A339. The retail park includes an Argos, Boots, Next, New Look, Marks & Spencer Simply Food, Matalan, Costa Coffee, Mountain Warehouse and Starbucks

2.13 Approximately 250 metres south of the Monks Lane/Andover Road/Essex Street roundabout, a signal-controlled pedestrian crossing point is provided allowing pedestrians to cross between the eastern and western footways and providing access to Falkland Primary School and Park House School (secondary and sixth form) located to the west and east of Andover Road, respectively.

2.14 Public Right of Ways (PROW) GREE/9/1 passes through the site connecting the A339 in the east to the boundary of the New Warren Farm site to the west. GREE/9/1 connects directly to NEWB/5/1 at the New Warren Farm boundary providing a continuous link to Warren Road and then the A343 Andover Road in the west.

Cyclists

2.15 **Figure 4** shows the existing cycling network within the vicinity of the site.

2.16 The site benefits from a well-established local cycle network within Newbury. There is an extensive identified network of cycle routes that permeate through Newbury and comprises both signed on and off carriageway routes and various ‘quiet routes’ (i.e. lightly trafficked roads).

2.17 Signed cycle paths (cycleway or shared footway / cycleway) run along Monks Lane, which connect to a signed cycle route on Newtown Road travelling north towards the town centre.

2.18 Some sections of the local roads include on-road signed cycleways. These are sections of A343, Greenlands Road, St John’s Road, Bartholomew Street and A343 connecting onto other cycleways or shared foot paths.

2.19 In terms of long-distance cycle routes, National Cycle Route 4 (NCR 4), which runs from London to Fishguard, passes through Newbury and lies approximately 2.3km to the north of the application site. NCR 4 provides connection to Thatcham approximately 4.0 km to the east of the centre of Newbury and to Hungerford 13.5km to the west.

Public Transport

2.20 I have shown the existing bus services in the area in a series of plans at **Appendix A** and, immediately adjacent to the site at **Figure 5**.

2.21 The nearest bus stops to the site are located on Monks Lane, approximately 150 metres from the proposed site accesses. There are also stops on the A339 to the east, on the A343 to the west, on Chandos Road and Newton Road to the north and at Newbury College. These stops are accessible to the northern part of the Appeal Site.

2.22 I have summarised the services below.

Table 2.1: Existing Bus Services

No.	Operator	Route	Average Frequency (mins)		
			Weekday	Saturday	Sunday
2	Newbury & District	Pigeons Farm - Greenham (Tesco) - Wash Common - Newbury	60	60	-
103, 103A, 103B	Newbury & District	Newbury – Greenham Common	60	-	-
LINKS	Stagecoach	Newbury - Basingstoke	60	120	-

Rail

2.23 Newbury railway station lies on the Reading to Taunton line which is a major branch of the Great Western Main Line. The station is served by local services operated by Great Western Railway (branded as GWR) from Reading to Newbury and Bedwyn, and by inter-city trains operated by GWR from London Paddington to the West Country with regular services throughout the day (frequency 30 – 60 minutes) into Reading and London Paddington. The station is circa 2km to the north of the site.

Local Amenities

2.24 A significant number of local facilities are available within close proximity of the site and I describe these and the accessibility to them in Section 5 of this proof.

Section Summary

2.25 It can be seen from the above analysis that the site is well located for access to local amenities such as a food superstore, schools and a medical centre. It is also accessible to the town centre and rail station, both of which are approximately 2km from the northern boundary of the appeal site.

3 Planning Policy

3.1 In this section I provide a summary of the current transport related policy guidance at National and Local level which is relevant to the development proposals.

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

3.2 The current version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in February 2019. The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It provides a framework within which locally prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced.

3.3 Chapter 9 covers the promotion of 'Sustainable Transport' and states in paragraph 102 that transport issues should be considered in the earliest stages of plan-making and proposals, so that:

"*a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;*

b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;

c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;

d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and

e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes and contribute to making high quality places."

3.4 NPPF states that in assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

"a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;

b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and

c) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree."

Within the above context it is stated that all applications for developments should:

"a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;

b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;

c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character."

3.5 As such:

"Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe".

Local Policy

West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007)

3.6 Planning applications within Newbury are assessed against the saved policies set within West Berkshire District Local Plan, which was adopted in September 2007 and covers the period between 1991 and 2006.

3.7 The saved transportation policy relevant to this development is Policy 1, which states:

"The transportation needs of new development should be met through the provision of a range of facilities associated with different transport modes including public transport, walking, cycling and parking provision. The level of parking provision will depend on the availability of alternative modes, having regard to the maximum standards adopted by West Berkshire Council Standards."

Parking Provision

3.8 Parking standards for developments within West Berkshire are detailed within Appendix 5 of the Local Plan Saved Policies document. However, these parking standards have been superseded for residential dwellings by the Housing Site Allocations DPD, summarised within **Table 3.2** below.

Table 3.2: Residential Parking Standards

	Flats (+1 additional space per 5 flats for visitors)			**Houses**			
Bedrooms	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
Zone 2	1.25	1.5	2	1.25	2	2.5	2.5

West Berkshire Council, Core Strategy, Adopted July 2012

3.9 The Core Strategy forms part of the Local Plan for the District and sets out an overall planning strategy to 2026 and beyond.

3.10 The policies set within the Core Strategy relevant to the proposals are set out below:

i) Policy CS 3: Sandleford Strategic Site Allocation - Land at Sandleford Park will provide a sustainable and high-quality mix used use development with up to 2,000 dwellings, two vehicular accesses off Monks Lane with an additional sustainable transport link for pedestrians, cyclists and buses provided from Warren Road onto Andover Road. Further infrastructure improvements will be delivered in accordance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

ii) Policy CS 13: Transport – Development that generates a transport impact will be required to a) reduce the need to travel, b) improve and promote opportunities for healthy and safe travel, c) improve travel choice and facilitate sustainable travel particularly within and between main urban areas and rural service centres, d) demonstrate good access to key services and facilities, e) minimise the impact of all forms of travel on the environment, f) mitigate the impact on the local transport network and the strategic road network, and g) prepare Transport Assessments/Statements and Travel Plans to support planning proposals in accordance with national guidance.

iii) Policy CS14: Design Principles – New developments must demonstrate high quality and sustainable design that respects and enhances the character and appearance of the area and makes a positive contribution to the quality of life in West Berkshire. Development proposals will be expected to make good provision for access by all transport modes and ensure environments are accessible to all and give priority to pedestrian and cycle access.

Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document, March 2015

3.11 The Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is a document that provide a framework for the future development of the allocated site of Sandleford Park.

3.12 It has been developed in collaboration between West Berkshire Council and the Sandleford Park Landowners. It was first adopted in September 2013 and then updated in March 2015.

3.13 The document sets out a number of strategic objectives for the Sandleford Park Development. From a transport perspective, the development principles are as follows:

i) The layout and design of Sandleford Park will promote a hierarchy of streets, spaces and routes which create a legible and permeable place.

ii) The scheme will integrate with the existing surrounding development to ensure connections to the wider area.

iii) Sandleford Park will promote alternative forms of transport to the private car.

iv) The layout of buildings and spaces will lead to a connected and safe neighbourhood where pedestrians and cyclists have priority and the impact of vehicles is kept to a minimum.

v) Car Parking and Cycle Parking will meet the needs of residents and visitors.

vi) The design of buildings and spaces will be accessible to all members of the community.

3.14 As stated at paragraph 6.14 of the Statement of Common Ground (CD 9.1), the location of pedestrian and cycle accesses identified on the Land Use and Access Parameter Plan (14.273 PP02 rev H1) allow connectivity with adjoining land uses. These are similar to those shown on the Masterplan Framework (Fig.13) in the Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document to provide access to local destinations by walking and cycling.

3.15 The Statement of Common Ground (CD 9.1) also states at paragraph 10.9 that the proposed street network, hierarchy, design and character principles are substantially in accordance with the Sandleford Park SPD and that the indicative layout of roads and streets shown in the Design and Access Statement are appropriate.

3.16 Whilst Core Strategy Policy 3 defines that vehicular access to Sandleford Park will be provided from Monks Lane, the SPD encourages additional points of access to be explored, namely to the A339 Newtown Road and to the A343 Andover Road via Warren Road.

3.17 With regards parking standards, the SPD sets out that car parking will be in line with guidance and principles in the Manual for Streets.

West Berkshire Local Transport Plan

3.18 The Local Transport Plan (LTP) sets out the framework for the delivery of all aspects of transport and travel for West Berkshire. The Council's third LTP covers the period from 1st April 2011 to 2026.

3.19 The goals of the LTP include:

i) Improving travel choice and encourage sustainable travel;

ii) Supporting the economy and quality of life by minimising congestion and improving reliability on West Berkshire's transport networks;

iii) Maintaining and improving West Berkshire's transport networks for all modes of travel;

iv) Improving access to services and facilities;

v) Improving and promoting opportunities for healthy and safe travel; and

vi) Minimising energy consumption and the impact of all forms of travel on the environment.

3.20 The policies set within the LTP relevant to the proposed development are:

i) Policy LTP K1: *Travel Choice* – The council will work towards widening travel choices in order to minimise congestion and improve accessibility and air quality in the District.

ii) Policy LTP AT1: *Walking* – The council will work towards increasing the use of walking as a mode of travel for local journeys and as a means of accessing other sustainable travel modes for longer journeys.

iii) Policy LTP AT2: *Cycling* – The council will work towards increasing cycling in West Berkshire by ensuring that all new developments make cycling at least as desirable as any other transport mode choice by connecting with the local network where possible and following the West Berkshire Council Cycling Guidance.

iv) Policy LTP SC1: *Travel Planning* – The council will promote and encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel for residents, staff and pupils by requiring developers to submit travel plans will all major planning applications and support schools, workplaces and other organisations in the review and updating of existing travel plans.

v) Policy LTP SC2: *Car Sharing and Car Clubs* – The council will work with partners to facilitate car sharing and car clubs across the district by investigating the feasibility of a car club for the Newbury and Thatcham area.

vi) Policy LTP SC3: *New Technology* – The council will work with partners to embrace and facilitate the use of new technologies in transport to reduce carbon emission, reduce congestion and make travel smarter.

vii) Policy LTP K2: *Minimising Congestion* – The council will work towards tackling congestion on the District's highway network in order to minimise delays and improve local air quality. To achieve this, the council will work with its partners to improve capacity at identified congestion hotspots, particularly along the A339 (Newbury).

viii) Policy LTP K3: *Accessibility* – The council will work towards improving access to essential services and facilities for all living and working within West Berkshire. To achieve this, the council will focus on ensuring that new developments are focused where there is already good access to services and facilities.

ix) Policy LTP K4: *Accessibility (equality, diversity and inclusion)* – The council will work with partners to improve access to transport services and infrastructure for those with a disability by working with transport organisations and providers to improve transport infrastructure such as pavements, crossing points, bus stops

and rail stations to reduce barriers to travel, and facilitating equal access to the rights of way network for health and leisure purposes.

x) Policy LTP K5: *Climate Change* – The council will develop measures to reduce road transport energy consumption and carbon emissions in West Berkshire and to plan for the impacts of climate change on transport.

xi) Policy LTP K8: *Road Safety* – The council will work towards creating a safer environment for all by focusing on monitoring road traffic collisions and addressing high risk routes and sites with appropriate schemes, improving safety for vulnerable road users and providing education, information and training for pedestrians, cyclists and higher risk drivers.

xii) Policy LTP PT1: *Bus Services* – The council will seek to provide safe, integrated and efficient bus services that permit easy interchange with other modes of transport and that meet the travel needs of customers who choose not to use, or are unable to use, a private car.

xiii) Policy LTP PT6: *Infrastructure and Interchange* – The council will seek to enable development of pedestrian, cycle and bus routes to deliver good interchange opportunities for travel within and between urban areas including linking to rail stations.

xiv) Policy LTP K10: *School Travel* – The council will work towards reducing car use through increasing the use of walking, cycling and public transport to school for staff and pupils.

xv) Policy LTP K11: *Parking* – The council will facilitate and manage parking throughout the District.

xvi) Policy LTP P3: *Parking Standards* – The council will implement the following parking standards when managing developments: car parking should be provided in accordance with standards developed through the Local Development Framework and LTP Parking Strategy; cycle and motorcycle parking should be provided in accordance with the West Berkshire Council Cycling Advice and Standards Guidance Note; and, disabled parking should be provided in accordance with national standards.

xvii) Policy LTP K13: *New Development* – The council will manage the transport and travel aspects of developments by ensuring Transport Assessments / Statements submitted in support of development are of an acceptable standard and use relevant modelling tools; ensuring appropriate measures are developed and delivered to mitigate impacts of development on transport networks; ensuring robust Travel Plans are developed, delivered and monitored for relevant developments; ensuring the transport and travel aspects of all development are planned to integrate with and enhance existing networks and to support delivery of Policy CS 14; ensuring traffic impacts from developments do not adversely affect safety on transport networks; and ensuring the transport impacts of development do not adversely affect the environment especially the character of rural roads, rural communities and the AONB.

xviii) Policy LTP K14: *Health and Leisure* – The council will work towards the promotion of transport as a means of improving health and access to leisure by maintaining, promoting and improving the rights of way network and other routes for walking, cycling and horse riding.

Section Summary

3.21 The policies I have summarised above encourage development to take place in locations that are accessible or can be made accessible by sustainable modes. I will demonstrate throughout the remainder of this proof and particularly in the Summary and Conclusions Section how the appeal proposals comply with these policies.

4 Development Description

4.1 In this section I give a brief description of the scheme proposals as they relate to transport. I provide further details on the sustainable transport links in the Sustainable Transport Strategy section of the proof (Section 5).

Development Proposals

4.2 The planning application for the site, submitted in March 2020, seeks outline planning permission for the erection of up to 1,000 new homes; an 80 bed extra care facility (Use Class C3) as part of the affordable housing provision; a new 2 form entry primary school (D1); expansion land for Park House Academy School; a local centre to comprise flexible commercial floorspace (A1-A5 up to 2,150sqm, B1a up to 200sqm) and D1 use (up to 500sqm); the formation of new means of access onto Monks Lane; new open space including the laying out of a new country park; drainage infrastructure; walking and cycling infrastructure and other associated infrastructure works.

4.3 As part of the Appellants Statement of Case (CD 5.1, December 2020) a Valley Crossings Study was submitted which put forward amended illustrative material which showed how the valley crossing could be achieved and which sought to address the points made in the Reasons for Refusal. I refer to this study in this section.

Access Arrangements

Monks Lane Eastern Access

4.4 Access from the public highway is not a reserved matter within the application and therefore the access arrangements onto Monks Lane are applied for in detail.

4.5 As part of the proposals, a new priority junction will be constructed on Monks Lane approximately 250m to the west of the Newtown Road/Monks Lane roundabout junction. I have included the proposed access arrangements at **Appendix B**.

4.6 Monks Lane is subject to a 30mph speed limit, and as such the proposed access will be constructed in accordance with the Manual for Streets, which is the government produced guidance for non-trunk roads with speed limits of less than 40mph. Based on this guidance, visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m are required and can easily be achieved from the proposed access in both directions.

4.7 The roads within the site will be designed in accordance with the design guidance set out within Section F CA1 of the Sandleford Park SPD. This makes allowance for vehicle, cyclist and pedestrian routes.

Monks Lane Western Access

4.8 A roundabout junction with an inscribed circle diameter of 30m will provide a second access to the site, located approximately 300m to the west of the Eastern Access. A new priority junction is also located approximately 50m to the west of the access roundabout, which will provide access to a small number of dwellings. I have included the proposed access arrangements at Drawing No. 172895/A/08 Rev A, provided at **Appendix C**. Drawing No. 172895/A/08 Rev A also shows the visibility splays and stopping sight distance, which are in accordance with Manual for Streets guidance and are agreed with WBC.

4.9 Paul Goddard of WBC Highways confirmed he is content with these access designs in his response of 8th September (para 13).

A339 Newbury College Access

4.10 A new highway link between the A339 and the boundary of the Appeal Site was granted planning permission (Ref: 17/00158) as part of the Highwood Copse Primary School scheme in June 2017, as shown at **Appendix D**. A second permission was sought in December 2017 which on this occasion included the additional provision of bunds and this was granted in March 2018.

4.11 WBC secured part funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership for the access which, at the time of finalising this proof, was under construction. As part of the agreed mitigation package for the Appeal Scheme, a £1.5M contribution will be made towards these works by Bloor Homes in exchange for the access road being completed to the Bloor Homes boundary and either being adopted as public highway or full rights being granted for the passage of vehicles, pedestrian and cyclists between the Bloor Homes boundary and the public highway.

4.12 Condition 22 of this permission requires that within two years of the school opening, the vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access via the A339 and associated engineering operations shall be constructed in accordance with the approved drawings. The temporary access via Newbury College should at this point be stopped up thus requiring the new access from the A339 to be open to traffic. The School is due to open in September 2021, and, on this basis, the A339 access will be open to traffic by September 2023 at the latest, although it is expected to be open before that.

4.13 As part of the Appeal Scheme, an internal road will be constructed to the boundary of Newbury College to connect to this new highway and provide a vehicular, pedestrian and cycle connection from the Appeal Scheme to the A339.

4.14 I consider this access will be particularly helpful for traffic travelling between the Appeal Scheme and the A339 south since it will not need to pass through the Pinchington Lane junction.

Emergency Access

4.15 The site has two access points from Monks Lane and I consider this is sufficient to provide for an emergency access in the event that one of the access points was unavailable at the same time as an incident occurred on site.

4.16 However, the area to the south of the Valley (DPC - Development Parcel Central) has only one access route, which is across the valley and I discuss this later in this section. Whilst I consider this valley route itself to be sufficient to provide for emergency access, a further fallback provision is provided by use of the proposed cycle route that passes to the south of the site and connects to the A339.

4.17 A new route, with surfacing sensitive to the surroundings, will be provided adjacent to the existing PROW as shown in **Appendix E.** The cycle route will be 3m wide. If, during detailed design, it is agreed with WBC and the emergency services to be necessary or desirable, a geocell of a minimum width of 0.7m, covered by grass that can take HGV loads could be provided, thus providing an available emergency route width of 3.7m, which is in accordance with guidance for emergency accesses given in Manual for Streets. A colleague consulted with the Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service (RBFS) and a copy of the exchange of correspondence is included at **Appendix F**. As can be seen the RBFS consider that the proposed provision is likely to comply with their requirements under Building Regulations.

4.18 In the Highways Response of 3rd March 2021, Paul Goddard repeated his concern on this emergency access route. He states the following:

"I still have significant concerns that the diversion that an emergency vehicle would need to take using this route is much too long"

4.19 At Drawing 172985/A/19 (**Appendix G**) I have shown the distance to the proposed local centre via Monks Lane western access and the A339 emergency access. The distances have been measured from the A339/Pinchington Lane junction and assumes that emergency vehicles would travel via the A339 to access the site. The distances via each route are:

i) Via Monks Lane 1,622m

ii) Via A339 emergency access 2,179m

4.20 The analysis indicates that the access via the A339 to the local centre is approximately 560m further compared to access via Monks Lane. Assuming an average speed of 30mph, it would take an emergency vehicle an additional 42 seconds to reach the local centre via the A339 compared to the Monks Lane route. I consider this a minor increase in time compared to the Monks Lane access route.

4.21 Therefore, if necessary, an emergency access could be provided in this way although I would expect the primary emergency access to be provided via the Valley crossing.

Internal Layout

4.22 The internal layout of the scheme has been formulated to assist with sustainable transport links. Internal roads will be designed in accordance with the Sandleford Park SPD to include on-street cycle lanes, footways on both sides of access roads etc. Paragraph 10.9 within the Statement of Common Ground (CD 9.1) states that the street network, hierarchy and street design are substantially in accordance with the Sandleford Park SPD.

4.23 In addition, during detailed scheme design, additional off-road walking and cycling routes will be investigated. Walking and cycling connections external to the site will be provided as follows (see **Figure 6** and **Figure 7**):

i) At the Monks lane Eastern and Western Access Points

ii) At the new A339 Newbury College Access

iii) To the west to Andover Road via the existing PROW and Warren Road

iv) To the south east, via the new route to be provided adjacent to PROW GREE/9/1 and linking to the A339.

4.24 I consider that the above provides a good level of pedestrian and cycle connectivity within the site and to external locations.

4.25 In relation to parking, it is intended to provide car and cycle parking in accordance with current WBC standards.

Valley Crossing between Northern and Central Development Plots

4.26 In their Delegated Officer Report (CD 4.1) and Reasons for Refusal (CD 4.2), a number of issues were raised by WBC with respect to this valley crossing. Therefore, whilst it is a reserved matter and the detail of the design can be determined at reserved matters stage, I contributed to the examination of further design options, in order to demonstrate a number of ways in which the crossing could be achieved. This further work is reported in the Valley Crossings Study (VCS), included at Appendix 4 of the Appellant's Statement of Case (CD 5.1).

4.27 From a transport perspective the key requirements of the crossing are:

i) To provide adequate width and gradient for vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access;

ii) To tie in to the envisaged masterplan at both ends;

iii) To facilitate suitable emergency access.

4.28 I consider that the three alternatives presented within the VCS satisfy these criteria as follows:

4.29 **Option 1 (Drg VD17562-SK014)**: This route provides two carriageways with associated on-carriageway cycle lanes and adjacent footways. The road is mainly on embankment with a short bridge structure. There is a separation of 4m between the carriageways. Therefore, if there is an incident on one of the carriageways then the alternative can be used for emergency access.

4.30 The comment from WBC is that "*satisfactory emergency access could only be provided in this case in the form of two separate and independent access road structures across the entire width of the central valley*." Independent bridge structures are provided so I assume WBC mean that the embankments would need to be separate. There is no reason to require this. The logic in having separate structures is in case at incident occurs on site whilst maintenance is taking place on one of the structures. However, embankments require considerably less maintenance and there is no need for independent embankments. Introduction of such a solution would significantly increase the width of the access route which would be unnecessary and undesirable.

4.31 **Option 2 (Drg VD17562 – SK001)**. This solution seeks to follow the valley floor. There are no structures involved (except potential retaining walls) and therefore there is no need for a separate emergency access.

4.32 **Option 3 (Drg VD 17562 – SK023 and STR-SK-003)**. This option has a longer, slender structure across the valley. Two separate structures are provided. The walking/cycling route would have a useable width of 4.5m and is therefore suitable as an emergency access.

4.33 In the response from WBC on highway matters dated 3rd March 2021, Paul Goddard comments on this alternative solution. He states:

"VD17562-SK023: proposed vehicular/ pedestrian straight alignment bridge and VD17562-STR-SK-003: proposed parallel structures straight alignment option is an improvement on VD17562-SK014 as two separate carriageways and structures have seemingly been to be extended to level ground. However, I still consider that at least one passing place would be required within the emergency route"

4.34 However, at a subsequent meeting held with Mr Goddard on 26 March 2021, Mr Goddard advised he now agreed that a passing place was not required and therefore he was content with Option 3. This is reflected in the Transport Agreed Statement.

4.35 I therefore conclude that all three options provide suitable access both during normal operations and in the case of emergencies. Option 3 is agreed to be acceptable by WBC Highways.

Crooks Copse Link

4.36 As described in the VCS and illustrated at Appendix 4 of that report (Vectos Drawing VD 17562-SK021), a suitable route can be provided across this valley. The proposals will provide a new at-grade link road with a small culvert over the existing watercourse. The proposed alignment of the carriageway, which follows the contours of the existing valley, has been designed in accordance with the proposed design speed of 20mph. The link road will provide a maximum gradient of 6%, which accords with design guidance.

4.37 The width of the proposed link road varies between 5m-6m, providing sufficient space on bends to allow two HGVs to pass, plus a 2m pedestrian footway on the northern side.

Section Summary

4.38 In this section I have described the on-site proposals from a transport perspective. Three main access points (plus one minor one) are provided to the local highway network that provide for all modes. There are additional pedestrian and cycle links to the east and west via the existing PROW that will be upgraded along with an adjacent cycle route.

4.39 There are a number of alternative designs for the Valley Crossing between the northern and central development parcels and a suitable route can be created for the Crooks Copse Link that follows the contours.

5 Sustainable Transport Strategy

5.1 In this section I describe the Sustainable Transport Strategy (STS) that has been developed for the site.

Locational Benefits of the Site

5.2 Before describing the proposals in detail, it is relevant to ask the question whether the site is well located for a residential led, mixed use development from a transport perspective.

5.3 I have considered this under 5 headings as follows:

i) Policy Support;

ii) Relationship to Town Centre

iii) Local Facilities

iv) Sustainable Transport Accessibility

v) Vehicular Access

5.4 **Policy**: The Appeal Site is allocated in the adopted Core Strategy and such an allocation would have been based on a careful analysis of all the issues including transport. The plan makers concluded that it is an appropriate site for such development from a transport perspective.

5.5 I also note that the LPA commenced work on a new Local Plan in 2018 and published an Issues and Options consultation in November that year. In December 2020, the LPA produced an emerging draft of the Local Plan Review, which identifies the development that is required to meet local needs, the strategy for distributing development within the District and policies for conserving and enhancing the natural and built environment.

5.6 The LPA continue to allocate Sandleford Park as a strategic site for housing development in the emerging plan. Certain of the criteria in the site-specific allocation are proposed to be amended but the overall intention for development at Sandleford Park is not materially different from the Core Strategy and SPD.

5.7 **Town Centre**: The site is located circa 2km from the town centre. This is similar to a number of other areas within Newbury as well as more recently consented sites such as Newbury Racecourse and North Newbury (see **Figure 1**).

5.8 Therefore, the town centre facilities and the rail station are available within an approximately 30-minute walk, 8-minute cycle and 5-7 minute bus journey from the centre of the site.

5.9 **Local facilities**: Whilst the town centre is easily accessible, it is also beneficial to have facilities in the immediate vicinity of the Appeal Site which can serve the day to day needs of residents. There are a range of facilities within easy walking and cycling distance of the site which I will describe I more detail later in this section. The facilities include:

i) Tesco and Marks and Spencer food stores

ii) Retail Park

iii) Doctors Surgery

iv) Pharmacy

v) Local Centre

vi) Various educational facilities

5.10 **Sustainable Transport Accessibility**: A site should be well located to existing sustainable transport options. This is the case with the Appeal Site, with good local walking and cycling routes (there are at least 5 connections to/from the site) with options to improve them. Furthermore, there are bus routes that run on the roads to the north, east and west of the site. The rail station is circa 2km to the north of the site.

5.11 **Vehicular Access**: Whilst sustainable travel should be given priority, nevertheless a site needs to be accessible to the local highway network with the aim that traffic does not need to use unsuitable local roads. This is the case with the Appeal Site with three access points onto the highway network.

5.12 I therefore conclude that the site is very well suited to the intended use from a transport perspective.

5.13 I now go on to describe the Sustainable Transport Strategy (STS) in detail under the following headings:

i) Masterplan

ii) Local facilities

iii) Walking and Cycling

iv) Public Transport

Masterplan

5.14 The starting point for creating a sustainable development from a transport perspective is to create a good masterplan. This has two key features.

5.15 The first is a mix of uses that allows people to undertake some of their day-to-day activities on site thus minimising the need to travel. However, this mix needs to recognise facilities that are already available in the immediate vicinity.

5.16 In the case of the Appeal Scheme there are proposals for a primary school and local centre. This will allow the great majority of primary school trips to be undertaken by walking. The application applies for flexible commercial space in the local centre and therefore there is likely to be a mix of retail, community and commercial space. The commercial space could well include a work hub that allows people to work close to their home whilst meeting with others. This is becoming more prevalent and reflects the desire for more flexible working patterns that has been accelerated by the COVID 19 pandemic.

5.17 The second key aspect of the masterplan is the provision on site for sustainable modes. I have already discussed this in the previous section of my proof, where I outlined that high quality walking and cycling facilities will be provided. There are good connections from the site to the surrounding area at least 5 points.

Local Facilities

5.18 As I highlighted above, the site is well placed for a number of local facilities. The table below highlights these facilities along with the relevant distances and walk/cycle times measured from the centre of the site. The location of these facilities is shown on **Figures 3 and 4**.

Table 5.1: Local Facilities

Facility Type	Key	Facility	Approximate Distance from centre of the site (metres)	Approximate Walking Time (minutes)	Approximate Cycle Time (minutes)
Education	1	Newbury College	1,030	12	3
	2	Park House School	1,675	20	5
	3	St George's Pre-School	2,225	26	7
	4	St John The Evangelist C.E. Nursery and Infant School	1,930	23	6
	5	Falkland Primary School	1,625	19	5
	6	St Gabriel's School and Sandleford Nursery	1,335	16	4
	7	The Willows Primary School	2,030	24	6
	8	St Bartholomew's School	2,130	25	7
	9	John Rankin Nursery, Infant, Junior School	2,515	30	8
	10	St Nicolas CofE Junior School	2,430	29	8
Food Retail	11	Tesco	1,230	15	4
	12	M&S	1,230	15	4
	13	Budgens	1,315	16	4
Non-food Retail	14	Newbury Retail Park (including Argos, Boots, Homebase, McDonald's, Next, New Look, Sports Direct, TK Maxx,)	1,230	15	4
	15	Kennet Shopping Newbury	2,930	35	9
Leisure	16	David Lloyd	1,115	13	3
	17	Newbury Rugby Club	1,115	13	3
Medical Centre	18	Falkland Surgery and Pharmacy	1,015	12	3
	19	Wash Common Dental Surgery	1,415	17	4
Other	20	Greenham Business Park	3,800	47	14
	21	St John's Post Office	1,915	23	6
	22	Newbury Railway Station	2,530	30	8
	23	Bus Station (The Wharf)	2,530	30	8

5.19 The above table demonstrates the following:

i) A **primary school** will be provided as part of the Appeal Scheme allowing children to walk from within the development;

ii) **Secondary schools** are available at Park House immediately to the west of the site and St Bartholomew's which is located approximately 2km away which is an easy walk or cycle for secondary school children; Newbury College is a sixth form college and is immediately to the east of the site.

iii) There is a **Medical Centre** and Pharmacy on Monks Lane (Falkland Surgery) which is a short walk from the Appeal Site. There is a dental surgery approximately 17-minute walk away.

iv) There are Tesco and Marks and Spencer **foodstores** located immediately to the east of the A339 within a circa 15-minute walk of the Appeal Site;

v) **Non-food** retail facilities are available at Newbury Retail Park, also immediately to the east of the A339.

5.20 It can therefore be seen that many day-to-day activities can be undertaken on or very close to the site and in a sustainable fashion.

5.21 In the following paragraphs I describe how the above facilities can be accessed by sustainable modes i.e. walking, cycling and public transport.

Walking and Cycling

5.22 I have described in Section 4 how the internal site layout will be developed to encourage walking and cycling and therefore these paragraphs focus on the external strategy.

5.23 Following extensive discussions with WBC, the agreed improvements to the walking and cycling links to be funded by the development are as follows:

i) Upgrade on Pinchington Lane/Newbury College/A339 junction to a linked signalised junction with Toucan Crossings that facilitate pedestrian and cyclist crossings. This will allow pedestrian and cyclists to pass from the Appeal Site to the Tesco/M&S/Retail Park in a controlled manner (**Appendix H**);

ii) Improved pedestrian facilities on Rupert Road/Wendan Road (**Appendix L**);

iii) Wayfinding signage (see **Figure 6 and Figure 7**);

iv) Provision of informal crossing on A339 at the eastern end of the upgraded PROW/cycle route that will facilitate access to St Gabriel's School and the footway on the eastern side of the A339 (**see Appendix J**).

5.24 The key walking and cycling routes from the Appeal Site are as follows (see **Figure 3 and 4**):

5.25 To travel east from the site to the retail facilities on the east side of the A339 pedestrians and cyclists can use one of the Monks Lane access points and then travel along the southern shared footway/cycleway toward the A339. When they reach the Newbury College/Newtown Road junction they can pass over the junction using the signalised Toucan Crossing and this will be the same when they cross the A339. From this point pedestrians can pass into the Tesco using the dedicated pedestrian/cyclist access. Or they can cross the road to access the Retail Park.

5.26 To the west of the Appeal Site people can also travel along the combined footway/cycleway in order to gain access to the Falkland Surgery and Pharmacy a few minutes' walk away. If they continue west, they will reach the Andover Road Local

centre and the Wash Common Dental surgery which are about a 15-minute walk. Two toucan crossings are also provided on Monks Lane offering access for both pedestrians and cyclists to travel north towards the town centre along Rupert Road and Newtown Road.

5.27 There are two routes for pedestrians and cyclists wishing to travel north to the town centre and rail station, both of which can be accessed by controlled crossing points over Monks Lane. Newtown Road has dedicated cycle lanes and Rupert Road/Wendan Road is a designated quiet route. To enhance the use of Rupert Road for both pedestrian and cyclists, way-finding signage is proposed in the form of 'gateway maps' and directional signs (see **Figures 6 and 7**). This will enhance the legibility of the route and provide a feeling of continuity between the site and surrounding facilities. These proposed way-finding and gateway maps will be the same design as those already located within the town centre.

5.28 As shown at **Figure 3 and 4**, those wishing to access the Greenham Business Park can use the route to the east along Monks Lane and Pinchington Lane and then use footpaths that pass to the south to access the business park.

5.29 Running east-west through the southern part of the site is the existing PROW. A new cycle route will be provided adjacent to it. To the east the PROW links to the A339 from where St Gabriel's School can be accessed via a new crossing of the A339.

5.30 To the west in due course the PROW will link to a new route through New Warren Farm i.e. the remaining section of the SSSA. However, prior to that development proceeding and if the DPC has started build out by that time the PROW surfacing could be upgraded by WBC using their highway powers. Approximately 250m to the north of Warren Road on Andover Road, there is a Sainsbury Local Store.

Public Transport

5.31 I have developed the bus strategy in close collaboration with the main local bus operator, Reading Buses.

5.32 As with any bus strategy there needs to be flexibility to adapt the services over time to react to differing circumstances. Therefore, the strategy set out below should be seen as one way, but not the only way, of providing services to the site.

5.33 The strategy proposes an amendment of existing services and introduction of a new service, phased with the build out of houses on the site. This will ensure that there are bus services available from the first occupation of the site, thus allowing sustainable travel patterns to be established, but will also ensure that the level of service is compatible with the number of new residents on site.

5.34 The phased bus strategy is shown at **Figure 8** and I describe it below.

5.35 **Phase 1**: The initial phases of the development, close to Monks Lane, would be served by existing bus services Nos. 2 and 103A that run along Monks Lane and serve stops on Monks Lane. This will provide an hourly service to link to Newbury town centre and rail station and also peak period services to Greenham Business Park. A timetable prepared by Newbury buses showing how this would be achieved is included at **Appendix M**. Residents could also access the Link bus service that runs along A339/Newtown Road and provides an hourly service between Newbury and Basingstoke. The 103B bus service also runs along Chandos Road.

5.36 **Phase 2**: Once there are two operational site accesses from Monks Lane, it is proposed to divert the No.2 and No.103A service, which currently run along Monks Lane, into the site via the Monks Lane accesses, travel through the site and exit back onto Monks Lane. As can be seen from **Figure 11**, this would allow the area to the north of the valley to be built out with the great majority of units falling within 400m of a bus stop.

5.37 **Phase 3**: As the central element of the development is built out, it is proposed to provide a new bus service, which will link the site to the town centre. The proposed service would access the site via Monks Lane and travel through the site to the new local centre within site, then returning north towards the town centre. The proposed bus service would provide a 30-minute frequency throughout the day. The combination of the new service and existing would provide 3 buses per hour throughout the day.

5.38 **Phase 4:** Once the Warren Road link is provided, it is expected that the new bus service, rather than terminating at the Local Centre, will continue along Warren Road and head north on Andover Road.

5.39 Depending on phasing and trajectories it may be that Phase 3 is not implemented and the service moves straight to Phase 4.

5.40 **Figure 11** shows walking isochrones from the potential location of bus stops within the site. As can be seen all units are within a 400m walking distance of a bus stop. Additional stops are likely to be introduced, for example towards the south of the northern development area.

5.41 In addition to the above, there are opportunities to divert the existing services that run on the A339 via the eastern part of the site as I have shown at **Figure 9**. This is a logical diversion since the services would attract additional custom from the Appeal Site and services 103B and LINK would avoid the Pinchington Lane signals. As I have shown at **Figure 12**, a significant proportion of the northern site could access a bus stop along this diverted route.

5.42 Based on the analysis undertaken by myself and Reading Buses (taking into account potential patronage generated by the proposed development, operating costs of providing the new service, and potential revenue), it is concluded that the proposed new service will be self-financing in Year 10 of operation which is just before the development is fully built out. Hence the services, and in particular the new service, is sustainable in the long term.

5.43 As a long stop, if the Warren Farm element of the allocation is delayed, then the service that terminates at the local centre would be maintained until such time as the link to Andover Road is available. It may be that, in that interim situation, a smaller bus is used which would reduce costs.

5.44 Prior to the service becoming self-sustaining, Bloor Homes will provide sufficient funding for pump priming the service and this will be secured through the S106 Agreement. DNH will make proportionate contributions to this funding in a similar way to the infrastructure works, as I explain in the following Section of this proof.

5.45 In summary, the SSSA will be served by a comprehensive bus service that serves Newbury and Greenham Business Park as well as other locations and which will become self-financing after an initial pump priming period.

Travel Plan

5.46 A comprehensive Travel Plan was submitted with the planning application and includes measures to encourage the use of sustainable modes. Following further discussions with WBC, it has been proposed that WBC manage the Travel Plan funded by a financial contribution per unit will be secured through the proposed S106 Undertaking. The financial contribution will enable WBC to manage and implement the Travel Plan in a co-ordinated manner with the New Warren Farm development

5.47 Key features of the Travel Plan are:

i) Creation and distribution of Travel Information packs to all residents and students;

ii) Cycle training;

iii) Cycle discount vouchers

iv) Walking and cycling maps/guidance advertised and distributed;

v) Bus/rail travel incentives;

vi) On-site car club.

Summary

5.48 In summary a comprehensive Sustainable Transport Strategy has been developed for the site. This comprises:

i) The masterplan layout that will incorporate good quality pedestrian and cycling links and on-site facilities including a local centre and primary school;

ii) Links to nearby local facilities including education, healthcare and retail;

iii) The provision of a comprehensive walking and cycling strategy with links to local facilities, the town centre and rail station;

iv) The provision of a bus service to the town centre and rail station as well as Greenham Business Park;

v) A comprehensive Travel Plan.

5.49 I consider this to be an excellent level of sustainable transport for a residential development of this nature and in this location and will give people a real choice in how to travel to a wide range of destinations.

6 The Effects of the Development

6.1 In this section I summarise the assessment that has been undertaken of the effects of the development on the surrounding highway network.

6.2 I and colleagues have worked closely with officers of WBC in developing the mitigation strategy that I describe below and the assessment of the residual impacts.

VISSIM Modelling

6.3 The Newbury VISSIM model was used to assess the impact of the proposed development. VISSIM is a microsimulation model that is commonly used for assessing the impacts of a development on an area wide basis. It has the advantage of being able to re-assign traffic on the basis of journey time and congestion and therefore provides a realistic estimate of traffic effects.

6.4 The Newbury VISSIM model has been kept up to date with the inclusion of new traffic surveys and traffic estimates for known committed developments in the Newbury area. Some additional background traffic growth has also been assumed. Also included are all planned highway improvement schemes along the A339 and the A4 and the B3421 link road at Sterling Industrial Estate.

6.5 The VISSIM model has been validated by WBC and agreed to be fit for purpose for assessing existing conditions and the likely future operation of the network with proposed developments and highway mitigation. Validation involves checking that the base model is accurately reflecting conditions measured on the ground.

6.6 The trip rates used to estimate traffic levels for the Appeal Scheme were derived from the trip rates used by the Newbury Racecourse Eastern Area and the West Berkshire Local Development Framework Phase 4 Transport Assessment. The use of these trip rates was agreed with WBC.

6.7 I consider that the agreed trip rates represent a “worst case,” as they do not take into consideration any internalisation of vehicle trips because of having a primary school or local amenities on-site or the implementation of the Travel Plan and sustainable transport measures such as improved public transport accessibility. Furthermore, they take no account of the move to more flexible working which has been accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic. A reasonable estimate is that this could lead to a reduction in peak hour trips of circa 10% as people choose to work at home (or in local hubs) 2 -3 days per week.

6.8 I undertook discussions with WBC to agree the development scenarios to be tested within the VISSIM model. The assessment year was agreed as 2031. Three scenarios were tested:

i) All development within the SSSA (i.e. 1500 units)

ii) The Bloor Homes application only (1000 homes and a 80 bed extra care facility)

iii) The New Warren Farm (Donnington New Homes) application only (500 homes)

6.9 These assessments showed significant impacts on the local highway network, particularly further towards Newbury town centre, with the degree of impact dependent on the scenario being considered.

6.10 There then followed extensive discussions, meetings, and workshops involving myself, colleagues and WBC to further test, revise and agree the proposed highway mitigation.

Agreed Mitigation

6.11 The above discussions led to an agreed mitigation package being developed and this is summarised in the tables below.

6.12 Table 6.1 shows the mitigation that Bloor Homes will provide, mainly though delivering the works through a S278 Agreement with WBC (as highway authority), but also through provision of a contribution towards the A339/Newbury College access works. The appendices containing drawings of the works are shown in column 2. The location of these works is shown at **Figure 10**.

Table 6.1: Sandleford Park (Bloor Homes) Mitigation. All S278 works to be fully funded/delivered by Bloor Homes

Scheme	Drawing	Procured By	Trigger Point (No. of units completed by Bloor Homes) & Responsibility for Delivery
A339/B4640 Swan Roundabout improvements with VMS and A339 PROW Greenham 9 crossing	81311-041-108 (Appendix J)	S278 highway works	Prior to the first occupation of 200 dwellings. Bloor Homes
Rupert Road, Chandos Road and Wendan Road pedestrian improvements	Drawing No. 12985/A/21 (Appendix L)	S278 highway works	Prior to the first occupation of 100 dwellings Bloor Homes
Monks Lane Eastern Site Access	172985_A_07.1 (Appendix B)	S278 highway works	Prior to first occupation of any development. Bloor Homes
Monks Lane Western Site Access	172985_A_08 (Appendix C)	S278 highway works	Following completion of the Eastern Access. Bloor Homes
A339 Access (Newbury College)	4768-SK-100 (Appendix D)	S106 £1,500,000. 100% of contribution to be paid by Bloor Homes	Prior to commencement of development. WBC

6.13 I have included Table 6.2 for information. These are works that will be delivered by Donnington New Homes, the developer of the Warren Farm element of the SSSA. The triggers for these works are still to be agreed between WBC and DNH. The drawings may also be updated as part of the Warren Farm application process.

Table 6.2: Sandleford Park (Donnington New Homes) Mitigation. All S278 works to be fully funded/delivered by Donnington New Homes

Scheme	Drawing	Procured By	WBC anticipated Trigger Point (Number of Units delivered by DNH) & Responsibility For Delivery (details to be agreed between WBC and DNH)

A343 Andover Road – Warren Road to Monks Lane Cycle Route	172985_A_05.2 (Appendix K)	S278 highway works	Prior to first occupation of 100 dwellings Donnington New Homes
A343 Andover Road – Monks Lane to Buckingham Road pedestrian / cycle improvements	18/00828/S278/PHI/OP 1/P3 (Appendix K)	S278 highway works	Prior to first occupation of 100 dwellings Donnington New Homes
A343 Andover Road/Monks Lane Junction	81311-59-001 (Appendix K)	S278 highway works	Prior to first occupation of 100 dwellings Donnington New Homes
A343 access - 4.8 metres wide with 1.5 metre wide footway one side	A090455-SK23 (Appendix K)	S278 highway works	Prior to first occupation of any development. Donnington New Homes
A343 access – 6.0 metres wide with 2.0 metre wide footway both sides	A090455-SK40 (Appendix K)	S278 highway works	Prior to first occupation of 100 dwellings – Donnington New Homes
Kendrick Road emergency access	A090455-SK24 (Appendix K)	S278 highway works	Prior to first occupation of 100 dwellings Donnington New Homes

6.14 Table 6.3 shows the works that are to be jointly funded by Bloor Homes and DNH. The Appellants propose to implement and / or fund the full cost of the junction improvements identified in Table 6.3 if they reach the trigger point first. This ensures that the necessary highway infrastructure is provided. DNH's draft Section 106 includes the principle of proportionate contributions towards this infrastructure. The cost sharing for the combined works will be in the form of recompense or repayment from DNH to the Appellants as part of its planning obligation and the hence the contribution control strip is proposed to ensure this.

Table 6.3: Sandleford Park Mitigation. Items to be secured by whichever development reaches the trigger point first with appropriate mechanism in place to allow the repayment of proportionate costs by the second developer in the future prior to commencement of their development.

Scheme	Drawing	Procured By	Trigger Point (Number of Units delivered within SSSA) & Responsibility For Delivery
Newtown Road / Pound Street and Bartholomew Street / Market Street traffic signals upgrade	N/A	S106. £286,000 (£143,000 for each of two junctions)) BH: 68.35% DNH: 31.65%	WBC to complete the works prior to first occupation of 100 units across the SSSA. Contributions to be made as follows: Prior to Commencement: 100%
A339/A343 St Johns Road Roundabout	172985/A/12 (Appendix I)	S106 £1,532,703 BH: 68.35% DNH: 31.65%	WBC to complete the works prior to occupation of 500 units across the SSSA. Contributions to be made as follows: Prior to Commencement: 5% Prior to Completion of 200 units: 95%
A339/Pinchington Lane/Monks Lane/Newtown Road	172985_A_01 Rev D (Appendix H)	S106 cost £9,861,835* BH: 68.35% DNH: 31.65%	WBC to complete the works prior to the occupation of 1000 units across the SSSA. Contributions to be made as follows: Prior to Commencement: 5%

			Prior to occupation of 700 units across the SSSA: 95%

6.15 There are a number of benefits that derive from this package as follows:

6.16 At the **Swan Roundabout** (A3339/B4640) the enhancement to the junction provides measures to encourage traffic travelling northbound on the A339 to divert along the B4640 to the A34 and avoid the town centre. This is done in the following ways:

i) Signing and lining to encourage traffic to divert to the A34;

ii) Variable message signing activated when there is congestion within Newbury;

iii) Making the northbound carriageway single carriageway to the north of the junction;

iv) Potential reduction of speed to 40MPH to the north of the roundabout

6.17 In addition, the above allows the provision of a right turn lane into St Gabriel's school and provision of a crossing point to link with PROW GREE/9 that connects to the SSSA, thus improving safety at the access.

6.18 The **A339/Newbury College Access** has the advantage of allowing traffic travelling between the SSSA and the A339 south to avoid the Pinchington Lane junction.

6.19 The **A339/Pinchington Lane/Monks Lane/Newtown Road** junction has two key advantages. First it allows for a comprehensive series of Toucan (combined pedestrian and cycle) crossings so that, for example, those living to the west of the A339, including the SSSA can access the Tesco and Retail Park. Secondly traffic approaching from the south can be held at this junction this allowing better management of traffic within Newbury.

VISSIM Model Results

6.20 With the inclusion of the agreed mitigation package that I have summarised above, the VISSIM modelling showed significant improvements to the operation of the highway network.

6.21 The negligible residual impact of the development across the wider network is demonstrated by the average traffic speeds, which remain unchanged in the AM peak and reduce by a negligible 1mph in the PM peak.

6.22 Paragraph 10.4 of the Statement of Common Ground (CD9.1) states that the results of the analysis demonstrate that development of the entire SSSA will not result in a severe impact on the local highway network.

6.23 Analysis was also undertaken of the Appeal Scheme as a stand-alone development i.e. without the New Warren Farm development and with access via Monks Lane and A339/Newbury College but without access via Warren Road. This analysis confirmed that the Warren Road access was not required. Paragraph 10.5 of the Statement of Common Ground (CD 9.1) states that the highway modelling demonstrates that the Appeal Scheme does not require a vehicular access to be constructed onto Warren Road/Andover Road.

6.24 Therefore, in summary, WBC has agreed that the analysis presented within the Transport Assessment that I submitted in support of the application is acceptable and have raised no objection on highways grounds.

A34 Strategic Highway Network

6.25 I have consulted with Highways England and they have now confirmed that they no objection to this application subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

6.26 Hampshire County Council have advised that they have no objection to the proposals. They have orally suggested they may seek a contribution towards improvements to the A339 towards Basingstoke but this has not been confirmed in writing. I do not consider such a contribution to be necessary since the impact of the Appeal Scheme on the A339 East is negligible being 1.5% in the AM peak and 2.7% in the PM peak. No justification has been provided by HCC.

Section Summary

6.27 I consider that the highway mitigation package that has been agreed with WBC strikes the right balance between giving strong encouragement and support to sustainable modes of transport whilst offering some targeted capacity enhancements. In particular, the ability to control traffic at the A339/Pinchington Lane junction will assist in good management of traffic in the town centre. Measures, which will be implemented as part of the Travel Plan such as cycle, bus and rail travel incentives, will also encourage sustainable modes of travel and reduce the reliance on the private car.

7 Reasons for Refusal

7.1 In this section of the proof I consider the transport related Reasons for Refusal raised by WBC. I will address the following Reasons:

i) RfR 1: Comprehensive Development

ii) RfR 2: Emergency access

iii) RfR 6: Valley Crossing and Emergency Access

iv) RfR 7: Strategic Network

v) RfR 14: Mitigation Package

RfR1 - Comprehensive Development

7.2 The council argue in this RfR that the Appeal Scheme should not be permitted in isolation of an approval of an application on the remainder of the SSSA. I refer to the remainder of the SSSA as New Warren Farm (NWF). My response on this RfR should be read in conjunction with the relevant section of the Proof of Evidence of Owen Jones (CD 10.1).

7.3 In relation to transport and movement I believe the tests that should be applied to this RfR to see if it has any merit are:

i) Test 1: Is the Appeal Scheme acceptable in transport terms as a stand-alone scheme or is it dependent on something forming part of or being delivered as part of NWF?

ii) Test 2: Does the infrastructure to be delivered as part of the Appeal Scheme prejudice the delivery of any of the infrastructure that will be delivered as part of NWF?

iii) Test 3: Does approval of the Appeal Scheme and its associated infrastructure put an unacceptable or unbalanced transport infrastructure burden onto NWF.

7.4 **Test 1**: As I have set out in Section 6 of this proof, the assessment of the Appeal Scheme has been undertaken in conjunction with WBC officers. It has been agreed that the appeal scheme is satisfactory if served off three access points (two on Monks lane plus A339/Newbury College access) and the agreed package of mitigation is implemented. Hence it is agreed that there is no need for Warren Road as a vehicular access to serve the development

7.5 If one combines the infrastructure to be provided/funded by the Appeal Scheme (Table 6.1) and by whichever development reaches the trigger point first (Table 6.3 - assumed to be the Appeal Scheme for the sake of this exercise) it can be seen that implementation of the Appeal Scheme delivers the following:

i) 3 access points to the public highway network;

ii) Improvements to A339//Pinchington Lane/Monks Lane/Newtown Road junction; improvements to A339/A343/St Johns Road roundabout; Newtown Road/Pound Street/Bartholomew Street/Market Street signals upgrade; and A339/B4640 Swan roundabout improvements;

iii) Rupert Road, Chandos Road and Wendan Road pedestrian improvements;

iv) Provision of bus services into development from Monks Lane and Andover Road.

7.6 This infrastructure will be provided by the Appeal Scheme with the exception of the bus access via Andover Road. In relation to this, I concur that once the NWF site is built out it is likely to have benefits in taking buses through the site from Monks Lane to Andover Road via Warren Road and vice versa. However, I do not agree that this link is necessary to serve the appeal site. It is very common to have new bus services that enter a site, call at a local centre and then exit the same way.

7.7 **Test 2**: The additional infrastructure that is required for NWF is set out in my Table 6.2 and comprises:

i) Andover Road pedestrian and cycle improvements

ii) Andover Road/Monks lane junction improvements

iii) Warren Road access

iv) Kendrick Road emergency access

7.8 None of these schemes overlap with the infrastructure to be provided as part of the Appeal Scheme and therefore implementation of the appeal scheme infrastructure does not prejudice the future delivery of the NWF infrastructure. Where there would have been prejudice is if Bloor Homes had sought to do a lesser scheme at the areas of overlap (as shown in my Table 6.3). However, Bloor Homes have agreed to implement the full schemes listed in this table and which mitigate the impact of the full development of the SSSA.

7.9 **Test 3**: The infrastructure I have identified above as being directly attributable to NWF is modest in nature i.e. access works and some modest junction and pedestrian/cycle improvements. In addition, NWF will make a contribution to works identified as joint in my Table 6.3. However, this will be a proportionate contribution based on the relative number of homes/traffic generation of the site and therefore will not place a disproportionate burden on the NWF scheme.

7.10 I conclude from the above that all three tests are satisfied and therefore there is no basis for refusing the appeal scheme on the basis of a lack of comprehensive development from a transport perspective.

7.11 The RfR 1 states that the development fails to provide adequate certainty that the proposal will deliver "*the co-ordinated and timely delivery of the associated infrastructure*". I consider that my analysis presented above demonstrates that this is not the case and, in fact, considerable care has gone into ensuring a proper co-ordination of infrastructure between the two elements of the SSSA.

7.12 In relation to the relevant policies quoted in the RfR:

7.13 **Core Strategy Policy CS5**: This refers to the desire to co-ordinate infrastructure delivery – which, as I have set out above, has been the approach adopted for the SSSA.

7.14 **Core Strategy Policy CS13**: There is nothing in this policy that supports a RfR of the appeal scheme on the basis of a lack of comprehensive development. The policies require, inter alia:

i) Good access to key services and facilities. As I have demonstrated in Section 5, this is the case with the Appeal Scheme;

ii) Minimise the impact of all forms of travel on the environment and help tackle climate change. The Appeal Schemes satisfies this requirement with its Sustainable Transport Strategy which is not dependent on the NWF scheme proceeding;

iii) To mitigate the impact on the local transport network and the strategic road network. There is an agreed mitigation package which will be fully delivered by the Appeal Scheme.

7.15 **Core Strategy Policy CS14**: Key elements of this policy related to transport are as follows:

i) make good provision for access by all transport modes. The Appeal Scheme makes excellent provision for all transport modes;

ii) give priority to pedestrian and cycle access providing linkages and integration with surrounding uses and open spaces. As I have explained in Section 5 the appeal site is very well connected to the surrounding area, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists. This linkage is not dependent on the NWF scheme proceeding although additional links through that site will be provided in due course.

7.16 Therefore, I conclude that this RfR is not sound since it does not satisfy the tests I have applied and the relevant policies, as quoted in the RfR are not contravened.

RfR 2 – Emergency Access

7.17 This reason for refusal states the unacceptable proposal of piecemeal development of only part of the SSSA gives rise to the need for unnecessary mitigation, which itself would result in harmful impact arising from, for example, the proposed emergency access proposals for development parcel central incorporated as part of the Central Valley crossing structure and also the widened cycleway through the country parkland. (my underlining)

7.18 In relation to the widened cycleway, other witnesses will deal with the environmental impacts of these proposals. However, I would note that a cycle route alongside the PROW forms part of the sustainable transport strategy linking the site to the A339 and St Gabriel's school and this is supported by WBC transport officers. To make this route suitable for an emergency access the width has been increased by only a small amount from circa 3m to 3.7m. The additional 0.7m will comprise a geogrid covered by grass, thus providing an available emergency route width of 3.7m which is in accordance with guidance for an emergency access. I would add that this emergency route will only be provided if agreed to be necessary by WBC and the emergency services at detailed design stage.

7.19 In relation to the central valley crossing, a number of options have been presented for delivering this solution. Option 3 provides a separate walking and cycling route that doubles up as an emergency access. Paul Goddard, WBC highways officer has agreed that, from a highways perspective, this provides an acceptable emergency access route.

RfR 6 – Development Parcel Central (DPC) Access

7.20 There are two elements to this RfR from a transport perspective. The first relates to operational access to the DPC and the second to emergency access.

7.21 In relation to operational access, the reason for refusal states "*DPC would stand as an island with a single point of the he can access being via the Central Valley crossing from the North East, forming a very large cul de sac. This is considered inadequate in urban design terms, in respect of permeability and connectivity*".

7.22 The starting point for my consideration of this reason for refusal is the Statement of Common Ground (CD 9.1). This states that "*The highways modelling demonstrates that the proposed development as part of this appeal does not require a vehicular access to be constructed onto Warren Road/Andover Road*".

7.23 Therefore, the council is in agreement that an access to Warren Road is not required for the appeal scheme and in particular DPC to proceed. Furthermore, the consultation response from the WBC highways officer (Paul Goddard) of 8th September does not make it a requirement to have an access to Warren Road. His comments are focused on the emergency access point.

7.24 In fact, Mr Goddard comments favourably on the layout stating "*I'm generally content that the layout complies with guidance set in the governments Manual for Streets. The layout includes loops and grids to spread traffic through the site*

including the link south of Crooks Copse that I am pleased to see." (Paragraph 3, WBC Highways Consultation Response, 8th September 2020)

7.25 Furthermore, at paragraph 10.5 of the Statement of Common Ground (CD 9.1) states *"highway modelling demonstrates that the proposed development as part of this appeal does not require a vehicular access to be constructed onto Warren Road/Andover Road".*

7.26 Turning to the substance of the reason for refusal, there are no set limits on the size of a development that can be served by a single access. In my experience, it is not uncommon to have a development of circa 500 units served from a single access point.

7.27 The particular points raised in the RfR are that there would be inadequate permeability and connectivity with a single access. However, I consider there will be good quality walking and cycling provision across the valley which means that residents of DPC will be able to access the northern part of the development and in particular the primary school. The school will be within a **980m** distance of the furthest property within the DPC. For those living within the northern development areas, they will also be able to use the walking and cycling route to access DPC and in particular the local centre.

7.28 In addition to the above, there is the upgraded PROW GREE/9 which provides access to both the west and east. To the west this links to Warren Road and thus Andover Road via the PROW NEWB5/1. This connection exists and does not need the NWF element of the SSSA to proceed. If for any reason NWF did not proceed in a timely manner then the highway authority have the powers to upgrade the surfacing of the route.

To the east, the PROW links to the A339 and St Gabriel's School via a new pedestrian crossing across the A339.

7.29 Therefore, there is good connectivity and permeability provided within the site without the need for the vehicular link to Warren Road.

7.30 Turning to emergency access, in relation to the potential emergency access using the valley crossing, the RfR states "*satisfactory emergency access could only be provided in this case in the form of two separate and independent access road structures across the entire width of the central valley. The applicants illustrative solution is for a substantial earthworks embankment bridge instead*".

7.31 I have dealt with the transport issues related to this RfR in Section 4 of my proof where I have demonstrated that a number of options exist for providing suitable emergency access with separate structures being created. WBC' highways officer, Paul Goddard, is content with Option 3.

RfR 7 – Strategic Road Impact

7.32 Highways England have now withdrawn their objection (Ref: 88973) and the Council have therefore withdrawn this Reason for Refusal.

RfR 14 – Mitigation Package

7.33 In response to the objection that there is not an agreed mitigation package, in relation to transport, the Statement of Common Ground (CD 9.1) advises the following:

7.34 *With the implementation of the mitigation set out in the response to the application by the Local Highway Authority provided on 8th September 2020, the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would not be severe*.

7.35 Furthermore, the highway officers' consultation response of 8 September lists the required mitigation and I have reproduced this in Section 6 of this proof (with some updates on triggers and funding). The Appellants propose to implement and / or fund the full cost of the junction improvements identified as necessary for the Appeal Scheme (Table 6.1) and those measures which arise from the combined developments (Table 6.3). This ensures that the necessary highway infrastructure is provided. DNH's draft Section 106 includes the principle of proportionate contributions towards the infrastructure in Table 6.3. The cost sharing for the combined works will be in the form of recompense or repayment from DNH to the Appellants as part of its planning obligation and the hence the contribution control strip is proposed to ensure this.

7.36 I therefore conclude that there is no justification for this RfR in relation to transport mitigation.

Section Summary

7.37 In this section I have demonstrated that there is no basis for the transport related Reasons for Refusal raised by the Council.

8 Third Party Objections

8.1 In this section I focus on the documents submitted by the two Rule 6 parties i.e. Greenham Parish Council/Newbury Town Council and SayNoToSandleford (snts).

Greenham Parish Council and Newbury Town Council Statement of Case

8.2 Paras 2.A.3 and 4: The council appear to be expressing concern over the access to Andover Road. However, as I have set out in Section 6 of my proof, it is agreed with WBC that the Warren Road access is not required for the Appeal Scheme.

8.3 Para 3.1: In relation to "active travel", the appeal scheme fully reflects current thinking. I have set out a full Sustainable Transport Strategy at Section 5 of my proof with an emphasis on active modes. A full Travel Plan was submitted with the application and a contribution will be made to WBC through the S106 UU to allow them to undertake comprehensive travel planning across the SSSA area.

8.4 Para 3.2/3.3: In addition to the primary school, a local centre is also to be provided and I also set out in Section 5 of my proof the local facilities that are available within walking distance of the site. The VISSIM modelling did not take into account the internalisation of trip due to the provision of the primary school and local centre and therefore gives a robust analysis.

8.5 Para 3.4/3.5: I have provided a detailed assessment of travel distances and times to local facilities in Section 5 of my proof.

8.6 Para 3.6: A comprehensive approach has been taken towards provision of walking and cycling infrastructure. For example, combined walking and cycling crossings are provided within the A339/Pinchington Lane/Monks Lane/Newtown Road junction.

8.7 Para 3.10: the cycle facilities along Monks Lane will be maintained with the introduction of the access points and the cycling facilities on site will tie into the existing cycle lane during the detailed design.

SayNoToSandleford Statement of Case

8.8 Section 6: It is important to note that the PROW has not been unnecessarily widened. In fact, a new cycle route has been provided adjacent to the PROW to maintain the PROW's integrity. Similarly, the Valley Crossing provides for a standard vehicular carriageway and separate walking and cycling route. A similar width crossing is still required even when an access via Warren Road is provided.

8.9 Section 7: No concerns have been raised by any of the highway authorities and in particular Highways England over the performance and safety of the A34/A343 junction. There was concluded to be no material impact on the junction from the development.

8.10 Traffic modelling takes full account of committed developments in the area, in accordance with best practice.

9 Summary and Conclusions

9.1 I conclude my evidence in the paragraphs below.

Site Location

9.2 The Appeal Site is very well located for the proposed mixed-use development from a transport perspective for the following reasons:

i) It is located within reasonable proximity of the town centre being a circa 30 minute walk, 8 minute cycle and 5-7 minute bus journey away;

ii) There are numerous local facilities within an easy walk of the site including: a health centre; nursery, primary and secondary education; food and non-food retail;

iii) There are good sustainable transport connections including: local walking and cycling routes (there are at least 5 connections to/from the site) with the options to improve them; and bus routes that run on the roads to the north, east and west of the site. The rail station is circa 2km to the north of the site;

iv) The site has good connections to the highway network at 3 locations. This means that traffic can access the main road network without rat running along unsuitable roads.

Sustainable Transport Strategy

9.3 Building on these locational benefits, a Sustainable Transport Strategy has been developed that has the following key benefits.

Masterplan

9.4 A mix of uses is provided on the site with a Local Centre and primary school. This will allow residents to walk to these facilities thus reducing external trips and promoting active travel and a healthy life-style. The Local Centre has a flexible use which would allow, for example, a work hub to be created allowing people to work remotely close to home but meet with other people.

Walking and Cycling

9.5 There are good local connections around the site which will be further enhanced by the proposals. In summary:

i) East/west connections along Monks Lane using the shared footway/cycleway

ii) An upgraded Pinchington Lane/Newtown Road/A339 junction that incorporates Toucan (pedestrian/cyclist) crossings allowing pedestrians and cyclists to pass to the east of the A339 and the retail facilities that are available there;

iii) North/south routes towards the town centre using Newtown Road and Rupert Road/Wendan Road (which will have some enhancements introduced using funding from the Appeal Scheme);

iv) Upgrading of the existing PROW that runs through the southern part of the site providing a link to Andover Road to the west and A339 to the east;

v) Provision of wayfinding signage.

Public Transport

9.6 There are existing bus services in the vicinity of the site. This provision will be enhanced by a new service that will serve the site. Initially this is likely to terminate at the local centre but once the New Warren Farm development proceeds the route is likely to pass through the SSSA to Andover Road. Services will be provided to the town centre, rail station and Greenham Business Park. The service will become self-financing prior to full build out of the development. Appropriate funding will be provided by the Appellant and Donnington New Homes to pump prime the services.

Travel Plan

9.7 A Travel Plan will be implemented on the site which will strongly encourage residents and visitors to use sustainable transport modes for their journeys both on and off site.

The Effects of the Development and Mitigation Package

9.8 Extensive discussions have been held with WBC to determine an appropriate mitigation package that balances providing additional traffic capacity with a desire to control traffic movements outside the town centre and provide enhanced pedestrian and cyclist crossing facilities.

9.9 The agreed package of highway mitigation achieves the above objectives and provides a number of benefits. For example:

i) enhanced pedestrian and cyclist crossing facilities in Pinchington Lane area;

ii) allows WBC to control traffic heading north towards the town centre;

iii) Diversion of traffic towards A34 and away from the town centre;

iv) Relief to A339/Pinchington Lane junction due to new A339/Newbury College access.

9.10 The Appellants propose to implement and / or fund the full cost of the junction improvements identified as necessary for the Appeal Scheme (Table 6.1) and those measures which arise from the combined developments (Table 6.3). This ensures that the necessary highway infrastructure is provided. Donnington New Homes draft Section 106 includes the principle of proportionate contributions towards the infrastructure in Table 6.3. The cost sharing for the combined works will be in the form of recompense or repayment from Donnington New Homes to the Appellants as part of its planning obligation and the hence the contribution control strip is proposed to ensure this.

9.11 With implementation of the mitigation package WBC have agreed that the traffic effects of the scheme are acceptable.

Reasons for Refusal

9.12 A number of Reasons for Refusal have a transport element and I have considered these fully in this proof of evidence. In summary:

RfR 1 – Comprehensive Development: In relation to transport and movement I believe the tests that should be applied to this RfR to see if it has any merit are as follows:

i) Test 1: Is the appeal scheme acceptable in transport terms as a stand alone scheme or is it dependent on something forming part of or being delivered as part of the remainder of the SSSA? It has been agreed with WBC that the effects of the Appeal Scheme are mitigated by the mitigation package delivered by the Appeal Scheme and is not reliant on the remainder of the SSSA proceeding. It has also been agreed that the Appeal Scheme can be served from the three proposed access points (Monks Lane and A339)

ii) Test 2: Does the infrastructure to be delivered as part of the appeal scheme prejudice the delivery of any of the infrastructure that will be delivered as part of the remainder of the SSSA? I have demonstrated that this is not the case. Where there is overlap in the mitigation required for the Appeal Scheme and the remainder of the SSSA then Bloor Homes have undertaken to initially fund that infrastructure if they reach the trigger point first;

iii) Test 3: Does approval of the appeal scheme and its associated infrastructure put an unacceptable or unbalanced transport infrastructure burden onto the remainder of the SSSA. I have demonstrated that this is not the case. There is an agreed split in infrastructure provision between the Appeal Scheme and the remainder of the SSSA with proportional splits in the common infrastructure.

RfR 2 – Emergency Access. I have demonstrated, by reference to the Valley Crossing Study submitted as part of the Appellants Statement of Case (CD 5.1), that emergency access can be provided in a number of ways. It can be provided across the valley using any of the three potential options with dual structures thus allowing for the emergency access during maintenance. Option 3 has been agreed by WBC's highways officer. Alternatively, emergency access can be provided using the cycle route to be provided alongside the existing PROW that links to the A339.

RfR 6 – DPC Access. There is a suggestion in this RfR that the DPC cannot be served by the single access that will be provided by the Appeal Scheme. This is not the position agreed with WBC within the Statement of Common Ground (CD 9.1) which states that a vehicular access to Warren Road is not required as part of the Appeal Scheme. Furthermore, the Reason for Refusal states that the issue is a lack of permeability and connectivity. However, I demonstrated in Section 7 of this proof that good quality connectivity can be achieved within the site and to locations off site using the valley crossing and the upgraded PROW.

RfR 14 Mitigation Package. The transport mitigation package has been agreed with WBC along with the split between the elements to be provided/funded by the Appeal Scheme and the remainder of the SSSA.

Overall Conclusions

9.13 To draw my overall conclusions, I have returned to the relevant policies, as summarised in my Section 3 of this proof

9.14 The starting point is the NPPF. I have set out the key policies from NPPF below with a summary of how the Appeal Scheme complies with them

9.15 Para 108: in assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

"a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location; A Sustainable transport strategy has been developed for the site which maximises the opportunities for use of sustainable modes. This allows access to local facilities by walking and cycling and access to local bus services.

b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and. The access points for the Appeal Scheme have been agreed with WBC and are available and suitable for all users including the mobility impaired.

c) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree." A mitigation package has been agreed with WBC that cost effectively mitigate the impacts of the development.

Within the above context it is stated that all applications for developments should:

"a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use; The Sustainable Transport Strategy and site layout will give priority to walking and cycling and will enhance local bus services

b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; The access points and internal layout (to the extent that it has been designed) address the needs of those with disabilities and reduced mobility.

c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character." The on-site layout is a reserved matter but these principles will be applied at the appropriate time.

Para 109:

"Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe". It is agreed with WBC that the impact of the Appeal Scheme does not have an unacceptable impact on safety or a severe impact on the capacity of the road network.

9.16 Turning to the adopted Core Strategy, Policy CS13 sets out the main requirements from a transport perspective. The policy, along with the way in which the Appeal Scheme complies with the different elements, is set out below:

Development that generates a transport impact will be required to:

a) reduce the need to travel: The Appeal Scheme provides a mix of uses on site including a Local Centre and primary school;

b) improve and promote opportunities for healthy and safe travel. The Appeal Scheme places an emphasis on walking and cycling within the site and provides connections to existing routes external to the site along with proposed improvements;

c) improve travel choice and facilitate sustainable travel particularly within and between main urban areas and rural service centres. Sustainable travel is facilitated, particularly between the site and local facilities including the town centre and rail station;

d) demonstrate good access to key services and facilities. Many facilities such as education, food and non food retail and health are within walking distance of the site;

e) minimise the impact of all forms of travel on the environment, A full Environmental Statement was submitted with the planning application. The location of the site close to local facilities and the emphasis on sustainable transport will reduce the residual levels of traffic and hence environmental impacts. Furthermore, the proposals allow traffic to be held on the outskirts of the town thus reducing impacts within the town itself;

f) mitigate the impact on the local transport network and the strategic road network: The proposed sustainable transport and highway mitigation package, that is agreed with WBC, mitigates the impact of the development on the local and strategic networks;

g) prepare Transport Assessments/Statements and Travel Plans to support planning proposals in accordance with national guidance. These documents were prepared and submitted with the application.

9.17 I have therefore demonstrated that the Appeal Scheme complies with national and local policies. The scheme offers considerable transport benefits and there are no unacceptable residual impacts. Therefore, there is no transport related basis for dismissing the appeal.