



Peter Evans Partnership  
Transport Planning & Highway Consultants

19<sup>th</sup> February 2024

3305R/AJK

New Forest District Council; and  
Appletree Court.  
Lyndhurst  
Hampshire  
SO43 7PA

New Forest NPA  
Town Hall  
Avenue Road  
Lymington  
SO41 9ZG

Dear Sirs

### **APPLICATION 22/11424 – LAND EAST OF LOWER PENNINGTON LANE, LYMINGTON**

We have been appointed by PALLS to review the transport and highway elements of the residential proposals for land east of Lower Pennington Lane, Lymington. Our latest review considers the Hampshire County Council (HCC) Highways consultation response dated 6<sup>th</sup> February 2024 in reference to the applicants submitted Transport Assessment and Walking, Cycling, and Horse-riding Assessment and Review (WCHAR) both dated September 2023.

Given that the application seeks the approval of access at this stage the approach of HCC as highways authority to leave these matters to the detailed design stage once permission is granted is not satisfactory. The inadequacy of the existing highway network local to the site, the sensitivity of the site to residents, the ecology issues with the scheme, lack of confirmation that footpaths/cycleway and site junctions can be provided either by agreement and/or within the redline all mean that it would not be appropriate to determine the application with these issues of principle unresolved and the application should be refused.

Following previous objections raised with the scheme, we still wish to reiterate our objections regarding the following areas:

- Suitability of access for pedestrians and cyclists and ability to achieve these;
- Suitability of vehicle access;
- Off-site highway works and contributions;
- Traffic impact;
- Safety of future and existing residents which would be contrary to NPPF;
- Highway access and footpath/cycle path works outside the redline and the ownership of the applicant; and
- Environment and ecological impact of the transport works not considered.

#### **Suitability of Access for Pedestrians and Cyclists**

HCC raise a concern with the proposed footpath link to Forest Gate Gardens and the crossing location on Ridgeway Lane in reference to the associated impact on trees, hedgerows and the ditch on Ridgeway Lane. However, go on to state these matters could be dealt with during the detailed design. Given the reliance on this pedestrian route by the applicant we still have concerns whether this pedestrian route can be achieved. Therefore, I am surprised that this is not required to be addressed at this stage.

Cont'd.

21 Richmond Hill, Clifton, Bristol BS8 1BA Tel: 0117 973 4355 Fax 0117 973 2793  
mail@pep-bristol.co.uk www.pep-bristol.co.uk

Peter Evans Partnership Limited.

Directors: Andrew J Kenyon BEng FCIHT Hilary R Vaughan BEng CEng MICE FCIHT Mark E Callaghan MCIHT

Associates: Helen M Stephens BSc MCIHT James Chequer BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI MCIHT MCILT

Consultant: Peter L Evans BEng Msc CEng MICE FCIHT MCILT

Registered in England and Wales No.4373557. Registered Office: 21 Richmond Hill, Clifton, Bristol BS8 1BA



As with our previous response, HCC also raise concerns with regards to the proposed footpath/cycle path connection to Ridgeway Lane in the centre of the eastern site boundary, with concerns raised in terms of the visibility achievable, and whether the route can be physically achieved because of driveway gates and utilities in the vicinity.

The scheme continues to rely on the provision of a footpath/cycle path through Woodside Park, yet still no evidence has been put forward to confirm that this can be achieved, especially given that the Town Council have already stated that they have only agreed this route on the principle it would be for pedestrians. Road safety concerns with the pedestrian connection to the north of the park to Rookes Lane also remain. The only confirmed cycle routes from the site would therefore be on-road. This does not provide safe and suitable access for all cyclists and therefore is contrary to LTN1/20. It is unclear how the applicant aims to overcome this matter.

Therefore, the applicant cannot demonstrate that there are any suitable or achievable pedestrian or cycle connections to Ridgeway Lane and beyond to the north east.

We remain unconvinced that the footway now proposed on Lower Pennington Lane can be practically or safely achieved. We note this concern is shared by HCC. However, even if achievable there are no proposals to improve the public footpath from the site to Lower Pennington Lane, and therefore a suitable continuous pedestrian route is not proposed. HCC has requested a financial contribution to the upgrading of this footpath, but as yet we have seen no commitment to this from the applicant.

The proposed footpath links and crossings all result in significant amount of tree/hedgerow loss along Ridgeway Lane and Lower Pennington Lane. This needs to be considered by the District Council, HCC and the National Park Authority ecologists as to whether this would be acceptable or even possible. If as likely the tree/hedgerows were cut back/removed this would alter the nature of the lanes, especially Ridgeway Lane, which in turn would impact on the speed of vehicles, increasing speeds on the approaches to the pedestrian crossing points proposed.

Suitable Road Safety Audits have still not been undertaken for the proposals along Lower Pennington Lane or Ridgeway Lane to determine whether there would be a road safety risk relating to the increased vehicle, pedestrian, and cycle movements, especially in relation to the narrow nature of the lanes and the adjacent ditches.

Therefore, where infrastructure is proposed in order to improve pedestrian and cycle accessibility to the site these designs have not been thoroughly assessed in terms of whether or not they meet the appropriate design and road safety criteria. We are therefore objecting in terms of the deliverability and safety of the pedestrian and cycle routes proposed.

The assessment undertaken still does not confirm that suitable access is provided for all road users.

### **Suitability of Vehicle Access**

Unless a new redline boundary for the application has now been submitted, which we have not been able to find on the planning portal, the Ridgeway Lane/Poles Lane access still includes land outside of public highway or the formal redline boundary of the planning submission. The HCC consultation response also makes reference to revised site access design drawings being submitted for the Ridgeway Lane/Poles Lane junction proposals. However, these do not seem to be in the public domain for others to review/comment and we would ask for them to be disclosed in order that third parties can view and comment as appropriate. It remains unclear as to whether the applicant is able to deliver the proposed site access junctions within public highway or land they control. Therefore, it has not been demonstrated that the scheme has a valid access or one that could be subject to planning conditions.