



Peter Evans Partnership  
**Transport Planning  
& Highway Consultants**

Proposed Residential Development  
Land East of Lower Pennington Lane  
Lymington  
Application ref: 22/11424

Transport Review of  
Planning Application Submission

February 2023

21 Richmond Hill, Clifton  
Bristol BS8 1BA  
Tel: 0117 973 4355  
Fax: 0117 973 2793  
[mail@pep-bristol.co.uk](mailto:mail@pep-bristol.co.uk)  
[www.pep-bristol.co.uk](http://www.pep-bristol.co.uk)

Peter Evans Partnership Limited  
Registered in England and Wales  
No.4373657  
Registered Office: Bath House,  
6-8 Bath Street, Bristol, BS1 6HL

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Aim of Note

1.1.1 An outline planning application with details of access and layout only for the development of 82 residential properties on land east of Lower Pennington Lane, Lymington, was submitted to New Forest District Council and New Forest National Park Authority in December 2023, application references 22/11424, and 22/01024OUT.

1.1.2 Peter Evans Partnership (PEP) has been appointed by the Pennington and Lymington Lane Society (PALLS) to review the proposals from a transport perspective. To undertake this review we have considered the information and drawings provided in the Transport Assessment (TA) July 2021 prepared by Bright Plan.

1.1.3 This note considers the following elements of the application submission:

- site accessibility for non-car users;
- suitability of pedestrian, cycle and vehicle access proposed;
- internal transport matters including road layout, pedestrian routes, parking;
- traffic generation and impact; and
- off site highway works design, suitability, and achievability.

1.1.4 We have previously provided PALLS with a review of an earlier version of the scheme proposals and have undertaken an independent Safety Assessment. Whether or not any of the issues we have previously addressed have now been resolved is also considered.

1.1.5 As with previous reviews we have also considered whether the proposals accord with the key transport tests of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) July 2021 including:

- suitable site accessibility by all modes of transport;
- if a safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users; and
- what is the safety and cumulative traffic impact of the development, and is this 'severe'.

---

## **2.0 APPLICATION REVIEW**

### **2.1 Wider Site Accessibility and Road Safety**

#### **Site Accessibility**

2.1.1 Whilst the TA has identified a range of facilities are within a 2km walk of the site there is no assessment as to whether the routes between the site and the facilities are actually suitable for pedestrians to use. This is also the case for suitability of routes for cyclists. The PEP Safety Assessment undertaken in December 2021 identified shortcomings in the pedestrian routes to local facilities, including inadequate crossing infrastructure on the A337, none of which seem to be addressed as part of the proposals. Some potential new pedestrian/cycle routes close to the site are shown in the application material however outside the planning application red line.

2.1.2 Therefore, from the submitted information it cannot be confirmed whether local facilities are accessible from the site for non-car users, and therefore the site does not meet national planning policy on sustainable transport as set out in NPPF.

#### **Road Safety Review**

2.1.3 The road safety records used in the assessment only covers a period up to April 2021. Accident data will be available to at least up to the end of 2021 and potentially more recent data would also be available. Up to date accident data should be assessed to understand the current conditions on the local roads.

2.1.4 Historic accident records identified a number of accidents at the A337/Ridgeway Lane roundabout involving cyclists. The proposals would increase both the volume of motorised vehicles and cyclists at this junction. However, this road safety matter has not been addressed in the application.

#### **Summary**

2.1.5 The submission has not confirmed that the site is sustainable in terms of transport accessibility to local facilities and whether road safety matters on the wider road network have been addressed, contrary to NPPF.

## 2.2 Access Design

### Pedestrian/Cycle Access to Ridgeway Lane

- 2.2.1 A proposed footpath/cycle path is shown from the site to Forest Gate Gardens to the north. However, this is not included in the redline boundary of the application therefore it is not clear how this is to be secured as part of the proposals. It is understood from information provided at Appendix G of the TA that this land is owned by New Forest District Council, leased to Lymington and Pennington Town Council, and is designated as public open space. Whilst Appendix G includes a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between the ownership parties that there is agreement to a link being provided, this does not mean that a lit surfaced foot/cycle path can be provided through the land and in any event it would not have planning consent. However, the scheme relies on this route to provide a pedestrian and cycle route out of the site.
- 2.2.2 It is also noted that the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Constabulary have also raised concerns with the footpath link between the site and Forest Gate Gardens, noting that there is limited natural surveillance of this route, the route is not straight so users cannot see the other end, and is not proposed to be lit.
- 2.2.3 The pedestrian/cycle Access strategy drawing 2020-6181-114 incorrectly notes that there is an existing footway along the western side of Ridgeway Lane to the north of Forest Gate Gardens. This is misleading as suggests that with the connection from the site to Forest Gate Gardens a continuous footway route is then available to facilities to the north. This is not the case.
- 2.2.4 The existing pedestrian access into Woodside Park opposite Forest Gate Gardens is to be marginally relocated, with new dropped kerbs/tactile paving provided on each side of Ridgeway Lane proposed. Visibility splays have been shown on drawing 2020-6181-118. However, the calculation of these splays is using the speed surveys recorded on Ridgeway Lane just north of Poles Lane some 450m to the south. This is a narrower section of lane near a bend. The nature of the lane in the location of the proposed crossing is different to that where the speed survey was undertaken, and this would alter the speeds that vehicles are travelling. It is therefore not demonstrated that appropriate visibility splays are being shown at the new crossing location on Ridgeway Lane by Forest Gate Gardens.
- 2.2.5 The proposed pedestrian route from the site to the A337 is therefore convoluted, requiring residents to leave the site via a potential link to Forest Gate Gardens and then to walk north east through Woodside Park, to then continue west along Rookes Lane towards the A337. Instead residents are more likely walk along the 85m of Ridgeway Lane between Forest Gate Gardens and the Rookes Lane junction. Therefore, the proposed pedestrian route, if even possible to be provided, is not on the desire line.

- 2.2.6 A footpath/cycle path is proposed from the centre of the site to Ridgeway Lane, crossing the lane to connect to a new footpath/cycle path through Woodside Park to the north east. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving are proposed to provide a formal crossing location. Visibility splays have been shown on drawing 2020-6181-118. However, the calculation of these splays also uses the speed surveys recorded on Ridgeway Lane north of Poles Lane, some 250m to the south. The nature of the lane is different in the location of the crossing and would alter the speeds that vehicles are travelling. It is therefore not confirmed whether appropriate visibility splays can be achieved along Ridgeway Lane in this location. The current splays shown on the design can only just be achieved within the site ownership/highway land and therefore if vehicles are identified to be travelling faster in this location an appropriate splay would not be achievable without third party land.
- 2.2.7 The route through the park has not been included in the red line of the planning application and it is not clear how this is to be secured as part of the proposals. It is understood from information provided at Appendix G of the TA that this land is owned by Lymington and Pennington Town Council. Whilst Appendix G includes a SoCG between the ownership parties that there is agreement to a link being provided, this does not mean that a surfaced footpath/cycle path can be provided through the land. As there is no mention of lighting it is assumed the route would also not be lit. Therefore, this route would not be a suitable route after dark. The route would also be secluded with no natural surveillance at times when the park was not occupied and therefore could raise concerns of personal safety. This would discourage walking trips to/from the site after sunset.
- 2.2.8 Where the proposed footpath/cycle path meets Rookes Lane to the north visibility splays are shown. However, no speed surveys have been undertaken along Rookes Lane. Therefore, the assessment to date does not demonstrate that the splays shown would be acceptable for the speeds of vehicles passing along Rookes Lane. The splay is also shown outside the public highway and therefore it is not clear if the splay shown can be achieved in any event.
- 2.2.9 At the end of each of the proposed footpath/cycle paths 'end of cycle route' signs are proposed. However, there is no proposed transition to allow cyclists to then continue on road. In practice cyclists are unlikely to dismount, but to try to move through the barriers proposed to reach the highway beyond to continue their journeys on road.
- 2.2.10 The footpath/cycle route does not reference the design guidance in LTN1/20 and therefore it unclear whether the scheme is adequate in any event.

2.2.11 Tree and hedgerow removal would be required to achieve visibility at crossing points. Along Ridgeway Lane this would be partly within the public highway but there would be impact on third party trees. However, at the northern end of Woodside Park this would be on park land and again it is not clear if this is achievable.

### **Ridgeway Lane Vehicle Access**

2.2.12 The proposed vehicle access on to Ridgeway Lane shown on drawing 2020-6181-102 is a simple priority junction. However, it is also proposed to realign the lane in the vicinity of the adjacent Poles Lane junction. These proposals involve land which is not identified as highway and not in the red line of the application site for either New Forest District Council or New Forest National Park Authority applications. Therefore, the proposed access design and road realignment cannot be achieved as part of the current application being put forward.

2.2.13 The redline plan submitted for the New Forest National Park Authority application is also misleading as it includes the proposed alignment of Ridgeway Lane/Poles Lane junction rather than the existing road layout in this location, suggesting that the redline abuts the existing public highway, which is not the case.

2.2.14 Even if the applicant revisits their application boundary and third party land ownership, visibility splays at the proposed Ridgeway Lane access have been calculated using traffic surveys from 2017. The pre-application response from HCC highways dated 19<sup>th</sup> February 2021 notes that new speed survey data is required. Therefore, the junction design should not be considered further until new speed data is provided.

2.2.15 A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was undertaken by Road Safety Answers in August 2021 covering the two vehicle access points, plus the separate pedestrian/cycle accesses. Only two 'problems' were raised, with no queries raised for either vehicle access. The limited quantity of comments received on a previous Audit at the site, when the Audit covered a number of access points was raised as a concern by the highway authority. PEP's own Safety Assessment undertaken in December 2021 identified that at the Ridgeway Lane junction whilst realigning the lane would enable the site access and Poles Lane junction to be provided to a more suitable standard, this in turn could increase vehicle speeds in this locality as the road is being straightened. This has not been taken into consideration in the design or visibility splays proposed.

2.2.16 The changes to the Poles Lane/ Ridgeway Lane junction would in turn make this a more attractive route to use to the marinas and quay from the local residential areas and caravan park, thus increasing traffic through this junction, and also through the site.

2.2.17 A significant amount of tree and hedgerow removal would be required to achieve the realigned lane and visibility at the junctions along Ridgeway Lane.

---

## **Pedestrian Access to Lower Pennington Lane**

- 2.2.18 There has been no consideration as to the suitability of pedestrian access from the site to the west/north west on to Lower Pennington Lane. This includes no consideration of the Public Right of Way (PRoW) from the site to Lower Pennington Lane to the north west, with the proposed layout showing new homes being constructed across the existing PRoW route. A diverted route is suggested, but this assumes an adjacent development comes forward. Any footpath diversion should not rely on other developments.
- 2.2.19 However, in any event the existing PRoW, even if retained as an unsurfaced path, is on the desire line to Lower Pennington Lane and facilities to the north west. The use of this route and the quality of Lower Pennington Lane beyond therefore needs consideration.
- 2.2.20 Lower Pennington Lane is poorly lit with no footway provision. The lane is also not well overlooked and so the secluded nature of this route is an issue for pedestrians. The quality of the route in terms of surfacing and drainage is also poor.
- 2.2.21 As no pedestrian improvements are proposed on Lower Pennington Lane pedestrians, cyclists, cars, and service vehicles would share the same space – a shared street. Shared streets are typically only recommended when vehicle speeds are at or lower than 20mph. Speed surveys recorded 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of 25.5mph and 27.1mph, which are significantly higher than would be recommended for a shared street. MfS paragraph 7.2.14 also states that shared surface streets are only likely to work when traffic flows are less than 100 vehicles per hour at peak times. The 2017 ATCs recorded two-way flows over in excess of 100 vehicles per hour on Lower Pennington Lane. Therefore, even without adding further traffic from the development Lower Pennington Lane does not provide a safe and suitable access for all users. The shared space route would also include through traffic to the Hurst View caravan park and car park near the marshes to the south.

## **Pennington Lane Vehicle Access**

- 2.2.22 Whilst the design of this access indicates that the required visibility splays can be provided. There would need to be significant tree and hedge loss to achieve this.

## **Summary**

- 2.2.23 Safe and suitable accesses cannot be achieved for all road users and therefore the site is not in line with NPPF. Pedestrian access routes in particular raise issues of both personal and road safety.

---

## 2.3 Internal Site Layout

- 2.3.1 As noted earlier detailed consideration has not been given to the existing public rights of way across the site. This needs to be addressed.
- 2.3.2 The legibility of the streets for pedestrians is poor. For example, the in southern part of the site a footway is only proposed on the southern side of the street, whereas the residential properties are along the north. This would mean residents would need to walk along the carriageway where vehicles would not expect them to be. The transition from carriageway/footway to shared space is also unclear and would be extremely difficult for pedestrians especially young, elderly, and disabled to navigate. In general the internal layout is not fit for purpose for pedestrians.
- 2.3.3 In general the street layout within the site is very tight. Some of the streets are not of sufficient width to enable vehicles to satisfactorily enter/leave parking bays without cars overhanging adjacent footways. The main access road is also not of sufficient width to satisfactorily enable a car to pass a refuse vehicle on the bends, with some junctions also not able to satisfactorily accommodate a refuse vehicle turning.
- 2.3.4 Some vehicle visibility splays at internal junctions are shown to cross the gardens of the adjacent proposed properties. This is not appropriate as these splays need to be able to be maintained by the highway authority assuming the roads are to be adopted.
- 2.3.5 There is not sufficient traffic calming along some sections of the main vehicle route through the site to keep speeds below 20mph. This means that the design doesn't encourage slow speeds. In any event the route would be used as a route for those visiting the marshes car park or Hurst View caravan park and the Quay area.
- 2.3.6 In a number of locations rows of perpendicular parking adjacent to the streets are proposed. It is not clear how provision for electric vehicle charging for these spaces is to be achieved/managed. Provision of cycle parking is not shown on the plans.

### Summary

- 2.3.7 The internal site layout proposals do not satisfactorily give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and do not meet the needs of people with disabilities. The layout also includes a number of pinch points impeding suitable vehicle access. Therefore, contrary to NPPF.

## 2.4 Off Site Highway Works and Traffic Impact

### Lane Widening

- 2.4.1 Localised road widening is proposed on Lower Pennington Lane to the north of the proposed site access. Whilst this widening has been suggested to be all within highway land there is a ditch on one side of the road which the highway authority has indicated is not highway in the location of the widening, the works would impact on third party banks, hedges and trees. Therefore whether or not the proposals can be achieved in practice needs to be confirmed.
- 2.4.2 In order to assess the potential conflict between two vehicles meeting and vehicles/pedestrians meeting the TA sets out a probability calculation using the 'Monte Carlo method'. This is not an accepted methodology used by the transport planning industry. A microsimulation model of the impact would be appropriate. The traffic data used is also from early May. It has not been confirmed how this compares to the traffic flows using each lane in the peak summer months.
- 2.4.3 Tracking has also been undertaken with the aim to confirm that two vehicles are able to pass along some sections of Lower Pennington Lane and Ridgeway Lane. However, no consideration has been given to the full vehicle widths and ease of vehicles passing each other, as wing mirror widths have not been included.
- 2.4.4 Two passing bays are proposed on Ridgeway Lane, the northern passing bay is proposed just south of Forest Gate Gardens and is shown within highway land (below right). However, the highway records provided by HCC (below left) show that not all of this land is public highway:



- 2.4.5 Whether or not the developer is able to provide the northern proposed passing bay on Ridgeway Lane on third party land is not clear and the works are outside the application red line. There is also an existing ditch along this section of Ridgeway Lane which would need to be taken into consideration and further questions whether this passing bay is achievable.

### **A337/Ridgeway Lane Roundabout**

- 2.4.6 Roundabout junctions are typically considered by highway engineers to be operating satisfactorily in terms of capacity when the ratio of flow to capacity (RFC) is below 0.85. The junction capacity testing presented for the A337/Ridgeway Lane roundabout junction indicates that in the morning peak hour the maximum RFC would be 0.87, this means that the junction is not operating satisfactorily. The traffic data used for the base position at this junction has not been provided in the TA and therefore it is not clear what time of year the surveys were undertaken, and whether they are therefore representative. Given the nature of the local area a summer seasonality assessment should also be undertaken.
- 2.4.7 The standard method of Arcady assessment has also been used. On the A337 north approach two lanes are provided, with traffic surveys identifying there is unequal lane usage between the two lanes. Therefore the 'lanes' module of Arcady should have been used to assess this rather than the standard methodology. The modelling results provided in the TA would underestimate queues that would occur.
- 2.4.8 The TA identifies that mitigation measures were considered at the junction in order to reduce the traffic impact of the development. The TA goes on to note that mitigation measures put forward to Hampshire County Council at the site allocation stage would have resulted in an impact to pedestrian amenity at the junction. Therefore, the highway authority 'considered it preferable not to amend the roundabout design.' If the A337/Ridgeway Lane junction has been identified as operating over capacity then alternative mitigation measures should be considered, which has not been the case. In our experience queuing through the roundabout junction occurs for much of the day. This impacts both vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists using the junction.

### **Lower Pennington Lane/Ridgeway Lane**

- 2.4.9 Whilst the capacity test results at the Lower Pennington Lane/Ridgeway Lane junction suggest the junction would operate satisfactorily we continue to have issues as to the suitability of the junction on safety grounds. DMRB guidance CD123 notes a right turn lane on Ridgeway Lane should be provided at this junction if the daily two-way flows on Lower Pennington Lane exceed 300 vehicles. This is a safety requirement. Based on the ATC data provided at Appendix B of the TA the existing daily traffic flows two-way on Lower Pennington Lane are already in excess of 1000 vehicles, with on average the survey recording 1212 vehicles two-way during a 24 hour period on a weekday, and this is before the development traffic is added. The surveys were undertaken in December, therefore flows in the summer months are likely to be higher as a result of the car park and Hurst View caravan park to the south. It is therefore questionable whether there should be an increase in traffic at this junction without mitigation measures being proposed.

### **Rat Running Impact on Poles Lane**

- 2.4.10 An assessment as to the impact of a through route through the site on traffic flows on Poles Lane to the east is set out in the TA. However there are a number of flaws in the assessment which could underestimate the suggested impacts. The assessment uses a mix of base flows from early May and December traffic surveys, which are unlikely to be representative of the traffic flows on the local roads occurring during the peak summer months, underestimating potential level of rat running flows. The assessment also gives no consideration of traffic travelling to/from the Hurst View Hurst View caravan park and the marshes car park at the southern end of Lower Pennington Lane which are key traffic generators in the local area during the summer months. Therefore overall it is likely that the through traffic flows through the site would be greater than anticipated a peak times of year.

### **Summary**

- 2.4.11 It is not clear from the material submitted whether the measures put forward to enable cars to pass along some sections of Lower Pennington Lane and Ridgeway Lane can technically be achieved, or are fully within public highway/ownership of the site.
- 2.4.12 The proposals are not in accordance with NPPF as measures put forward do not mitigate against the impact of the development in terms of traffic or highway safety.

### 3.0 ASSESSMENT AGAINST PREVIOUS CONCERNS RAISED

3.1.1 In 2020 PEP prepared an initial review of the proposals on the site, and in 2021 undertook a Safety Assessment of the local routes anticipated to be used by potential residents at the site. We have set out below a summary of these reviews, noting whether or not the proposals have addressed any of the previous concerns raised.

Issue	Addressed Yes/No	Notes
Pedestrian accessibility to local facilities	No	No assessment of pedestrian accessibility beyond proposed new links
Suitability of Ridgeway Lane and Lower Pennington Lane for increased vehicle and cycle movements	No	Assessment doesn't justify increase in use
Suitable vehicle access junction design	Partly	It is not clear if all land available is in the control of the applicant. Realigning Ridgeway Lane could increase speeds locally
Suitability of pedestrian access and new links to the north east via Ridgeway Lane/Woodside Park	No	Proposed routes not in red line, visibility splays need confirmation
Suitability of Lower Pennington Lane as a pedestrian route	No	No material changes to the route, which is identified as not suitable for pedestrians
Whether design encourages pedestrian movements, or if design makes car use more attractive	No	Design makes car use more attractive
Lower Pennington Lane/Ridgeway Lane junction safety concerns	No	No safety review undertaken
Suitability of crossing and cycle facilities at A337 roundabout and along A337 in vicinity of site	No	No review undertaken and no mitigation measures proposed.
Junction capacity at A337 roundabout	No	Junction at capacity and if assessed correctly junction will work worse - no mitigation proposed
Accident record involving cyclists at A337 roundabout	No	No mitigation proposed
Construction traffic access	No	The TA does not address construction access
Vehicles more likely to use soft verges in order to pass ongoing vehicles	Partly	Whilst passing bays proposed on Ridgeway Lane not clear if these can be implemented.
Vegetation impeding visibility at nearby junctions	No	Whilst a highways maintenance matter this has not been raised in the application material.

3.1.2 Overall, the highways issues previously raised have not been addressed in the TA submitted. Of key concern is the limited consideration given to accessibility for non-car users to local facilities.

---

## 4.0 SUMMARY OF REVIEW

- 4.1 The proposals fail to demonstrate that the scheme can satisfactorily achieve accessibility by sustainable travel modes and therefore is contrary to NPPF.
- 4.2 Whether or not the proposed pedestrian and cycle routes can even be achieved as part of the proposals is questioned and in any event are outside the planning application redline and so should be discounted.
- 4.3 The proposed Ridgeway Lane access design and adjacent Ridgeway Lane realignment are not fully within public highway or the redline of the site. Therefore, the applicant has failed to identify how the access is to be achieved.
- 4.4 The provision of a safe and suitable access for all users is not demonstrated, with site access designs making use of historic traffic data, or data from elsewhere on the road network.
- 4.5 Where the applicant has identified traffic capacity issues off site mitigation measures have not been put forward. PEP have also identified safety issues with the existing road network design which also have not been addressed.
- 4.6 Ridgeway Lane and Lower Pennington Lane are unsuitable for increased cycle and vehicle traffic and would result in a greater chance of vehicles meeting on each lane which would raise safety issues. Pinch point assessments used traffic flows from early May and it has not been confirmed if these flows are comparable to peak summer months. Where improvements are proposed there are third party ownership issues.
- 4.7 Traffic flows on Lower Pennington Lane are already in excess of 1000 vehicles per day in winter months, and likely to be higher in the summer. The level of vehicle traffic passing along this route is already unsuitable for the design of the lane.
- 4.8 The vehicle through route between Ridgeway Lane and Lower Pennington Lane would encourage rat running and increase traffic on Poles Lane. Traffic associated with visitors to Hurst View caravan park and the marshes car park would also be able to use this route during the summer, the level of which is not considered given traffic surveys were undertaken in December and early May.
- 4.9 The proposed access points and footpath crossing locations would all result in a significant amount of tree/hedgerow loss, especially as hedgerows should typically be cut back by 1m to 1.5m beyond the visibility splay to allow for future growth. Therefore, this needs to be considered carefully by other disciplines.

- 
- 4.10 The development layout design is not legible or safe for pedestrians especially vulnerable road users, and means that car use is more attractive than other modes. Therefore, the scheme design is contrary to NPPF as does not give priority to non-car road users.
- 4.11 Therefore, the proposals have not confirmed that the scheme would not have a 'severe' impact in safety and traffic terms in line with NPPF. The application should be refused based on severe impact