

New Forest District Council
Appletree Court
LYNDHURST
Hampshire
SO43 7PA

Hampshire 2050
The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD

Telephone: 0300 555 1375
Fax: 01962 847055

www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries To Anna Li

My reference 048645

Direct Line

Your reference 22/11424

Date 26 April 2023

Email Hampshire.Highways.New
ForestDC@hants.gov.uk

Dear Mr.Norris,

Ss6 Land East Of Lower Pennington Lane, Pennington, Lymington SO41 8AN

Erection of up to 82 No. Dwellings, including Access, Highways Works, Public Open Space (POS), Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG), Landscaping and Drainage Attenuation (Outline Application with details of Access and Layout only)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above application. The applicant is seeking outline planning permission (with details only for access and layout) for the construction of up to 82 dwellings on the land to the east of Lower Pennington Lane and west of Ridgeway Lane, Lymington. It is noted that the development site is allocated in the adopted Local Plan as part of the strategic site SS6. Following a review of the Transport Assessment (TA) and associated information, the Highway Authority (HA) wishes to make the following comments.

Walking and Cycling:

The applicant has described the existing highway infrastructure near the development site in the TA submitted. It is stated in the TA 3.5.1 that *“there is no existing pedestrian infrastructure on Ridgeway Lane or Lower Pennington Lane in the vicinity of the site however the low speed environment means walking in the carriageway is common*

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

place”. With regard to cycling infrastructure, there is no dedicated/segregated cycle facilities on either lane, although Lower Pennington Lane is an approved on-road cycle route (shown on New Forest National Park Authority’s New Forest Cycling Map) which allows for pedal cycles on the main carriageway of the road. The highway officers observed cyclists on both lanes during their site visits.

Although the applicant has described the existing highway infrastructure, a more detailed audit of a Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Assessment & Review (WCHAR) has not been submitted. A WCHAR is required to identify the existing condition and safety of the walking and cycling infrastructure/facilities such as street lighting provision, condition of the paths, surface and width of pavements, crossing provision and missing tactile paving etc on those routes between the site and local amenities.

The HA requires the following routes between the site and the local amenities reviewed in the WCHAR assessment:

- Between the Site and Priestlands School and Lymington Health & Leisure Centre
- Between the Site and Pennington Infant & Junior School / Pennington Local Shops
- Between the Site and Pennington parade of shops
- Between the Site and the nearest bus stops
- Between the Site and Lymington town centre
- Between the Site and Lymington quay
- Between the Site and Lymington Town Railway Station

The findings of the WCHAR will form the basis in determining whether any mitigation measures are required, either via the S278 process or financial contribution, towards appropriate enhancements to walking and cycling facilities. The design of mitigation measures should comply with LTN1/20 guidance.

It has been noted that Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Footpaths 82 and 83 run through the site and connect Lower Pennington Lane with Ridgeway Lane. Footpath 82 runs west-east across the application site, partly following the existing access to Northfield Nursery. Footpath 83 runs broadly diagonal northwest-southeast across the site, joining Lower Pennington Lane in northwest adjacent to the property Northfield and Ridgeway Lane in southeast at the property Greencroft.

Policies associated with SS6 clearly specify that the development should “*Maintaining the public right-of-way across the site as a dedicated footpath*”. The submitted masterplan has not adequately demonstrated how the development proposal complies

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

with this policy. If these footpaths are to be diverted/re-aligned or stopped up, the applicant must explain their plans in more detail and submit them to the HA and HCC's Countryside Service team for review and comment. HCC's Countryside Service team has provided a separate response on this matter.

It is noted that the proposal as shown on the masterplan (drawing 2020-6181-101) does not show any connection between the site and the northwest part of Footpath 83. In the Transport Assessment paragraph 4.5.1, the consultant stated that "*the site would additionally allow for a potential connection through to Lower Pennington Lane via the adjacent site to the northwest*". This footpath connection is not "a potential connection", Footpath 83 is an existing Public Right of Way which must be kept open to the public all the time unless agreed with the HA.

The HA requires the applicant to provide a connection from the site to this footpath as it provides a significantly shorter route from the development site to Lower Pennington Lane and the amenities to the northwest and further beyond compared to using the footway proposed along the access road then via the proposed vehicular site access on Lower Pennington Lane. The development proposal should be modified to include a connection to the northwest section of the existing Footpath 83 and show it on the masterplan/site layout plan.

Given the above is an important amenity link, the applicant should also improve the standard of Footpath 83 (surface and width) between the site boundary and Lower Pennington Lane and also the footpath adjacent to the property Sunnybank, cutting across the corner of the junction of Lower Pennington Lane/Fox Pond Lane, so to improve the walking route from the site to the amenities on Milford Road via Fox Pond Lane.

Furthermore, the applicant needs to provide further information regarding what future plan is for the section of the Footpath 83 adjacent to Greencroft, as masterplan shows this path would be redundant. Advice should be sought from HCC Countryside.

Bus Accessibility

The TA states that the closest bus stops are at 'South Street' and 'Milford Road', circa 500m from the site. The HA considers the nearest bus stops from the site are on Milford Road near Pennington Cross Garage, approximately 700m from the site. This is considered an acceptable walking distance given the scale of the site, subject to adequate walking routes being provided. These bus stops serve the local bus services X1/X2,6, C10, 119, 780 and 789. The regular services X1/X2, 6 and 119 operate

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Monday to Saturday at frequency of 1 service every hour. The X1 and 6 also operate on Sunday at a frequency of 1 services every 2 hours.

The HA considers that the current level of bus services would be adequate to accommodate future residents, however the condition and safety of the walking route to these bus stops should be assessed and identified in the WCHAR.

Rail Accessibility

Lymington Town Railway Station is located approximately 1.4 miles northeast of the site. This is considered within an acceptable walking and cycling distance. However, as a WCHAR has not been submitted, the condition and safety of the routes to the railway station has not been identified in the TA. Therefore, the applicant is required to review the walking and cycling infrastructure along the route to the rail station, and provide appropriate mitigation proposals if they are necessary to make the route safe and attractive for walking and cycling. The cycle routes need to be reviewed in the context of LTN 1/20 guidance. Any improvement proposals should be compliant with current national and HCC design guidelines.

Personal Injury Accident Data (PIAs)

The TA has demonstrated Personal Injury Accident data for the period from May 2016 to April 2021. The study area covers both Lower Pennington Lane and Ridgeway Lane as well as the stretch of the A337 Milford Road between the junction of Londesborough Place and the junction of South Street.

The HA requires the applicant to update the PIA data to the most recent five year period. A further review should be carried out and submitted once the PIA data is updated.

Notwithstanding this, the HA has reviewed the PIA data as submitted, which shows during this five-year period, there were five recorded accidents within the study area, four of these five incidents occurred at the roundabout of Milford Road/North Street/Ridgeway Lane and involved cyclists.

Given the fact that high percentage of the incidents involved cyclists at the roundabout of Milford Road/North Street/Ridgeway Lane, the HA would request the applicant to make financial contribution towards the improvement measures at this roundabout to improve the safety of walking and cycling and mitigate the impact of the proposed

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

development. The HA considers this contribution is deemed necessary to make the development of this site acceptable and it should be secured via Section 106. This mitigation would form part of the overall improvement at the Pennington Cross Roundabout described below.

Proposed Vehicular Access

The applicant has proposed two vehicular accesses, one from Lower Pennington Lane and the other one from Ridgeway Lane. A link road would be built between the two accesses to connect Lower Pennington Lane with Ridgeway Lane. The Lower Pennington Lane access would utilise the existing access serving Northfield Nursery and Oakhaven Hospice. The access from Ridgeway Lane would be in the position of the existing gated field access approximately 38 metres north of Poles Lane junction. Both access junctions have been designed in the form of a simple priority T-junction. The layouts of the access arrangement have been shown on the drawings 2020-6181-102 and 2020-6181-103. Both accesses have been subject to Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA1).

NFDC Local Plan 2016- 2036 (July 2020), Policies II (e), SS6 clearly states: *'Provide points of vehicle access to the site from both Lower Pennington Lane and from Ridgeway Lane, connecting to provide a vehicle route through the site.'* In relation to access, the applicant has achieved this objective. The HA considers the choice of junction form - simple priority junctions to serve the development are in keeping with other accesses along both lanes.

The HA acknowledges local concerns regarding the potential rat running impact on Poles Lane. Having reviewed the highway network in the area, , the HA considers the link road would not attract a significant amount of additional through traffic on Poles Lane. This is because Hurst View caravan park and the marshes car park are located at the southern end of Lower Pennington Lane, which is a wider road than Poles Lane and it also has more direct access to the A337. As such, visitors of the caravan park (who are likely traveling from/to the A337) would be more likely to travel to/from the caravan park via Lower Pennington Lane (as is currently the case); this remains a more attractive route for accessing the caravan park than using Poles Lane.

Having reviewed the design of both vehicular accesses and the submitted RSA1 report, the HA requires the following design issues are addressed:

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

- The distance between the proposed Ridgeway Lane access and Poles Lane is below HCC's technical design standards, therefore the applicant will be required to submit a Departure from Standard (DfS) application to the HA for approval in principle at this stage.
- Vehicle tracking speeds must be annotated next to each vehicle manoeuvre. The tracking speed should be appropriate for the location, with a minimum tracking speed of 10mph. Subject to agreement to the tracking speeds used, the proposed geometry of the accesses appears suitable.
- Visibility splays for each of the accesses have been derived using 7-day ATC data but survey locations appear to be very close to the accesses, which is not in accordance with HCC's Technical Design Guidance TG3. TG3 specifies *"the location at which the speed measurements are to be taken shall be at the approximate "Y" distance (see Figure 3.1) based on the posted Speed Limit of the major road."* The applicant's consultant therefore must provide a response to support their chosen locations or carry out additional speed surveys.
- Weather information during the period of speed surveys must be provided. TG3, 3.1.6 states that *"In the absence of confirmed dry weather and road conditions, 85th percentile speeds shall be increased by 8kph for dual carriageways and 4kph for single carriageways in accordance with CA 185"*.
- The provision of required visibility splays for new accesses and crossings (once assessed based on the agreed measured speeds) will impact on trees and hedgerows. The owners of any affected trees/hedgerows need to be confirmed and to the applicant must ensure the proposed works are deliverable. An Arboricultural Assessment will be required (see TG15: <https://documents.hants.gov.uk/transport/TG15-Trees-Landscape-and-Ecology.pdf>) once the impact is agreed. The applicant is also advised to refer to the guidance of protection and management of Countryside hedgerows (See <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/countryside-hedgerows-regulation-and-management>).
- All land required for visibility should be available for dedication to the Highway Authority. The applicant needs to demonstrate this land is either within the highway boundary, under applicant's control or dedication is agreed by the landowner. It has been noted the visibility splay (to the south) shown at the access off Ridgeway Lane crosses a land outside the redline boundary and the

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

highway boundary. The applicant needs to confirm if this land can be dedicated as highway.

- There are ditches on both Lower Pennington Lane and Ridgeway Lane adjacent to the proposed accesses. While not an impediment to delivery of the accesses, any works affecting the ditch will require Ordinary Watercourse Consent (OWC) prior to any works commencing.
- Although not raised in the RSA1, given the potential for increased two-way vehicle conflicts, and no street lighting at Lower Pennington Lane access, the transport consultant should consider the safety risk associated with the deeper sections of open ditches. This is a particular concern for turning manoeuvres.

Widening and Passing Places

The applicant has proposed two formal passing bays along Ridgeway Lane. They would be located approximately 25 meters and 200 meters respectively to the south of junction of Forest Gate Gardens.

The applicant has undertaken an RSA1, which identifies that the design of the passing bays does not allow for a large vehicle to pull into and out of without overrunning the verge prior to and just downstream of each passing place. This could lead to damage and blockage to the drainage ditch leading to flooding on the carriageway and increasing the risk of loss of control collisions. The design of passing bays should be reviewed and modified.

There are ditches within both passing bays that would need to be culverted and/or filled in to deliver these proposals and therefore OWC (Ordinary Watercourse) consent will be required. The RSA comments regarding the impact on ditches must be addressed. The applicant should liaise with HCC OWC Team as soon as possible as such consultation may result in updates being required, which could affect the design of the passing bays.

The HA believes that the first proposed passing bay (just to the south of the junction of Forest Gate Gardens) may not be deliverable as part of the land required for the passing bay appears to be neither adopted highway land nor within the developer's ownership. Should this passing bay be progressed, the applicant must confirm the landowner agrees to construction of the passing bay and to dedication of the land to the HA.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

However, the HA do not consider delivery of the first passing bay necessary to make the development acceptable as existing traffic already uses Forest Gate Gardens junction or the wider section of the road to wait when encountering traffic coming from the opposite direction. There have been no recorded accidents associated with vehicles passing each other at this location. This section of the road is straight and has good visibility, therefore it is not considered that the lack of a formal passing bay at this location would significantly increase safety risk to road users given the forecast traffic of generation from the proposed development (21 vehicle movements during the peak hour).

The Highway officers noted during site visits that at several locations on both Lower Pennington Lane and Ridgeway Lane, the metaled surface of the road is narrow due to tarmac being broken off from the edge of the road. If this is rebuilt to the full available width, then the width of the road would be considered satisfactory. Rather than providing two formal passing bays, the applicant should consider re-surfacing to widen these narrow sections. The HA is happy to engage with the applicant in deciding the locations of possible widening.

Poles Lane Junction Improvement

The proposed realignment of Ridgway Lane will shift the T- junction of Poles Lane further west. The applicant needs to confirm the land required for this realignment is under the control of the applicant or consent from the landowner has been given. The applicant should also provide further information to the HA regarding for the treatment of the existing carriageway; that is, will this area become grass verge, will it remain as highway or be stopped up and will the realignment introduce kerbs?

Proposed Non-vehicular Access

The applicant has proposed the following new walking & cycling infrastructure:

Within the site-

- Footways would be provided along the internal access road including both vehicular accesses from Lower Pennington Lane and Ridgeway Lane;
- Crossing points would be provided along the internal access road;
- A series of internal footpaths will be provided within ANRGs;

Outside of the site –

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

- Two dedicated pedestrian and cycle only accesses would be provided. One from Ridgeway Lane between the properties of The Buccaneer and Brocklands Cottage and the other from the cul-de-sac end of Forest Gate Gardens. These two paths then connect with the proposed internal paths aforementioned.
- Three formal crossing points on Ridgeway Lane are proposed. One would be provided near the junction of Forest Gate Gardens; one would be in front of property Brocklands Cottage and one between the Ridgeway Lane access and Poles Lane junction.
- A new shared use foot/ cycle path is proposed on the land of Woodside Park, running parallel to Ridgeway Lane and ends at Rookes Lane in the north. This path would connect with the first two crossing points aforementioned on Ridgeway lane.

The highway authority has no objection in principle to these proposals, however, a number of issues need to be addressed to confirm delivery is achievable.

The highway authority has noted that the proposed new paths through the land south of Forest Gate Gardens and Woodside Park are under the ownership of New Forest District Council and Town Council. In Town Council's planning response, it states that *"the proposed cycle routes shown through Woodside Park and the amenity land adjacent to Forest Lodge Gardens are not deliverable. The Council has entered into a Statement of Common Ground with the NFDC and the applicant to allow pedestrian links over these public open spaces. The agreement does not extend to allowing cycleways"*. The applicant therefore needs to confirm whether they will still propose these paths to be used for cycling.

While use by cycles would be beneficial, should cycling not be allowed, given the fact that Lower Pennington Lane is an existing cycle route and Ridgeway Lane is considered acceptable for cycle use the removal of cycle rights on this proposed route would not be considered a reason for the HA to object to the application.

Given the SOCG, the HA has sufficient confidence that at least the footpath proposals can be delivered. These proposals should be secured by Grampian conditions and the HA requires works to be completed prior to any occupation of the development.

It is also worth noting that in the response from HCC Countryside Services, it states that the proposed new footpaths within Woodside Park and the land to the south of Forest Gate Gardens are not a Public Footpath therefore will not be maintained by the Highway Authority. A planning condition would be required to ensure these paths are

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

open to the public and maintained in perpetuity, or alternatively they may be offered to HCC for adoption. The design of these paths should be in accordance with LTN 1/20 and a site specific WCHAR. Lighting should be provided along the route, so it is safe and attractive during the hour of darkness.

The applicant has undertaken an RSA1 which identifies an issue on the design of the end of proposed cycle/footway connections, at the staggered barriers. The RSA1 points out that there could be risk of cyclists travelling around the barriers and entering the roads at inappropriately high speeds. The HA require this issue to be addressed, however this can be dealt with during the detail design stage should the development come forward.

In summary, subject to the delivery of these proposals, it is considered that the site would be connected with the existing pedestrian/cycle network and provide a safe route for the future residents of the site to access local services on foot or by cycling. This thereby accords with national and regional planning policies.

The HA acknowledges local concerns over the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on Lower Pennington Lane and Ridgeway Lane due to the lack of dedicated footway/cycle way, inadequate lighting, increase of traffic and the fact that the proposed route via the new path within Woodside Park is not on the desire line for the direction of Pennington Cross roundabout. This roundabout is en-route to several amenities including Priestlands School, Lymington Junior/infant schools, the Health and Leisure centre and bus stops on Milford Road, so is likely to generate a significant number of pedestrian and cycling trips.

From the centre of the site to the roundabout, the new route via the proposed path within Woodside Park is approximately 770 metres, approximately 50 meters longer than the existing route via Ridgeway Lane. Although longer, it is still well within the preferred maximum walking distance of 1.2km recommended by the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT). It is therefore considered the additional distance would not overly dissuade people from using this route especially for vulnerable users who are more likely to choose the proposed route over walking along Ridgeway Lane.

Regarding Lower Pennington Lane, if the site were to be connected with the existing Footpath 83, it would provide a safe walking route via Fox Pond Lane to access the local facilities (the parade of shops beside the A337 Milford Road, Tesco Express and Pennington Junior/Infants schools on Priestlands Road). This route comprises a quiet

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

road (Fox Pond Lane) and pavements along Milford Road. Pedestrians only need to walk approx. 80m along Lower Pennington Lane at a point where the road is relatively straight and has sufficient forward visibility. This route is not considered to be dangerous or have unacceptable safety risks to pedestrians.

The HA acknowledge that some future residents are likely to still choose to walk on Ridgeway Lane and Lower Pennington Lane, but given the fact that this is an existing situation with no recorded injury accidents and that the development would provide an alternative off carriageway route for residents to walk to local amenities, the principle of the pedestrian and cycle access routes is considered acceptable.

Notwithstanding the above, the applicant still needs to carry out a WCHAR assessment for the required routes mentioned in the earlier section of this response. Based on the findings of the WCHAR, the applicant may be required to deliver mitigation measures towards improvements to off-site walking and cycling facilities via the S278 process or via financial contribution if deemed appropriate and necessary to make the development acceptable.

Parking and Internal Site Layout

The TA stated that car parking would be provided in accordance with NFDC's Parking Standards SPD which indicates 192 parking spaces would be required. The proposal would provide 195 spaces for residents and 12 visitor spaces. The HA consider this level of provision is appropriate.

Vehicle swept path tracking has been submitted showing car manoeuvres can be achieved.

The Highway Authority would expect a clear indication from the applicant on whether the internal access roads (incl. foot/cycle way) will be offered to HCC for adoption. Regardless, whether the internal access road will be adopted or not, all the main internal access roads must be designed and constructed to adoptable standard, so to ensure the road is suitable for refuse collection by large vehicles.

The car park access for Oak Heaven is not aligned with the development access road, which will make certain manoeuvres (for example the right-turn from the access road into the car park) more challenging. The applicant needs to modify the angle of this car park entrance and demonstrate the acceptability of the revised design with vehicle swept path tracking analysis.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Traffic Surveys:

The applicant has submitted three surveys, which are summarised as follows:

- ATC surveys – between 12th and 18th Dec 2017, surveys were taking at Lower Pennington Lane north (165m south of Fox Pond junction) and Lower Pennington Lane south close to the proposed access (Oakhaven Hospice), Ridgeway Lane at the proposed access and Poles Lane.

The applicant has used speeds data obtained from this survey to inform the visibility splays required at the proposed site accesses. However as aforementioned, the above locations are not in accordance with HCC's Technical Design Guidance TG3 which specifies "the location at which the speed measurements are to be taken shall be at the approximate "Y" distance (see Figure 3.1) based on the posted Speed Limit of the major road." The applicant's consultant therefore must provide a response to support their chosen locations or carry out additional speed surveys.

- Turning Count Surveys – 8th May 2019
This was undertaken at Ridgeway Lane/Lower Pennington Lane and Ridgeway Lane/Rookes Lane junctions.

The data obtained from this survey was used in the traffic modelling and traffic impact assessment; use of this data is considered robust.

- Pedestrian/ Cycle survey – 10th May 2022 at Lower Pennington Lane/Fox pond lane junction; north end of Lower Pennington Lane and Rookes Lane/ Ridgeway Lane junction. This data was used to assess the impact on pedestrians and cyclists.

The Transport Assessment shows that the TEMPRO Growth Factors from 2019 to 2027 have been applied to the base traffic flows for future years. The HA consider the methodology used for the base traffic flow in the assessment is acceptable.

Trip Generation and Assignment

The number of vehicle trips that would be generated by the proposed development has been calculated using TRICS (Trip Rate Information Computer System). TRICS is an

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

independent database of traffic surveys from which a trip rate is obtained that enables the total number of vehicles that will be generated by the site to be predicted. The TA presents the proposed trips that could be expected for the proposed development during both the AM and PM weekday peak periods (0800-0900 and 1700-1800). These are shown below.

TRICS Trip Rate per Dwelling									
Mode	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)			PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)			Daily (07:00 – 19:00)		
	Arr	Dep	2-way	Arr	Dep	2-way	Arr	Dep	2-way
All modes	0.247	0.812	1.059	0.696	0.263	0.959	4.493	4.551	9.044
Vehicles	0.144	0.363	0.507	0.349	0.147	0.496	2.327	2.314	4.641
Cycle	0.006	0.017	0.023	0.012	0.007	0.019	0.068	0.073	0.141
Pedestrian	0.042	0.091	0.133	0.062	0.025	0.087	0.572	0.581	1.153
TRICS Trip Generation (82 Dwellings)									
All modes	20	67	87	57	22	79	368	373	742
Vehicles	12	30	42	29	12	41	191	190	381
Cycle	0	1	2	1	1	2	6	6	12
Pedestrian	3	7	11	5	2	7	47	48	95

Figure 5.2: Anticipated Trip Generation

The above Table shows that the proposed development is expected to generate 42 two-way vehicle movements during the morning peak period and 41 two-way vehicle movements during the evening peak period.

Having reviewed further detailed information submitted in relation to the trip rates, the highway authority considers the above forecast of trips is acceptable.

The TA also assumes that 50% of development traffic would travel via Lower Pennington Lane and the other 50% use Ridgeway Lane. This means the development would generate about 21 vehicular trips on each lane during the peak hour, which equates to 1 additional trip about every 3 minutes. The highway authority considers these assumptions are acceptable and the increase of traffic on both lanes is not significant.

Traffic Impact on the highway network

The applicant has carried out a traffic impact assessment for the following three junctions:

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

- 1) Junction of Lower Pennington Lane/ Ridgeway Lane
- 2) Junction of Ridgeway Lane/ Rookes Lane
- 3) Pennington Cross Roundabout (A337 Milford Road/North Street/Ridgeway Lane)

The modelling results show that all the junctions except Pennington Cross Roundabout of the A337/North Street could be expected to operate within operational capacity for year 2027 with the development traffic.

Pennington Cross Roundabout

The modelling results show that this junction is likely to operate close to its optimum capacity (RFC <0.85) in 2027 without the proposed development. With the development traffic, delays and congestion will be slightly worse with the maximum Ratio Flow Capacity (RFC) of 0.87 and the maximum delays of 25 seconds.

The applicant has not assessed the traffic impact with the proposed development and with other Local Plan committed developments which are listed below:

- Land to the North of Milford Road (the northern parcel of Policy SS5) – 45 dwellings;
- Land to the South of Milford Road (SS5) – 110 dwellings;
- Land North of Manor Road, Milford on Sea (Strategic Site 7) – 110 dwellings;

However the assessment on the impact of cumulative traffic (with above Local Plan sites) has already been carried out in the Transport Assessment in support of planning application 20/11192 for the site “Land to the South of Milford Road (SS5)” and was approved by the HA. The modelling results showed that when traffic generation of other allocated sites is included, the capacity of this junction would likely be exceeded and improvements to this junction will be required.

When the application “Land to the South of Milford Road (SS5)” was assessed the HA agreed that the improvement of this roundabout can be dealt with by way of a proportionate financial contribution secured via S106 agreement, if the application is granted planning permission. HCC’s engineers have provided a cost estimate at circa £160,000 which is considered representative of the improvement works required. The HA therefore requests a contribution of £58,080 (160K x 36.3%) from the applicant.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

This sum has been calculated based on the cost of the works required to improve the roundabout including walking and cycling facilities, split proportionally between the strategic developments that impact on the junction.

Other Issues

The HA has noted a local concern regarding the impact to the existing junction of Lower Pennington Lane/ Ridgeway Lane and a request for a right-turn lane at this junction. The HA does not consider a right turn lane is a safety requirement in this low speed (30mph) environment. Furthermore, the existing daily flows on Lower Pennington Lane are already in excess of 1000 vehicles, and the junction has no collision history associated with vehicles waiting to turn right. The proposed development will increase movements through this junction by 8%. As such, the HA does not consider the additional traffic generated by the development will significantly increase the current level of risk.

Traffic modelling has shown that this junction would be able to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the proposed development within capacity. A larger, more complex junction type is unlikely to add any significant benefit and would reduce the pavement area, increase difficulty of crossing for pedestrians and cyclists as well as may be visually intrusive with excessive land take. It is therefore not considered necessary or desirable.

Travel Plan

This travel plan has been assessed using Hampshire County Council's evaluation criteria for the assessment of travel plans – A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans. Whilst the quality of this travel plan is generally good, some amendments are required before it can be approved.

Title page and introduction

The following pieces of information should be included on either the title page, or within the introduction:

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

- The type of travel plan (e.g. framework or full).
- The planning reference (22/11424).

Existing site details

Section two should include information on the current access arrangements to the existing site. Details of the facilities at Lymington Town station should also be given (e.g. the number and type of cycle storage, amount of car parking, provision of waiting rooms etc.)

Measures and initiatives

The following measures should be included in Section 5:

- The travel plan coordinator should collaborate with local public transport operators to negotiate discounts, trial initiatives, and improve services.
- An annual travel plan newsletter should be considered, as well as a dedicated website highlighting aspects of the travel plan.
- The travel plan coordinator should offer personalised journey planning services to residents.

Travel plan coordinator

- Details of the travel plan coordinator (name, company, and contact details) should be given in Section 6. If these are not yet available, this section should include a commitment to inform Hampshire County Council of the details once they become available.
- Points iv and v in paragraph 6.2.1 refer to employees, this should be changed accordingly.

Monitoring

- The proposed monitoring strategy detailed in Section 6.3 (residents surveys) will not be able to collect the necessary data to determine if the proposed targets (Section 4) are to be met.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

- The target to reduce vehicle trip numbers by ten percentage points over the five years of the travel plan would require traffic count data to be collected as part of the monitoring strategy. The use of residents surveys for monitoring would give modal share data. Therefore, the monitoring strategy and/or the travel plan targets should be altered to one of the following:
 - A target to reduce overall vehicle trips to/from the site by ten percentage points. This should be measured by traffic counts.
 - A target to reduce single occupancy vehicle journeys by ten percentage points based on modal share. This should be measured by the use of residents surveys to determine modal share. If the residents surveys do not have a high enough response rate, the travel plan coordinator should consider carrying out TRICS surveys to determine modal share.

Action plan

The travel plan action plan included in Section 7 contains a cost estimate for the sustainable travel vouchers. However, it only includes a budget for 62 dwellings. A 100% take up of vouchers should be assumed and should be budgeted for. The budget for sustainable travel vouchers should, therefore, be £12,300.

Delivery and enforcement

Section 6.4 should include a commitment to pay Hampshire County Council the travel plan evaluation fee of £1,500. This should be included in the S106 agreement.

This section should also include a commitment to pay a travel plan cash deposit, this being the value of the costed action plan in Section 7 plus 10%. This should also be included in the S106 agreement.

Summary

This travel plan will require further amendments as set out above before it can be considered acceptable for submission in conjunction with the proposed site. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Joe Tarbuck by email at Joe.Tarbuck@hants.gov.uk

Recommendation

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Having regard to the above, the Highway Authority would recommend a holding objection until further information is submitted. However, if you are minded to determine the application prior to receiving the required further information, please contact the Highway Authority for refusal reasons. I trust that the above is clear but please contact Anna Li on the above number should you need further information.

Yours faithfully

Gemma McCart
Team Leader – Highways Development Planning

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook