

## **BASINGSTOKE AND DEANE LOCAL PLAN**

### **LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION HEARING 5 NOVEMBER 2015**

#### **ISSUE 9 (Q19.1.3) – RELEVANT TO POLICY SS3.10 MANYDOWN (ALSO POLICY SS3.11 BASINGSTOKE GOLF COURSE & SS3.12 HOUNSOME FIELDS)**

#### **IS THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIVEWAYS JUNCTION AT KEMPSHOTT JUSTIFIED; WILL THE INCREASED CAPACITY CATER FOR LIKELY TRAFFIC FLOWS UP TO 2029; AND HOW USER-FRIENDLY WILL IT BE FOR BOTH PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS?**

### **FURTHER STATEMENT OF PETER WILSON (ID 786114)**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

- 1 Throughout the Local Plan process, I have consistently argued that the local road network in Kempshott is inadequate to accommodate the additional traffic that will be generated by the Policies SS3.10, SS3.11 & SS3.12 allocations. I therefore objected to the lack of specific provision in the Plan for any highway improvements or mitigation measures in Kempshott and expressed particular concern about the cumulative impact of the proposed development on the Fiveways Junction. In the absence of adequate highways improvement or mitigation measures proposed to the local highway network, I requested that the Parcel 6A part of the Manydown allocation and the entirety of the Golf Course and Hounsome Fields allocations be deleted.
- 2 In a position statement dated 16 October (PS/04/56a), the Highway Authority withdrew its earlier objection to the inclusion of Parcel 6A of the Manydown allocation. This part of the allocation is governed by criterion (u) of Policy SS3.10, which limits the development to a yield of approximately 300 units unless workable transport mitigation measures can be demonstrated to support a higher yield.
- 3 The preparation of the Highway Authority's position statement followed a technical assessment of the Fiveways junction that had been prepared by AECOM on behalf of the Manydown promoters (PS/04/56b). Both this assessment and the Highway Authority's position statement were the subject of discussion at the Hearing on 20 October. However, because the documents were only made available to the Hearing participants a few days beforehand, the Inspector gave participants the opportunity to submit written responses in advance of a further discussion on 5 November on the transport implications of the allocations. The Inspector also invited AECOM and HCC to submit the following two further

documents in advance of the 5 November hearing:

- a revised drawing of the proposed junction improvement showing the highway boundary and the realigned footways
- a statement indicating how the revised junction would perform by the end of the Plan period (2029)

4 My further statement therefore focuses on the AECOM assessment.

### **AECOM ASSESSMENT (PS/04/56b)**

5 The AECOM report proposes a reconfiguration of the junction to enable it to handle increased traffic flows stemming from the development of Parcel A and the forecast growth in background traffic. The report compares the performance of a reconfigured junction against a 'Do Minimum' scenario with or without the inclusion of development at Parcel 6A. The report concludes that in 2021, by which time the Parcel 6A development would be expected to have been completed, the reconfigured junction would perform better than the existing junction if the growth in 'background traffic' only is allowed for.

6 However, in my view there are four key weaknesses in the AECOM assessment, which have not been addressed to date. These relate to

- the assumptions about traffic flows from Parcel 6A,
- the time horizon of the assessment,
- the deliverability of the junction reconfiguration
- the provisions for cyclists.

### **Parcel 6A traffic flow assignment assumptions**

7 The assessment assumes that 11% of the traffic from the development will "leak" to and from the site via Dorset Crescent on the existing residential development to the north of the site. It is unclear whether this means that there could be a vehicular connection through the site between Pack Lane (West) and Dorset Crescent or whether part of Parcel 6A will be accessed exclusively via Dorset Crescent. More importantly, this assumption is at variance with the Policy S3.10 Inset Map, which shows a pedestrian and cycle corridor

only between Parcel 6A and the existing development to the north. Moreover, the impact of additional traffic flows on the road network serving that development appears not to have been assessed.

### **Time horizon for the AECOM assessment**

- 8 The junction's performance has only been assessed to 2021. By that time the assessment assumes that the 300 dwellings proposed at Parcel 6A will have been completed. The proposed Parcel 6A development will have an obvious impact on the performance of the Fiveways junction because the Assessment assumes that at least 85% of the traffic it generates will pass through it. However, it is inevitable that some of the traffic generated by the other, very much larger, proposed developments on the west side of the town will pass through the junction. Added to that, the proposed new Critical Treatment Hospital to the southwest of the town will have an impact on the local road network in Kempshott but it is not known what assumptions AECOM and the Highway Authority have made about that.
  
- 9 My interpolation of the Local Plan forecast housing completions on greenfield sites to the west and southwest of the town suggests that over 70% of the housing on those allocations will be completed in the period between 2021 and 2029, as the table overleaf shows.

Site	Expected completions		
	<i>Up to 2021</i>	<i>2021 - 2029</i>	<i>Total</i>
Parcel 6A, Manydown	300	0	300
Rest of Manydown	550	2550	3100
Kennel Farm	310	0	310
Golf Course	100	900	1000
Hounsome Fields	300	450	570
<b>Total</b>	<b>1560</b> (29%)	<b>3900</b> (71%)	<b>5460</b> (100%)

10 I look forward to commenting on the assessment of the Fiveways Junction's performance at 2029, which should take into account the above developments. The Inspector has requested this further assessment from AECOM and the Highway Authority.

### **The deliverability of the Fiveways junction improvement**

11 The Parsons Brinkerhoff TA indicated that the necessary improvement of the junction would entail the acquisition of third party land. The AECOM report makes no reference to land availability and the plan attached to the report showing the reconfiguration of the junction does not show how the footways are to be realigned or the position of the highway boundary. It should be noted that there are significant level differences on the approaches to the junction, particularly on the Pack Lane (East) and Buckskin Lane arms, which may constrain the opportunity to achieve a satisfactory layout within the existing highway boundary.

12 I look forward to commenting on the revised drawing that the Inspector has requested AECOM and the Highway Authority to prepare, which will show the highway boundary and the footways as proposed to be realigned.

## **Provisions for cyclists**

- 13 The junction was significantly modified two to three years ago to make specific provision for cyclists, including the introduction of ASLs for cyclists and a cycle phase on the Old Kempshott Lane arm. The AECOM report infers that the removal of those provisions may be necessary to provide the necessary additional capacity for cars. The basis for these proposals is a survey of cycle movements at the junction during peak hours only on a single day. The report also suggests the removal of the 'Keep Clear' road markings. These allow residents to access their drives without causing a build-up of traffic behind them.
- 14 Downgrading or removing facilities for cyclists flies against a raft of BDBC and HCC policies that seek to improve and encourage cycling. The desirability of promoting and encouraging non-vehicular modes of travel throughout Basingstoke is a consistent theme of the LP and its policies, specifically LP Policy CN9. These strands are drawn together in the Cycling Strategy Document for Basingstoke recently approved as a consultation draft by BDBC.
- 15 Downgrading the facilities for cyclists at this junction is also at odds with the Council's LP Inset Map, which shows an east-west pedestrian and cycle corridor across the junction. If Area 6A is to be developed, the 300 houses proposed are likely to generate significant additional pedestrian/cycle movements to the shop/ post office in Pack Lane East, the large village hall to its rear and the adjoining Stratton Park sports pitches. Cycle use of the junction is likely to increase also because of additional cycle movements on the north-south multi-user path to the west of Kempshott (arising from the South West Basingstoke sites) and the short section of already widened cycle and footway connecting to Fiveways on the south side of Pack Lane West.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

- 16 AECOM and the Highway Authority have not yet demonstrated that the proposed reconfiguration of the Fiveways junction will perform satisfactorily at 2029, the end of the Local Plan period. A further assessment is therefore needed which will factor in the traffic flows arising from the Local Plan proposed housing developments in the west and southwest of the town, the bulk of which are expected to be completed in the period 2021 to 2029. Moreover, it has not yet been demonstrated that the improvement to the junction

can be carried out within existing highway boundaries and that there is therefore a guarantee of its deliverability. Furthermore, the proposed reconfiguration significantly worsens the facilities both for existing cyclists and for additional cyclists arriving at the junction from the proposed development at Parcel 6A and from the large proposed new housing allocations in the southwest of the town.

- 17 The growth in background traffic by 2021 is forecast to lead to a worsening in the degree of saturation and queue lengths at the junction even without any development at Parcel 6A. I anticipate that conditions would further worsen by 2029, when the remainder of the Manydown allocation is completed and if the Golf Course and Hounsome Fields sites are also developed.
- 18 Assuming that Parcel 6A is removed from the Local Plan, I submit that some improvement will be required to the junction by 2029 were all of those other housing allocations to be confirmed. However, it is important that any improvement should make satisfactory provision for cyclists and pedestrians.