



Hampshire County Council

Hampshire County Council Proof of Evidence of: Ben Howard BA (Hons) MSc

On behalf of Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council

In relation to the land north of Marnel Park

Outline planning application including means of access for up to 450 dwellings, a community centre, a 1 form entry primary school and associated access, open space and landscaping

&

Full planning application for erection of 200 no. dwellings with associated access, open space and landscaping.

APP/H1705/A/12/2188125 (Outline Application) and
APP/H1705/A/12/218837 (Full Application) (Basingstoke ref BDB/75761
(Outline) and BDB/75762 (Full))

March 2013

Prepared by Hampshire County Council
Economy, Transport & Environment Department
Hampshire County Council
Queen Elizabeth II Court West
The Castle
Winchester
SO23 8UD

CONTENTS

PAGE

1. Qualifications and Experience	3
2. Scope of Evidence	4
3. Site Description and Local Transport Network	6
4. Development Proposals	7
5. Policy Considerations	8
6. Development Impact	12
7. Reason for Refusal No.8	15
11. Conclusions	23

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Application consultation response to BDB/75761

Appendix 2 – Application consultation response to BDB/75762

Appendix 3 – Hampshire County Council's Transport Contributions Policy

1. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 1.1 My name is Ben Howard and I am a Senior Engineer within the Highways Development Planning Team at Hampshire County Council (HCC). I have 5 years experience within transport planning and have been responsible for providing the strategic highways and transportation advice on a large number of major planning applications across Hampshire.
- 1.2 I hold a Bachelors degree in Geography from the University of Exeter and a Masters degree in Transportation Planning and Engineering from the University of Southampton.
- 1.3 HCC is the Local Highway Authority for Hampshire and is a statutory consultee of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC). I am responsible for providing the strategic transport advice on all major planning applications submitted to the Borough, including residential, retail and commercial planning applications.

2. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1 In February 2012 HCC was consulted on the Appeal Applications by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Following consideration against current planning and transport policy and guidance, HCC raised no highway and transport objections to the applications subject to a Transport Contribution and a Travel Plan being secured within a Section 106 Agreement, and the imposition of specific planning conditions. A copy of HCC's consultation responses to the applications is provided at Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.
- 2.2 Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council refused planning permission for the outline application on 2 August 2012 and the full application on 1 October 2012, and included a number of reasons for refusal in relation to transport matters.
- 2.3 The reasons for refusal below did not form part of the recommendation by the County Council to the application and therefore this proof of evidence will not provide details to support the issues raised. These reasons for refusal will be dealt with by a separate proof of evidence submitted by the Borough Council. For completeness, the reasons for refusal 4, 5 and 6 are listed below;

Reason for Refusal 4

- 2.4 *'The development a proposed would be unsatisfactory since the roads and pathways leading to and from the site are of inadequate capacity, width and alignment to accommodate safely the cumulative traffic generated from the proposed development in addition to that generated by the existing residential area. The approval of this development and the potential for a bus route to be provided to improve the sustainability of the site could lead to the imposition of parking controls within the existing adjacent residential areas thereby adversely impacting upon existing parking provision and the amenities of existing residents in an area already blighted by parking problems. As such the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policies T1 and T2 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy and Saved Policies E1 and A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.'*

Reason for Refusal 5

- 2.5 *'The development as proposed would be unsatisfactory given it would result in a significant increase in traffic with vehicles entering or leaving the local and wider road networks and thereby interfering with the safety and free flow of traffic on these busy traffic routes , including the C58, A33, A339 and A340. As such the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policies T1 and T2 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy and Saved Policies E1 and A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.'*

Reason for refusal 6

- 2.6 *'The site is insufficiently sustainable to warrant development by virtue of there being inadequate options for travel by public transport, inadequate local facilities and inadequate access to local services. The proposal would therefore fail to meet the aims of sustainable development as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy CC1 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy and Saved Policy A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.'*
- 2.7 As set out in paragraph 2.3, the above reasons for refusal do not form part of this evidence and will be dealt with separately within Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council's proof of evidence. However, as the required Transport Contribution and Travel Plan have not been secured following refusal of the application it is necessary to justify the requirement of each of the above obligations.
- 2.8 As such, my evidence provided here supports the refusal for the Appeal Application by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in relation to Reason for Refusal 8 only. For completeness, reason for refusal 8 is listed below;

Reason for Refusal 8

- 2.9 *"In the absence of any suitable legal agreement, or justification for the absence of a legal agreement, the proposed development does not make adequate provision for community and infrastructure contributions in relation to play areas/recreation, playing fields, community facilities, education, on-site provision for art and Basingstoke Environmental Strategy for Transport (BEST) to adequately off-set the impact of the development. Furthermore the proposed development fails to provide the necessary travel plan, landscape management plan, protected species management plan or ecological compensation habitat to adequately mitigate the impact of the development. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, Saved Policies C1, C2, C7, C9 and A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011 and the guidance contained within the Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Interim Guidance Document."*
- 2.10 My evidence will demonstrate why the requirement of the Transport Contribution and Travel Plan is necessary to support the proposed development. It will be demonstrated that without the provision of the Transport Contribution and the Travel Plan that the impact of the proposed development would result in a demonstrable detrimental impact and that the development would not encourage greater use of non car based transport.
- 2.11 Following refusal of the application, the Appellant has contacted HCC and confirmed that they intend to enter into a Section 106 Agreement with the County Council to secure the Transport Contribution and Travel Plan. Whilst the Appellant intends to complete the legal agreement, which in the County Council's view would overcome the Reason for Refusal 8, this evidence has been prepared should no such agreement be in place.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION AND LOCAL TRANSPORT NETWORK

- 3.1 The appeal site is located to the north of Basingstoke town centre adjoining the residential area of Popley. It is proposed that the site subject of the full application will be accessed from Hutchins Way and Hewitt Road. The site subject to an outline application is proposed to be accessed from Hutchins Way, Hewitt Road, Cleeve Road and Jersey Close.
- 3.2 In addition to the four vehicular access points, there is also a new footway/cycleway access proposed in the south west corner of the site subject to the full application.
- 3.3 The site is currently of an agricultural land use.
- 3.4 The site is located approximately 3 miles from Basingstoke town centre, 1 mile from Marnel Community Junior School and Marnel Infant School, and 1 mile from Everest Community College.
- 3.5 Within the vicinity of the site there is a good level of walking provision in the form of footways and crossing routes. In addition to this there are also some pedestrian routes which provide traffic free routes to local destinations. Also within close proximity to the site there are a number of cycle routes providing for east – west journeys through Popley along Popley Way and Carpenters Down.
- 3.6 The nearest existing bus stops to the proposed development site are located within approximately 400 metres of the proposed development site boundary, with bus stops located on Carpenter's Down. The stops provide access to the Stagecoach 3 service which has a weekday frequency of every 10 minutes and serves East Popley – Basingstoke – South Ham and also the Stagecoach 4 service which has a weekday hourly frequency and serves Basingstoke – Winklebury – South Ham.
- 3.7 The closest rail station to the site is Basingstoke Rail Station which provides services to London Waterloo, Weymouth, Manchester and Exeter. Services to London operate on a weekday frequency of 5 to 7 services per hour and services to Southampton and Winchester are provided at a frequency of 3 to 4 services per hour.

4. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

- 4.1 As noted above the appeal relates to two planning applications; the first BDB/75761 which is an outline permission for 450 dwellings, a community centre and a 1 form entry primary school and the second application BDB/75762 which is a full permission for 200 dwellings which forms the first phase of the proposed development.

BDB/75761 Outline Application

- 4.2 A Transport Assessment was prepared in support of the application BDB/75761. This considered the existing highway network and the impact of the development upon the transport network within close proximity to the site but also across Basingstoke. The junctions considered within the Transport Assessment are listed in chapter 6.
- 4.3 As noted above the site is to be accessed from the following locations; Hutchins Way, Hewitt Road, Cleeve Road and Jersey Close. These access points, with the exception of Jersey Close, are extensions of the existing estate roads.
- 4.4 The development is proposed to be constructed in two phases, with the first phase consisting of 200 dwellings north of Appleton Drive (BDB/75762) and the second phase of 250 dwellings on land situated west of Jersey Close. As part of the Transport Assessment both phases of the development were assessed to consider the cumulative impact of the development. The first phase is also considered as part of the full application.

BDB/75762 Full Application

- 4.5 A separate Transport Assessment was prepared in support of the application BDB/75762. This considered the impact of the traffic generated by the proposed 200 dwellings under the full application.
- 4.6 The application proposes access via Hutchins Way and Hewitt Road.

5. POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 The following documents and policies are relevant to the transport aspects of the proposals:-

Policy level	Policy document / reference
National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations
Local Policy	Basingstoke Town Access Plan Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy Basingstoke and Deane Borough Adopted Local Plan 1996-2011 Hampshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2031

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

5.2 The key objectives outlined within the NPPF with regards to transport are;

- The opportunities for sustainable modes have been taking up
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

5.3 Paragraph 29 identifies '*The transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people real choice about how they travel,*' and '*Government recognises that different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solution.*'

5.4 Paragraph 32 states the following; '*All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether;*

- *The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;*
- *Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and*
- *Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development*

should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

- 5.5 Paragraph 35 asserts '*Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable modes can be maximised.*'
- 5.6 Paragraph 36 states '*A key tool to facilitate this (sustainable travel) will be a Travel Plan. All developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan.*'

The Community Infrastructure Levy

- 5.7 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations came into force in April 2010 and it allows local authorities to raise funds from developers.
- 5.8 Paragraph 62 states '*From 6 April 2010 it has been unlawful for a planning obligation to be taken into account when determining a planning application for a development, or any part of the development, that is capable of being charged the levy, whether there is a local levy in operation or not, if the obligation does not meet all of the following tests:*
- a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms*
 - b) Directly related to the development; and*
 - c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development*

Local Policy

Basingstoke Town Access Plan

- 5.9 The Basingstoke Town Access Plan was developed by Hampshire County Council and Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and it was formally adopted by the County Council in January 2012.
- 5.10 The Basingstoke Town Access Plan sets out a strategy to improve access to facilities and services within Basingstoke by all transport modes. The aims of the town access plan are outlined below;
- Improve the accessibility throughout Basingstoke by all sustainable modes of transport, notably walking, cycles and public transport
 - Enhance Basingstoke as an important centre to live, work and visit
 - Support the local economy by providing important transport infrastructure
 - Promote social inclusion and access for all; and
 - Integrate transport proposals with land use development
- 5.11 The Basingstoke Town Access Plan identifies a number of schemes under the strategies identified above for which developer contributions are sought to fund. These are considered later in my evidence.

Hampshire County Council's Transport Contributions Policy (Appendix 4)

- 5.12 Hampshire County Council's Transport Contributions Policy outlines a formulaic approach for which transport contributions for new developments are calculated. Developer contributions are calculated based on a cost per trip, which for residential is £535 and for employment uses is £230.
- 5.13 The Transport Contributions Policy is in accordance with the CIL regulations. The cost per trip formula is calculated using an evidence base of costs for providing necessary transport infrastructure associated with residential and employment developments in Hampshire. The Transport Contributions Policy is applicable towards schemes where it can be demonstrated they are directly related to the site. The Transport Contributions Policy is fair and reasonable in scale and kind as it is based on an assessment of the number daily multi-modal trips generated from a development and therefore proportionally relates the trip generation for the development.
- 5.14 The table below provides detail of the cost per dwelling for residential transport contributions and also the cost per 100m² floor space;

C3 - Residential	Cost per Trip (£)	Household Occupancy	Multi-Modal Trips (per dwelling)	Cost per dwelling (£)
1 Bed Dwelling	535	1.3	3.7	1980
2-3 Bed Dwelling	535	2.42	7.0	3745
4+ Bed Dwelling	535	3.5	10.2	5457
B - Employment	Cost per Trip (£)		Multi-Modal Trips (per 100sqm)	Cost per 100 sqm (£)
B1 Business	230		18.7	4301
B2 General Industry	230		7.5	1725
B8 Warehouse & Distribution	230		9.4	2162

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Adopted Local Plan 1996-2011

- 5.15 Policy C1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Adopted Local Plan 1996-2011 states;
- 'Development will be permitted only where there are, or will be, adequate infrastructure and community facilities. Where provision is inadequate, developers will be required to provide the infrastructure and community facilities necessary to allow the development to proceed. The Council will negotiate to secure planning obligations to ensure that such infrastructure and facilities are provided in time to meet the needs arising from the development.'*
- 5.16 Policy A1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Adopted Local Plan 1996-2011
- 'Travel Plans will be required for all development, other than residential, which is above 500 square metres.'*

5.17 Policy A2 states that;

'The Borough Council will only grant planning permission for developments with vehicular and pedestrian generation implications where;

- i. cycling and walking infrastructure are integrated with the development and linked with surrounding networks; and*
- ii. development takes account of the needs of public transport.*

Elsewhere within the Plan area opportunities will be examined to improve provision for pedestrians, cyclists and to encourage use of public transport including community transport in areas not served by conventional public transport. Additionally, the funding of local transport improvements will be sought in conjunction with new development where appropriate.'

Hampshire County Council Local Transport Plan 3

5.18 The Hampshire County Council Local Transport Plan sets out Hampshire's transport strategy up to 2031. The first line of Chapter 1 of the Local Transport Plan states *"Hampshire's transport strategy as set out in this Local Transport Plan (LTP) will help the County Council to make progress on its corporate priorities; of developing and supporting stronger safer communities, maximising well being and enhancing quality of place, and on its Sustainable Community Strategy"*.

5.19 There are 5 main themes and 15 policy objectives of the LTP.

5.20 Theme D relates to quality of life and place and includes Policy Objectives to apply Manual for Streets design principles in order to support a better balance between traffic and community life along with investment in sustainable transport measures, including walking and cycling infrastructure. Under Theme D Policy Objective 12 outlines the requirement to invest in sustainable transport measures to provide an alternative to the car for short local journeys.

5.21 Theme E relates to Transport and Growth which identifies that *"new development provides opportunities to deliver better streetscapes, de-carbonise transport and reduce the need to travel. These aims can also be achieved within new development through the provision of more services locally that people can access easily by walking or cycling"*. Under Theme E, policy objective 14 seeks to achieve *'long-term transport strategy to enable sustainable development in major growth areas.'*

6. DEVELOPMENT IMPACT

6.1 The Transport Assessment submitted as part of application BDB/75761 considers the impact of the full development of the 450 dwellings, a community centre and a 1 form entry primary school. In addition to this, the impact of phase 1 of the proposed development submitted under application BDB/75762 was considered within a separate Transport Assessment. This section will consider the transport impact of each application in turn.

Outline application BDB/75761

6.2 To calculate the proposed vehicular trip generation for the proposed 450 dwellings and the primary school the applicant has interrogated the TRICs database to determine the number of vehicle movements. The table below demonstrates the peak hour vehicles movements anticipated to be generated by the proposed development;

Period	Arrivals	Departures	Two-Way Trips
AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)	120	204	324
PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	157	97	254

6.3 In addition to the additional peak hour vehicle demand set out above, the development will also generate a significant number of new multi-modal trips throughout the day. The daily multi-modal trip generation for the proposed development based on Hampshire County Council’s Transport Contributions Policy for the outline application of 450 dwellings is 3,489 new trips.

6.4 This number of new multi-modal trips is based on annual trip rates derived from the Department for Transport’s National Travel Survey. An occupancy level is assumed for various sizes of dwelling (1 bed, 2-3 bed, 4+ beds) to calculate the additional number of new multimodal trips, based on the size of the dwellings proposed as part of the development. The following table provides a breakdown of how the number of new multimodal trips has been calculated:

Number of bedrooms	Housing Mix	Daily multimodal trips per dwelling	Total Trips
2 Bed	189	7.0	1,323
3 Bed	155	7.0	1,085
4 Bed	106	10.2	1,081
Total	450		3,489

6.5 The proposed vehicle trip rates have then been distributed across the local highway network and the following junctions have been assessed to determine the impact upon the operation of each of the junctions;

- Barrington Drive/Jersey Close/Carpenter’s Down roundabout

- Don Allen Drive/Popley Way traffic signals
- Chineham Lane/Popley Way traffic signals
- A33 Reading Road/Carpenters Down/Croxford Lane roundabout

6.6 As a result of the assessment it is demonstrated that Barrington Drive/Jersey Close/Carpenter's Down roundabout and Don Allen Drive/Popley Way traffic signals will continue to operate within capacity including the development traffic plus future traffic growth. However, it is demonstrated that Chineham Lane/Popley Way traffic signals will operate marginally over capacity in the PM peak and with limited reserve capacity in the AM peak resulting in periods of queuing and delay. The appellants assessment of the A33 Reading Road/Carpenters Down/Crockford Lane roundabout demonstrates that the junction will be operating close to it's theoretical capacity in the AM and PM peak periods as a result of the additional development traffic and background traffic growth.

6.7 Further to the above detailed assessment, the following junctions were also considered within the Transport Assessment, which identified that the development traffic will result in a proportional impact upon these junctions;

- Carpenters Down/Popley Way traffic signals
- Popley Way/A33 Reading Road traffic signals
- Ringway/Aldermaston Road/Popley Way/Oakridge Road signalised roundabout
- Ringway/Reading Road/Faraday Road/Norn Hill/Oakridge Road signalised roundabout
- Ringway east/Churchill Way east gyratory
- Black Dam roundabout junction 6

6.8 The consideration of the additional travel demands for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users has been based on the proximity of services and facilities including education, retail, employment and leisure to the development and the likely routes residents of the development would take.

6.9 As set out above, the development will generate a significant number of new multi-modal trips. A contribution is required to mitigate against the impact of these trips on the transport network. The infrastructure required to accommodate the additional demand of this development and other development in Basingstoke is considered in Chapter 7 below.

6.10 The proposed development will require a Travel Plan in line with recommendations of the NPPF. This is to inform residents of travel choices available to them to encourage the take up of non car modes of transport.

Full Application BDB/75762

6.11 As noted above the applicant applied the same trip generation calculation methodology as applied to the outline application and the same vehicle trip rates have been used to calculate the trip generation for the proposed 200 dwellings. The vehicle trip rates for the AM and PM peaks are shown in the table below;

Period	Arrivals	Departures	Two-Way Trips
AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)	27	73	100
PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	67	41	108

- 6.12 In addition to the additional peak hour vehicle demand set out above, the development will also generate a significant number of new multi-modal trips throughout the day. The daily multi-modal trip generation for the proposed development based on Hampshire County Council's Transport Contributions Policy for the full application of 200 dwellings is 1550 new trips.
- 6.13 A detailed assessment of the impact of the additional vehicle trips was then applied to the junctions identified above as part of the outline application. The assessment of the junctions identified that the traffic generated as part of the full application will result in reducing capacity at the Chineham Lane/Popley Way traffic signals and the A33 Reading Road/Carpenters Down/Crockford Lane.
- 6.14 Further to the above detailed junction assessment, the applicant also considered the proportional impact on the junctions identified as part of the outline application for consideration. The appellant's assessment identified that the proposed development will result in a proportional impact at the junctions identified.
- 6.15 The proposed development will require a Travel Plan in line with recommendations of the NPPF. This is to inform residents of travel choices available to them to encourage the take up of non car modes of transport.

7 REASON FOR REFUSAL 8

- 7.1 *“In the absence of any suitable legal agreement, or justification for the absence of a legal agreement, the proposed development does not make adequate provision for community and infrastructure contributions in relation to play areas/recreation, playing fields, community facilities, education, on-site provision for art and Basingstoke Environmental Strategy for Transport (BEST) to adequately off-set the impact of the development. Furthermore the proposed development fails to provide the necessary travel plan, landscape management plan, protected species management plan or ecological compensation habitat to adequately mitigate the impact of the development. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, Saved Policies C1, C2, C7, C9 and A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011 and the guidance contained within the Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Interim Guidance Document.”*
- 7.2 As a result of the proposed development a Transport Contribution has been calculated in line with Hampshire County Council’s Transport Contribution Policy. The Transport Contributions Policy applies a financial value per house dependent upon the number of bedrooms per dwelling. The financial contribution is based on assumed household occupancy levels and the known cost of providing new infrastructure required to serve new development.
- 7.3 A contribution to mitigate the impact of the development has been agreed with the appellant. The following chapter provides a summary of the methodology for calculating the level of mitigation required and the reconciliation of this calculation to the Community Infrastructure Levy Legislation (CIL).

Transport Contributions Policy

- 7.4 The Transport Contributions Policy was adopted by HCC in September 2007 after a period of consultation and review. The Policy uses a formulaic approach to calculating the level of transport mitigation required which is based on the likely transport impact of each development. This is in accordance with the advice in ‘Planning Obligations Practice Guidance’ (DCLG 2006) which encourages local authorities to employ formulae and standard charges where appropriate as part of their framework for negotiating and securing planning obligations (paragraph B33).
- 7.5 In order to calculate the contribution the number of multi-modal trips that the development is expected to generate is multiplied by a financial value. The financial value is based on the known cost of providing off-site transport infrastructure at new development sites across Hampshire in 2006/07. The financial value for residential trips is £535 per trip. The Transport Contributions Policy is included in Appendix 3.

Impact of the Development

Outline application BDB/75761

7.6 The daily multi-modal trip generation based on Hampshire County Council's Transport Contributions Policy for the outline application of 450 dwellings is 3,489. Therefore the total contribution required is;

Number of bedrooms	Housing Mix	TCP cost per dwelling (£)	Contribution amount (£)
2 Bed	189	3,745	707,805
3 Bed	155	3,745	580,475
4 Bed	106	5,457	578,442
Total	450		1,866,722

7.7 To take into account the financial commitment included within the proposed Travel Plan, which will seek to increase the use of alternative modes to the private car, this has been deducted from the overall contribution required. The financial commitments are shown below;

- Travel Plan coordinator - £25,750
- Residents information packs - £1,200
- Provision of community notice board - £250
- Community website - £300
- Assistance with sustainable modes travel - £22,500 (offer of PT discounted ticket/cycle voucher)

The total financial commitment for the travel plan is £50,000 and therefore the total contribution required to mitigate against the impact of the outline application is £1,816,722.

7.8 The total contribution required takes into account the dwellings proposed under the full application (BDB/75761) and the calculation of the total financial commitments included within the Travel Plan has been calculated based on the total 450 dwellings being granted permission.

Full application BDB/75762

7.9 The daily multi-modal trip generation based on Hampshire County Council's Transport Contributions policy for the full application of 200 dwellings is 1,550 trips. Therefore the total contribution required for the 200 dwellings proposed under the full application is;

Number of bedrooms	Housing Mix	TCP cost per dwelling (£)	Contribution amount (£)
2 Bed	84	3,745	314,580
3 Bed	69	3,745	258,405
4 Bed	47	5,457	256,479
Total	200		829,464

7.10 To take into account the financial commitment included within the proposed Travel Plan, which will seek to increase the use of alternative modes to the private car, this has been deducted from the overall contribution required. The financial commitments are shown below;

- Travel Plan coordinator - £25,750
- Residents information packs - £550
- Provision of community notice board - £250
- Community website - £300
- Assistance with sustainable modes travel - £10,000 (offer of PT discounted ticket/cycle voucher)

The total financial commitment for the proposed Travel Plan is £36,850 and therefore the total contribution required associated with the full application £792,614.

Mitigation

Outline application BDB/75761

7.11 Should the proposed development of 450 dwellings be allowed, a contribution toward the following measures will be required to mitigate against the impact of the additional trips generated by the proposed development. These schemes are identified within the Basingstoke Town Access Plan and District Transport Statement and are required to support increased travel demands as a result of development within Basingstoke. The schemes identified below are directly related to the proposed development of Land North of Marnel Park;

Highway Infrastructure

7.12 As noted above, the Transport Assessment identified a number of junctions that vehicle traffic associated with the proposed development will impact upon. As a result a contribution is required to enable infrastructure improvements to be brought forward. The infrastructure required to support the proposed development at Marnel Park and other development within Basingstoke are set out below;

- Full signalisation of the A33 Reading Road/Carpenters Down/Crockford Lane Roundabout, including widening of the approaches and circulatory carriageway – estimated cost £1,600,000
- Full signalisation of the A33/Great Binfields roundabout including widening of approaches and circulatory carriageway - estimated cost £1,800,000
- Additional flaring on the approaches and circulatory carriageway of the A339 Ringway North/A340 Aldermaston Road/Popley Way/Oakridge Road roundabout and amendments to the existing signal timings - estimated cost £300,000
- Additional flaring on the approaches and circulatory carriageway of the A339 Ringway E/A339 Ringway N/A33 Reading Road

roundabout and amendments to existing signal timings - estimated cost £200,000

- Creation of a through-about junction bringing Ringway East through the central island of the existing Black Dam roundabout - estimated cost £5,400,000
- Popley Way/Chineham Lane signal junction improvements - estimated cost £38,400 (excluding potential land purchase from Basingstoke)

7.13 The total cost of the highway infrastructure schemes identified is £9,338,400 and it is recognised that there are a number of additional developments which will impact upon the operation of these junctions and will also have to provide the appropriate level of mitigation. It is considered that £1,271,705 reflects a reasonable contribution from the proposed development towards delivering the schemes outlined above. The figure has been calculated based on the proportion of the overall cost of the identified highway infrastructure required to support the development in comparison to the cost of infrastructure required to support all modes of transport as outlined below;

7.14 $\text{£9,338,400 (total cost of highway infrastructure) / £13,131,450 (total cost of all schemes identified) } \times 100 = 70\% \times \text{£1,816,722 (contribution required) } = \text{£1,271,705 (proportion of contribution allocated to highway infrastructure)}$

7.15 Since the submission of the application, the creation of a through-about junction bringing Ringway East through the central island of the existing Black Dam roundabout has secured additional funding through the Highways Agency's Pinch Point Funding Programme. As a result of this funding and funding from Hampshire County Council and Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, the scheme is now fully supported. However, there are still considerable strategic improvements that are required to the highway network to support the proposed development on Land North of Marnel Park and development across Basingstoke. The level of contribution set out above is still therefore considered appropriate to mitigate the additional travel demands resulting from the development.

Public Transport Improvements

7.16 The Basingstoke Town Access Plan has identified a number of improvements required to the public transport interchange facilities required to support the additional travel demands within Basingstoke and to encourage travel by sustainable modes. This is in addition to improvements to local facilities including local bus shelters. The strategic infrastructure improvements are;

- Basingstoke bus station access improvements – estimated cost £250,000 to £1,250,000 depending on the scale of improvements to provide bus priority to access the station.
- Alencon link interchange improvements including the provision of improved waiting facilities to support the recently completed public realm improvements along Alencon Link and the provision of additional bus waiting bays to accommodate new bus services required for new developments – feasibility cost estimate £1,566,000

- Work to the approaches and forecourt at Basingstoke Rail Station – provisionally estimated to cost in excess of £1,000,000

7.17 It is considered that £381,512 is a reasonable contribution towards public transport infrastructure improvements. This is calculated based on the proportion of the overall cost of the identified public transport infrastructure required to support the development in comparison to the cost of infrastructure required to support all modes of travel as shown in the calculation below;

$\text{£2,816,000 (total cost of public transport infrastructure)}/\text{£13,131,450 (total cost of all schemes identified)} \times 100 = 21\% \times \text{£1,816,722 (contribution required)} - \text{£381,512 (proportion of contribution allocated to highway infrastructure)}$.

7.18 It is noted that since the application certain elements of the Public Transport improvements at Basingstoke Rail Station and Alencon Link have been provided, however, further improvements are required to complete the schemes identified above and mitigate the increased passenger demand from additional development within Basingstoke. The level of contribution set out above is still therefore considered appropriate to mitigate the additional travel demands resulting from the development.

Pedestrian and Cycle Infrastructure Improvements

7.19 A contribution is required to improve pedestrian and cycle infrastructure within the vicinity of the site. This includes but not exclusively the following improvements;

- Crossing point of the A33 Reading Road linking to Kingsland Business Park via Bilton Road – estimated cost £150,000
- Crossing point of Crockford Lane with associated links to Hanmore Road – estimated cost £25,000 to £90,000 depending on level of improvement to crossing point
- Continuation of cycle facilities along Crockford Lane into Chineham Business Park – estimated cost £52,500
- Enhancements to the environment of the Shakespeare Road subway – estimated cost £50,000
- New off-road facilities for cyclists along Shakespeare Road and on-road facilities along Oakridge Road – estimated cost £64,550
- Improvements to the A339 footbridge parapets including raising the bridge parapets - £250,000
- Improvements to Hospital footpath, Priestly Road subway, Abbey Road subway, Abbey Road footpath, Kingsclere Road Subway – estimated cost £320,000

7.20 These improvements are focused on the pedestrian and cycle routes that will be used by occupants of the development to travel to local services and facilities including education, retail, leisure and employment destinations. A contribution of £163,505 is therefore considered reasonable. This total contribution reflects the proportion of the overall identified cost of the pedestrian/cycle infrastructure required to support the development in comparison to the cost of the infrastructure required to support all modes of travel, as shown in the calculation below;

£977,050 (total cost of pedestrian/cycle schemes) / £13,131,450 (cost of all schemes associated with the development) = 9%

9% x £1,816,722 (total contribution required) = £163,505

- 7.21 Since the submission of the application the crossing point of the A33 Reading Road linking to Kingsland Business Park via Bilton Road is to be delivered as part of another development. However, improvements to the pedestrian and cycle routes leading to this crossing also need to be improved and the contribution required from the proposed application would be used to help deliver these additional improvements to mitigate the additional travel demands resulting from the development. The level of contribution set out above is still therefore considered appropriate to mitigate the additional travel demands resulting from the development.

Full application BDB/75762

- 7.22 Should the proposed development of 200 dwellings as part of the full application be allowed then the required contribution will be used towards the schemes identified above as part of the required contribution for BDB/75762. The method for apportioning the contribution to the schemes will be applied to the total contribution of £792,614 as shown below;

Highway infrastructure

£9,338,400 (total cost of highway infrastructure schemes) / £13,131,450 (cost of all schemes associated with the development) = 70%

70% x £792,614 (total contribution required) = £554,830

Public Transport Infrastructure Improvements

£2,816,000 (total cost of public transport improvements) / £13,131,450 (cost of all schemes associated with the development) = 21%

21% x £792,614 (total contribution required) = £166,449

Pedestrian/Cycle Improvements

£977,050 (total cost of pedestrian/cycle schemes) / £13,131,450 (cost of all schemes associated with the development) = 9%

9% x £792,614 (total contribution required) = £71,335

Community Infrastructure Levy

- 7.23 Statutory Instrument 2010 No.948 Clause 122 limits the use of planning obligations and states that obligations must be:

- i) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- ii) directly related to the development; and
- iii) fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind to the development.

Necessary

- 7.24 The contribution sought is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms due to the need to provide new infrastructure to accommodate the extra demands generated by the development. The contribution is also necessary to promote travel by means other than the private car and create a sustainable development, as required by current planning policy identified within the NPPF. As identified above, the contribution will be used to deliver a number of schemes including improvements to pedestrian and public transport infrastructure.
- 7.25 The requirement for a contribution towards the improvements is also relevant in planning terms because it relates to the Government's and the Council's sustainability and growth agendas, and in particular, to encourage patterns of development which reduce the need to travel by private car and to enable travel to and from the site by sustainable modes as outlined in the NPPF.
- 7.26 If a contribution were not to be provided as part of the applications subject to this appeal, the resultant traffic generated by the proposed development would result in a severe impact upon the operation of the highway network. Through the applicants Transport Assessment it is identified that without mitigation the operation of the following junctions will exceed their theoretical capacity resulting in additional delay for users of the highway network;
- Chineham Lane/Popley Way Traffic Signals
 - A33 Reading Road/Carpenters Down/Crockford Lane Roundabout

In addition to the impact of the development on the above junctions, the Transport Assessment has identified that the development will have a proportional impact on the operation of a number of junctions across Basingstoke that are identified in the Basingstoke Town Access Plan and District Transport Statement as requiring improvement to support planned growth across Basingstoke. Without a contribution toward these improvements to enable them to be delivered, the cumulative impact on the operation of the highway network would be severe.

In addition to this there would not be the provision of access to and from the development via sustainable modes as identified within the NPPF as a prerequisite for development. This is also contrary to Policy C1 and A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Adopted Local Plan.

Directly related

- 7.27 The contribution is directly related to the proposed development as the infrastructure that will be funded by this appeal site will be of direct benefit to the residents of the development as set out above. The infrastructure improvements are focused on delivering better access from the appeal site to important services

such as the town centre, local schools and also the rail station to enable better access to these facilities across all modes.

- 7.28 The improvements will mitigate the impact of the additional traffic generated by the proposal and will also provide viable alternatives to travel other than the private car, thus reducing the overall impact of the development upon the local highway network.

Fair and reasonable in scale and kind

- 7.29 The contribution is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development because it is calculated by reference to the increased cost of mitigating residential trips forecast to be generated by the development proposals. This is based on the County Council's adopted policy for calculating transport contributions which provides for a cost per trip model.

Summary

- 7.30 As outlined above, a contribution of £1,816,722 and the implementation of a Travel Plan is required to mitigate against the impact of the development proposed under the outline application (BDB/75761). This includes the level of mitigation required under the full application.
- 7.31 Should the full application (BDB/75762) come forward in isolation of the outline application, a contribution of £792,614 and the implementation of a Travel Plan is required to mitigate against the impact of the development proposed under the full application.
- 7.32 The contributions are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the proposed development and reasonable in scale and kind to the impact of the development.

11 CONCLUSIONS

- 11.1 My evidence has demonstrated that the appeal application requires the payment of a Transport Contribution in line with Hampshire County Council's Transport Contributions Policy and a Travel Plan to mitigate against the impact of the additional development traffic and to also encourage sustainable travel to and from the site in line with the NPPF and local planning policy.
- 11.2 My evidence has demonstrated that the transport contribution will mitigate the impact of the development traffic by being applied to a range of highway, pedestrian, cycle and public transport measures that would encourage the take up of non car based travel modes and mitigate the harmful impact that the additional traffic would have on the local highway network. It has been demonstrated that the transport contribution would meet the tests set out in CIL Regulation 122, in that it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to the impact of the development.
- 11.3 On the basis of the above evidence, and in the event that a completed Section 106 Agreement is not presented to the Inquiry to secure the transport contribution and Travel Plan, I respectfully request that the Appeal be dismissed.

Appendix 1 – Application consultation response to BDB/75761



Head of Planning and Building
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Civic Offices
London Road
BASINGSTOKE
Hampshire
RG21 4AJ

*Economy, Transport and Environment Department
Elizabeth II Court West, The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD*

Tel: 0845 603 5638 (General Enquiries)
0845 603 5633 (Roads and Transport)
0845 603 5634 (Recycling Waste & Planning)
Textphone 0845 603 5625
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries to

Ben Howard

My reference

6-3-1-377 (2873)

Direct Line

01962 846814

Your reference

BDB/75761

Date

17 May 2012

Email

ben.howard@hants.gov.uk

For the attention of Katherine Miles

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application Consultation BDB/75761: Outline planning application including means of access for up to 450 dwellings, a community centre, a 1 form entry primary school and associated access, open space and landscaping, Land North of Marnel Park, Basingstoke

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced Planning Application. As you will be aware the County Council have been liaising with the applicant to understand the impact of the development on the surrounding highway and transport infrastructure and to discuss the proposals since the Planning Application was submitted. This has resulted in the submission of a series of amended plans and further assessment work being undertaken. I would now like to take this opportunity to make the following formal comments on the proposal on behalf of the highway authority.

Proposed Development

Trip Generation

The development proposals consist of up to 450 dwellings and a 1 form entry primary school on land to the north of the existing Marnel Park development in Basingstoke. In order to assess the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding transport network the TRICS database has been interrogated to determine the amount of vehicle movements that are likely to be generated by the residential dwellings and the school. The TRICS database contains independent survey data and its use to determine the likely number of vehicles generated by the proposed development is considered robust.

A traffic survey has also been undertaken of the neighbouring residential cul-de-sac of Jersey Close and Guernsey Close for comparative purposes. The number of car movements generated per dwelling on Jersey Close and Guernsey Close is lower than the figures derived from the TRICS database. The assessment undertaken is therefore considered robust.

Table 1 below illustrates the number of peak hour vehicle movements that have been considered in the assessment.

Period	Arrivals	Departures	Two-Way Trips
AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)	120	204	324
PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	157	97	254

Table 1: Site wide trip generation (450 dwellings & 1FE Primary School)

Trip Distribution

In order to determine the impact of these additional vehicle movements on the surrounding highway network the traffic has been distributed onto the network using the journey to work data contained within the 2001 census.

Consideration has also been given to the distribution of traffic across the site accesses and trips have been assigned across the accesses based not only on the origin and destination of the trip but also on the standard of route available. This approach is considered robust.

Traffic Growth and Committed Developments

To take account of background traffic growth that will occur from 2010 when the traffic surveys were undertaken to 2019 and 2026 when the future year assessments have been carried out, the TEMPRO dataset has been interrogated. TEMPRO growth factors have been used to project the future traffic flows and take account of background traffic growth across the strategic network as well as growth projected from local development. This approach is consistent with traffic forecasting methodologies applied nationally.

The additional traffic likely to be generated by a number of local developments has also been included in the assessment. This includes Marnel Park (BDB/48052), Merton Rise (BDB/56462), Park Prewitt (BDB/37260), John Hunt (BDB/57044) and Faroe Close (BDB/68128). Whilst there is potentially an element of double counting on the local road network as a result of the use of TEMPRO growth factors and the inclusion of the specific committed development traffic, the assessment is considered sufficiently robust.

Traffic Impact

The study area was agreed with the applicant in advance of the planning application submission. Detailed junction modelling has been undertaken at the following junctions:

- Barrington Drive/Jersey Close/Carpenter's Down roundabout;
- Don Allen Drive/Popley Way traffic signals;
- Chineham Lane/Popley Way traffic signals; and

- A33 Reading Road/Carpenters Down/Crockford Lane roundabout.

It is considered that the study area is suitable and considers the parts of the local network which are likely to experience the greatest impact from development. The operation of these junctions in terms of the increase in peak hour traffic flow have been considered individually below.

Barrington Drive/Jersey Close/Carpenter's Down roundabout

The operation of the Barrington Drive/Jersey Close/Carpenter's Down roundabout has been assessed using ARCADY. This is the industry standard tool for assessing the operation of roundabouts. The future years assessment (2019 & 2026) has demonstrated that the roundabout will continue to operate within capacity in the AM and PM peaks with the development traffic included on the network. The County Council concur with the results of the assessment of the operation of this junction and are satisfied that the proposed development will not have a significantly adverse impact on the operation of this junction.

Don Allen Drive/Popley Way traffic signals

The operation of the Don Allen Drive/Popley Way signals has been assessed using LINSIG which is the industry standard tool for assessing the operation of signalised junctions. The future years assessment has demonstrated that the junction will continue to operate within capacity in the AM and PM peaks with the development traffic included on the network. The County Council concur with the results of the assessment of the operation of this junction. No improvements to this junction are required to accommodate the impact of the development.

Chineham Lane/Popley Way traffic signals

The operation of the Chineham Lane/Popley Way signals has been assessed using LINSIG which is the industry standard tool for assessing the operation of signalised junctions. The future years assessment demonstrates that the junction will be approaching its theoretical capacity in the AM and PM peak periods without the development traffic included on the network.

Once the development traffic is included in the assessment of the operation of the junction it is predicted that the theoretical capacity of the Popley Way arms will be exceeded in the PM peak. This means that the queue that develops while the traffic signals are on red for the Popley Way arms of the junction is unlikely to clear within each cycle of the traffic signals. In the AM peak with the development traffic included in the assessment there is still predicted to be a very small amount of reserve capacity available, but the junction may be susceptible to periods of queuing and delay.

Whilst the junction is predicted to exceed its theoretical capacity the assessment undertaken by the applicant has demonstrated that the junction already operates very close to its theoretical capacity, and that the development will only have a proportional impact on the operation of the junction. It is therefore considered that a contribution toward mitigating the

impact of the development at this junction is required. This mitigation could include the provision of a left turn flare on the approach to the junction from Chineham Lane which offers an improvement to the operation of the junction or through the provision of alternative measures to encourage travel by sustainable modes. This will be considered further below when identifying the level of mitigation required from the development.

A33 Reading Road/Carpenters Down/Crockford Lane roundabout

The operation of the A33 Reading Road/Carpenters Down/Crockford Lane roundabout has been assessed using ARCADY. The baseline modelling of the junction provides a good representation of the current operation of the roundabout. Once the committed development traffic and background traffic growth has been included in the traffic model for the future years assessment the junction is anticipated to be approaching its theoretical capacity in the AM and PM peak periods with the demand on the A33 Reading Road arms of the junction beginning to exceed capacity.

Whilst the development is not anticipated to significantly increase the number of vehicles on the A33 Reading Road arms of the junction it is anticipated to contribute to an increase in vehicles along the Carpenter's Down arm of the junction, particularly in the AM peak. Because the capacity of this arm is currently very low due to the dominant flow of the A33 Reading Road the assessment demonstrates that the development will contribute to additional queuing and delay along this arm.

Given the impact of the development on the junction and the scale of improvement that the County Council are looking to deliver in this location to support the future growth in Basingstoke it is considered that a contribution toward the future improvement of this junction is required. This will be considered further below when identifying the level of mitigation required from the development toward strategic infrastructure improvements.

Further Junction Assessment

The proportional impact of the development has also been considered on the following junctions within the Transport Assessment:

- Carpenters Down/Popley Way traffic signals;
- Popley Way/A33 Reading Road traffic signals;
- Ringway/Aldermaston Road/Popley Way/Oakridge Road signalised roundabout;
- Ringway/Reading Road/Faraday Road/Norn Hill/Oakridge Road signalised roundabout;
- Ringway east/Churchill Way east gyratory;
- and; Black Dam roundabout and M3 junction 6.

The assessment illustrated that the development would have a proportional impact on the above junctions. Whilst the scale of the impact is not considered to necessitate detailed junction modelling it is the County Council's position

that mitigation is required by way of a contribution. This is considered in further detail below.

Site Access Proposals

Four vehicular accesses are proposed into the development. Three of these accesses are proposed from the existing roads that form part of the Marnel Park development and the fourth access is proposed from Jersey Close which is presently a cul-de-sac. The accesses proposed from the existing Marnel Park development are from secondary level roads and I have commented on the design of each access below.

Hutchins Way Access

The proposed access from Hutchins Way is shown on drawing HBH10090/D20 REV B and would convert the end of the existing cul-de-sac into a route into the proposed development. A raised table has been proposed as part of the access and will contribute to reducing traffic speeds. The internal street network of the new development has also been designed to achieve low vehicular speeds along Hutchins Way with a change in the horizontal alignment of the road provided by a 'square' within the development. Hutchins Way is currently 5.5m wide and the access into the development is approximately 90m from the primary route through the existing Marnel Park development.

On the basis of the assessment work that has been undertaken it is assumed that the development would result in approximately an additional 90 two-way vehicle movements (i.e. 64 outbound and 24 inbound in the AM peak) using Hutchins Way in the AM peak and PM peak periods to access the primary route through the development. The geometry and alignment of Hutchins Way is considered appropriate to accommodate this level of additional vehicle movement. The design of the access as shown in principle on drawing HBH10090/D20 REV B is considered acceptable.

Hewitt Road Access

The proposed access from Hewitt Road is shown on drawing HBH10090/D21 REV B and would convert the end of the existing Hewitt Road cul-de-sac into a route into the proposed development. The internal street network of the new development has been designed to achieve low vehicular speeds along Hewitt Road with the provision of a raised table feature within the development. Hewitt Road is 4.8m wide and connects to the primary route through the Marnel Park development via either Gardner Road or Cleeve Road. The route to the primary road via Gardiner Road is approximately 160m in length whilst the route via Cleeve Road is approximately 260m in length.

It is anticipated that the additional vehicle movements associated with the Hewitt Road access into development would be split across both Gardner Road and Cleeve Road depending on the destination of their journey. On the basis of the assessment work that has been undertaken it is assumed that the development would result in approximately an additional 50 two-way vehicle

movements using Hewitt Road in the AM peak and PM peak periods, with these 50 two way movements then split across both Gardner Road and Cleeve Road to access the primary route through the development.

The geometry and alignment of Hewitt Road, Gardner Road and Cleeve Road are considered appropriate to accommodate this level of additional vehicle movements. The design of the access as shown in principle on drawing HBH10090/D21 REV B is considered acceptable.

Cleeve Road Access

The proposed access from Cleeve Road is shown on drawing HBH10090/D23 REV B and would convert the end of the existing Cleeve Road cul-de-sac into a route into the proposed development. Whilst the details of the on-site layout for phase 2 of the development have not been confirmed due to the nature of the application, the applicant has demonstrated that the internal street network of the new development could be appropriately designed to achieve low vehicular speeds along Cleeve Road. This is shown '*in principle*' on drawing AI27-PS23 REV A and includes a change in the horizontal and vertical alignment of the road with the provision of a 'square'. Cleeve Road is currently 4.8m wide and provides a link which is approximately 130m in length to the primary route through the existing Marnel Park development.

On the basis of the assessment work that has been undertaken it is assumed that the development would result in approximately an additional 40 two-way vehicle movements using Cleeve Road in the AM peak and PM peak periods to access the primary route through the development. The geometry and alignment of Cleeve Road is considered appropriate to accommodate this level of vehicle movement. The design of the access as shown in principle on drawing HBH10090/D23 REV B is considered acceptable.

Jersey Close Access

The proposed access from Jersey Close is shown on drawing HBH10090/D09 REV G and is in the form of a simple priority junction. Vehicle tracking has been provided demonstrating that there is sufficient width and intervisibility available in this location to enable a bus and a car to pass. Drawing HBH10090/D09 REV G also illustrates a footpath connection set behind existing vegetation between the existing footway provided at the Barrington Drive roundabout and the proposed access.

Due to the proposed location of the school within the development and the number of projected pedestrian movements the County Council's preference would be for the footway to be provided adjacent to the carriageway. This is something that has been raised previously however it is understood that the Planning Authority are concerned regarding the impact on the existing hedge. On balance however the highway authority are content with the proposed provision behind the vegetation along Jersey Close. The footpath should however be finished with a metalled surface as opposed to the hoggin style surface currently proposed on the drawing. This is to ensure that the provision can be used in all weather and is appropriately surfaced for the number of

pedestrians that are anticipated to use this link. It is considered that this could be dealt with following a decision on the application by way of a condition.

It is assumed that the development would result in approximately an additional 130 two-way vehicle movements using the first 90m of Jersey Close between the Barrington Drive roundabout and the site access in the AM peak and approximately 70 two-way vehicle movements in the PM peak periods. Jersey Close is almost 6m in width and the geometry and alignment of Jersey Close is considered appropriate to accommodate this level of additional vehicle movement. The design of the access as shown in principle on drawing HBH10090/ D09 REV G is considered acceptable.

Carter Drive Pedestrian Access

A pedestrian/cycle link is proposed from Carter Drive into phase 1 of the development. This link is shown on drawing HBH10090/ D22 REV B and has suitable geometry and provides sufficient visibility where joining the adjacent road network and is considered acceptable *'in principle'*.

Summary

Whilst it is accepted that residents of the existing Marnel Park development will be concerned about additional traffic using the proposed accesses into the development, a series of traffic calming features have been incorporated into the design of the proposed development to encourage low vehicle speeds. In addition to this the geometry and alignment of the existing roads are considered to be appropriate in engineering terms to accommodate the additional traffic movements that are anticipated. The design of the individual access points, as shown in principle on the planning application drawings identified above, are considered to be acceptable. The submission of additional details in relation to the construction of the accesses should be secured by condition and I have recommended a series of conditions at the end of my response.

Construction Traffic

In order to minimise the impact of construction traffic on the existing residential area it is proposed that construction vehicles will access phase 1 of the development via the proposed access from Jersey Close and a haul road across phase 2 of the development. This is considered preferable due to the low number of dwellings in close proximity to Jersey Close and the more suitable alignment of the road. Detailed proposals for managing the construction of the proposed development will need to be submitted prior to the commencement of work on-site and should be secured by condition.

It is acknowledged that a small number of construction vehicles would need to gain access to a compound within phase 1 of the development from either Hutchins Way or Hewitt Road prior to the construction of the haul road. The submission of detailed proposals to manage these limited number of construction traffic movements will also need to be submitted and this should

be secured by condition. I have recommended a condition at the end of my response to secure this.

On-site Layout

The advice in relation to the on-site layout and level of parking proposed should be provided by the engineers at your authority under the terms of the Agency Agreement.

Access to Local Services and Facilities

The Transport Assessment demonstrates that there are a number of education, retail, employment and health facilities within walking and cycling distance from the site. Whilst a number of services and facilities are within walking and cycling distance, improvements are required to the routes that serve these facilities to encourage travel by sustainable modes. These are set out below when consideration is given to the level of mitigation required in support of the proposed development.

Consideration has been given in the Transport Assessment to the accessibility of the site to local bus services. As identified in the Transport Assessment there are bus stops located within 200 meters of the existing Barrington Drive roundabout which are served by the Jazz 3 and Service 4. The Jazz 3 provides a high frequency service to the town centre while the Service 4 provides services to the town centre, hospital and Chineham Centre.

Whilst the level of public transport provision from these stops is high it is acknowledged that a proportion of the development falls outside of a reasonable walking distance from these stops. The County Council are currently working with local bus operators to provide public transport services along the principal route through the existing development. This would provide public transport services within an acceptable walking distance of the proposed development.

The primary route through the proposed development has also been designed to accommodate buses and it is understood that the local bus operator is supportive of diverting a bus along this primary route when the development has been built out. This would serve to further enhance the level of public transport provision for occupants of the new development.

Transport Contributions Policy

A contribution is required to mitigate against the impact of the development on the local highway and transport network. The level of contribution will be calculated in accordance with the County Council's Transport Contributions Policy that uses a formulaic approach to calculating the level of mitigation required which is based on the direct transport impact of the development.

In order to calculate the contribution the net increase in the number of multi-modal trips that the development is expected to generate has been quantified and this has been multiplied by a financial value. The financial value is based on the known cost of providing off-site transport infrastructure at new development sites across Hampshire.

The contribution will be used to deliver the highway infrastructure required to mitigate against the cumulative impact of growth within Basingstoke and will also be used to deliver improvements to the existing pedestrian, cycle and public transport infrastructure in the vicinity of the development. The contribution will be used to deliver infrastructure that is directly related to the proposed development and is considered to be reasonable in scale and kind in accordance with the impact of the development as required by CIL Regulation 122. I have provided more details in relation to these infrastructure improvements below.

Highway Infrastructure

The contribution will be used to deliver the highway infrastructure required to mitigate against the cumulative impact of growth within Basingstoke. This includes improvements to the following junctions:

- A33 Reading Road/Carpentars Down/Crockford Lane roundabout
- A33/Great Binfields Road roundabout
- A339 Ringway North/A340 Aldermaston Road/Popley Way/Oakridge Road roundabout
- A339 Ringway E/A339 Ringway N/A33 Reading Road roundabout

In order to demonstrate that the highway network can continue to operate satisfactorily with the additional traffic from the proposed development sites contained within Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's draft core strategy, improvements have been developed for the a number of junctions across Basingstoke. This includes improvements at the above junctions to mitigate against the impact of the development proposed to the north and north east of Basingstoke including the development at Marnel Park.

The improvements identified for the Crockford Lane and Binfields roundabouts include the full signalisation of the existing junctions with considerable additional flaring and widening of the circulatory carriageway to facilitate the operation of the junctions under signal control. The improvements identified at the Aldermaston roundabout and the A33/Ringway junction include additional flaring on the approaches and circulatory carriageway and amendments to the existing signal timings to improve the operation of these junctions that currently operate under signal control.

In addition to the above improvements the contribution will be used to provide mitigation to reduce the impact of the development on the operation of the Popley Way/Chineham Lane signal junction. As identified by the assessment work undertaken by the applicant, the development at Marnel Park has an impact on the operation of this junction. The County Council have identified an

opportunity to improve the operation of the junction with the provision of a left turn flare on Chineham Lane. This improvement offers an improvement to the capacity of the junction that would support the proposed development to the north of Marnel Park and the consented developments in Popley.

A contribution toward these improvements is necessary to make the development acceptable and is directly related to the impact of the proposed development on land north of Marnel Park in accordance with the CIL regulations. The contribution is also fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind of the proposed development as the contribution will be used to mitigate against the cumulative impact caused by the additional traffic from the development and will only be used to fund a proportion of the works needed at these junctions to support the planned growth in Basingstoke.

Public Transport Improvements

A number of improvements are required to the public transport interchange facilities in Basingstoke to support the additional travel demands resulting from growth in Basingstoke. These interchange facilities include the bus station, rail station and Alencon Link interchange. The improvements required to the public transport interchange facilities are identified in the Basingstoke Town Access Plan and are necessary to accommodate the additional travel demand resulting from the proposed development at Marnel Park, as well as other development in the town, and to encourage travel by sustainable modes by providing high quality public transport infrastructure.

The improvements required at Basingstoke Bus Station include access improvements to the station forecourt along with the provision of bus priority measures in the vicinity of the bus station to improve access. These works are supported by the proposals to improve public transport information available at the station. The improvements at Alencon Link interchange include the provision of improved waiting facilities to support the recently completed public realm improvements along Alencon Link. The Alencon Link interchange works also include the provision of additional bus waiting bays to accommodate new bus services required for new developments in Basingstoke including the development at Marnel Park.

The Basingstoke Town Access Plan also identifies that improvements are required to the Basingstoke Rail Station to support additional travel demand and to promote travel by sustainable modes. The scope of works to the station are currently being investigated with Network Rail and the train operators but include improvements to the stations access, forecourt and booking hall.

A proportion of the overall contribution from the proposed development at Marnel Park would be used to bring forward improvements to the public transport interchange infrastructure in Basingstoke as outlined above. A contribution toward these measures is relevant to planning and necessary to make the development acceptable in that it will encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. This is in accordance with the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and Saved Policy A2

of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan that identify that opportunities to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes should be maximised.

Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Improvements

A contribution is required toward the provision of improved pedestrian and cycle facilities that link the development to surrounding services and facilities within Basingstoke. These improvements have been identified in the Basingstoke Town Access Plan to assist with the promotion of travel by sustainable modes within Basingstoke.

To the east of the site between Popley and Chineham retail centre and business areas there are a lack of pedestrian/cycle links and crossing facilities. This includes, but not exclusively, a crossing point of the A33 Reading Road linking to Kingsland Business Park via Bilton Road, a crossing point of Crockford Lane with associated links to Hanmore Road, and the continuation of the cycle facilities along Crockford Lane into Chineham Business Park.

To the south of the site improvements are required to the links between the development and Oakridge and onward toward the town centre. This includes, but not exclusively, enhancements to the environment of the Shakespear Road subway and new off-road facilities for cyclists along Shakespear Road and on-road facilities along Oakridge Road. Improvements are also required to the footbridges across the A339 which potentially include raising the bridge parapets to address perceived safety concerns that effect pedestrians decisions to use the bridges to walk and cycle toward the town centre.

To the west of the site improvements are required to the pedestrian infrastructure that provides access from the development to the Houndmill's Industrial Estate and the hospital. These improvements include upgrading Hospital footpath, Priestley Road subway, Abbey Road subway, and Abbey Road footpath, and the Kingsclere Road subway.

These improvements to the pedestrian and cycle infrastructure in the vicinity of the site are identified within the Basingstoke Town Access Plan and will contribute toward encouraging residents of the development to travel by sustainable modes. This is in accordance with the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and Saved Policy A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan that identify that opportunities to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes should be maximised.

The agreed level of contribution will need to be secured in a Section 106 Agreement between the County Council and the applicant. As you will be aware I am currently in the process of agreeing the contribution and the payment triggers with the applicant and will update you in due course.

Continued...//

Travel Plan

A Travel Plan has been submitted in support of the planning application. Whilst some of the elements of the Travel Plan are considered to be particularly strong further work is required in some areas. I have written to the applicant under separate cover in relation to this. The County Council consider that these amendments could be dealt with following a decision on the Planning Application. The obligation to implement the Travel Plan should be secured within the Section 106 Agreement.

Summary

The Transport Assessment submitted in support of the planning application considers the impact of the development on the local highway network. The assessment is considered robust. A financial contribution is required to mitigate against the identified impact of the development on the surrounding highway network and improve the multi-modal accessibility of the site. This contribution will need to be secured in a Section 106 Agreement between the applicant and the County Council.

The site vehicular accesses are shown in '*in principle*' on drawings HBH10090/D20 REV B, HBH10090/D21 REV B, HBH10090/D23 REV B and HBH10090/D09 REV G. These access points are considered acceptable to the highway authority '*in principle*'. Further details will need to be submitted by the applicant following a decision on the application and prior to the commencement of construction of each access. As set out above, the type of surfacing proposed for the footpath link between the Barrington Drive roundabout and the Jersey Close access will need to be amended on drawing HBH10090/D09 REV G. The alignment and geometry of the existing Marnel Park on-site roads are considered appropriate to accommodate the additional use by multi-modal traffic anticipated as a result of the development.

Recommendation: subject to the below conditions, the provision of a contribution toward mitigating against the impact of the additional multi-modal traffic generated by the development and the securing of a bonded and monitored Travel Plan I raise no objection to the above referenced application.

Conditions:

- No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i. the parking and turning of vehicles of site operatives and visitors (all to be established within one week of the commencement of development);
 - ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials;

- iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- iv. wheel washing facilities or an explanation why they are not necessary;
- v. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
- vi. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
- vii. a scheme for recycling and disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction work; and
- viii. the management and coordination of deliveries of plant and materials and the disposing of waste resulting from demolition and or construction activities so as to avoid undue interference with the operation of the public highway, particularly during the Monday to Friday AM peak (08.00 to 09.00) and PM peak (16.30 to 18.00) periods.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011

- No part of Phase 1 of the development hereby approved shall be commenced until such time as the details of the accesses as shown in principle on drawings HBH10090/D20 REV B, HBH10090/D21 REV B, HBH10090/D09 REV G and HBH10090/ D22 REV B have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be constructed in accordance with a programme agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interest of highway safety and in accordance with Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011

- No part of Phase 2 of the development hereby approved shall be commenced until such time as the detail of the access as shown in principle on drawing HBH10090/D23 REV B have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be constructed in accordance with a programme agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interest of highway safety and in accordance with Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011

I trust that the above is clear but I would ask you not to hesitate to contact Ben Howard should you wish to discuss this further.

Continued...//

Yours faithfully

Tim Wall
Team Leader - Highways Development Planning

cc. Owen Pocock – BDBC Transportation (email only)
cc. Hannah Baker – HCC Transport Team (email only)

Appendix 2 – Application consultation response to BDB/75762



Head of Planning and Building
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Civic Offices
London Road
BASINGSTOKE
Hampshire
RG21 4AJ

*Economy, Transport and Environment Department
Elizabeth II Court West, The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD*

Tel: 0845 603 5638 (General Enquiries)
0845 603 5633 (Roads and Transport)
0845 603 5634 (Recycling Waste & Planning)
Textphone 0845 603 5625
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries to

Ben Howard

My reference

6-3-1-377 (3155)

Direct Line

01962 846814

Your reference

BDB/75762

Date

12 June 2012

Email

ben.howard@hants.gov.uk

For the attention of Katherine Miles

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application Consultation BDB/75762: Full planning application including means of access for 200 dwellings, open space and landscaping, Land North of Marnel Park, Basingstoke

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced Planning Application. The Planning Application is a Full Application for 200 dwellings which forms the first phase of the proposed development of 450 dwellings on Land North of Marnel Park considered under a separate Planning Application (BDB/75761). As you will be aware the County Council have considered the proposed Outline Planning Application for 450 dwellings including the means of access and the impact of the development on the surrounding highway network. The highway authorities formal comments were set out in a letter to yourself dated 17 May 2012 and referenced 6-3-1-377 (2873).

I would now like to take this opportunity to make the following formal comments on the proposed Full Planning Application for 200 dwellings on behalf of the highway authority.

Proposed Development

Trip Generation

The development proposals consist of 200 dwellings on land to the north of the existing Marnel Park development in Basingstoke. In order to assess the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding transport network the TRICS database has been interrogated to determine the amount of vehicle movements that are likely to be generated by the residential dwellings. The TRICS database contains independent survey data and its use to determine

the likely number of vehicles generated by the proposed development is considered robust.

A traffic survey has also been undertaken of the neighbouring residential cul-de-sac of Jersey Close and Guernsey Close for comparative purposes. The number of car movements generated per dwelling on Jersey Close and Guernsey Close is lower than the figures derived from the TRICS database. The assessment undertaken is therefore considered robust.

Table 1 below illustrates the number of peak hour vehicle movements that have been considered in the assessment.

Period	Arrivals	Departures	Two-Way Trips
AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)	27	73	100
PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	67	41	108

Table 1: Phase 1 200 dwelling trip generation

Trip Distribution

In order to determine the impact of these additional vehicle movements on the surrounding highway network the traffic has been distributed onto the network using the journey to work data contained within the 2001 census.

Consideration has also been given to the distribution of traffic across the site accesses onto Hutchins Way and Hewitt Road and trips have been assigned across the accesses based not only on the origin and destination of the trip but also on the standard of route available. This approach is considered robust.

Traffic Growth and Committed Developments

To take account of background traffic growth that will occur from 2010 when the traffic surveys were undertaken to 2019 and 2026 when the future year assessments have been carried out, the TEMPRO dataset has been interrogated. TEMPRO growth factors have been used to project the future traffic flows and take account of background traffic growth across the strategic network as well as growth projected from local development. This approach is consistent with traffic forecasting methodologies applied nationally.

The additional traffic likely to be generated by a number of local developments has also been included in the assessment. This includes Marnel Park (BDB/48052), Merton Rise (BDB/56462), Park Prewitt (BDB/37260), John Hunt (BDB/57044) and Faroe Close (BDB/68128). Whilst there is potentially an element of double counting on the local road network as a result of the use of TEMPRO growth factors and the inclusion of the specific committed development traffic the assessment is considered sufficiently robust.

Traffic Impact

The study area was agreed with the applicant in advance of the planning application submission. Detailed junction modelling has been undertaken at the following junctions:

- Barrington Drive/Jersey Close/Carpenter's Down roundabout;
- Don Allen Drive/Popley Way traffic signals;
- Chineham Lane/Popley Way traffic signals; and
- A33 Reading Road/Carpentars Down/Crockford Lane roundabout.

It is considered that the study area is suitable and considers the parts of the local network which are likely to experience the greatest impact from development. The operation of these junctions in terms of the increase in peak hour traffic flow have been considered individually below.

Barrington Drive/Jersey Close/Carpenter's Down roundabout

The operation of the Barrington Drive/Jersey Close/Carpenter's Down roundabout has been assessed using ARCADY. This is the industry standard tool for assessing the operation of roundabouts. The future years assessment (2019 & 2026) has demonstrated that the roundabout will continue to operate within capacity in the AM and PM peaks with the development traffic included on the network. The County Council concur with the results of the assessment of the operation of this junction and are satisfied that the proposed development will not have a significantly adverse impact on the operation of this junction.

Don Allen Drive/Popley Way traffic signals

The operation of the Don Allen Drive/Popley Way signals has been assessed using LINSIG which is the industry standard tool for assessing the operation of signalised junctions. The future years assessment has demonstrated that the junction will continue to operate within capacity in the AM and PM peaks with the development traffic included on the network. The County Council concur with the results of the assessment of the operation of this junction. No improvements to this junction are required to accommodate the impact of the development.

Chineham Lane/Popley Way traffic signals

The operation of the Chineham Lane/Popley Way signals has been assessed using LINSIG which is the industry standard tool for assessing the operation of signalised junctions. The future years assessment demonstrates that the junction will be approaching its theoretical capacity in the AM and PM peak periods without the development traffic included on the network.

Once the development traffic is included in the assessment of the operation of the junction it is predicted that the theoretical capacity of the Popley Way arms will be exceeded in the PM peak. This means that the queue that develops while the traffic signals are on red for the Popley Way arms of the junction is unlikely to clear within each cycle of the traffic signals. In the AM peak with the development traffic included in the assessment there is still predicted to be a very small amount of reserve capacity available, but the junction may be susceptible to periods of queuing and delay.

Whilst the junction is predicted to exceed its theoretical capacity the assessment undertaken by the applicant has demonstrated that the junction already operates very close to its theoretical capacity, and that the development will only have a proportional impact on the operation of the junction. It is therefore considered that a contribution toward mitigating the impact of the development at this junction is required. This mitigation could include the provision of a left turn flare on the approach to the junction from Chineham Lane which offers an improvement to the operation of the junction or through the provision of alternative measures to encourage travel by sustainable modes. This will be considered further below when identifying the level of mitigation required from the development.

A33 Reading Road/Carpenters Down/Crockford Lane roundabout

The operation of the A33 Reading Road/Carpenters Down/Crockford Lane roundabout has been assessed using ARCADY. The baseline modelling of the junction provides a good representation of the current operation of the roundabout. Once the committed development traffic and background traffic growth has been included in the traffic model for the future years assessment the junction is anticipated to be approaching its theoretical capacity in the AM and PM peak periods with the demand on the A33 Reading Road arms of the junction beginning to exceed capacity.

Whilst the development is not anticipated to significantly increase the number of vehicles on the A33 Reading Road arms of the junction it is anticipated to contribute to an increase in vehicles along the Carpenter's Down arm of the junction, particularly in the AM peak. Because the capacity of this arm is currently very low due to the dominant flow of the A33 Reading Road the assessment demonstrates that the development will contribute to additional queuing and delay along this arm.

Given the impact of the development on the junction and the scale of improvement that the County Council are looking to deliver in this location to support the future growth in Basingstoke it is considered that a contribution toward the future improvement of this junction is required. This will be considered further below when identifying the level of mitigation required from the development toward strategic infrastructure improvements.

Further Junction Assessment

The proportional impact of the development has also been considered on the following junctions within the Transport Assessment:

- Carpenters Down/Popley Way traffic signals;
- Popley Way/A33 Reading Road traffic signals;
- Ringway/Aldermaston Road/Popley Way/Oakridge Road signalised roundabout;
- Ringway/Reading Road/Faraday Road/Norn Hill/Oakridge Road signalised roundabout;
- Ringway east/Churchill Way east gyratory; and

- Black Dam roundabout and M3 junction 6.

The assessment illustrated that the development would have a proportional impact on the above junctions. Whilst the scale of the impact is not considered to necessitate detailed junction modelling it is the County Council's position that mitigation is required by way of a contribution. This is considered in further detail below.

Site Access Proposals

Two vehicular accesses are proposed into the development and both of these accesses are proposed from the existing roads that form part of the Marnel Park development. The accesses proposed are from secondary level roads and I have commented on the design of both accesses below.

Hutchins Way Access

The proposed access from Hutchins Way is shown on drawing HBH10090/D20 REV B and would convert the end of the existing cul-de-sac into a route into the proposed development. A raised table has been proposed as part of the access and will contribute to reducing traffic speeds. The internal street network of the new development has also been designed to achieve low vehicular speeds along Hutchins Way with a change in the horizontal alignment of the road provided by a 'square' within the development. Hutchins Way is currently 5.5m wide and the access into the development is approximately 90m from the primary route through the existing Marnel Park development.

On the basis of the assessment work that has been undertaken it is assumed that the development would result in approximately an additional 70 two-way vehicle movements (i.e. 47 outbound and 18 inbound in the AM peak) using Hutchins Way in the AM peak and PM peak periods to access the primary route through the development. The geometry and alignment of Hutchins Way is considered appropriate to accommodate this level of additional vehicle movement. The design of the access as shown in principle on drawing HBH10090/D20 REV B is considered acceptable.

Hewitt Road Access

The proposed access from Hewitt Road is shown on drawing HBH10090/D21 REV B and would convert the end of the existing Hewitt Road cul-de-sac into a route into the proposed development. The internal street network of the new development has been designed to achieve low vehicular speeds along Hewitt Road with the provision of a raised table feature within the development. Hewitt Road is 4.8m wide and connects to the primary route through the Marnel Park development via either Gardner Road or Cleeve Road. The route to the primary road via Gardiner Road is approximately 160m in length whilst the route via Cleeve Road is approximately 260m in length.

It is anticipated that the additional vehicle movements associated with the Hewitt Road access into development would be split across both Gardner

Road and Cleeve Road depending on the destination of their journey. On the basis of the assessment work that has been undertaken it is assumed that the development would result in approximately an additional 40 two-way vehicle movements using Hewitt Road in the AM peak and PM peak periods, with these 40 two way movements then split across both Gardner Road and Cleeve Road to access the primary route through the development.

The geometry and alignment of Hewitt Road, Gardner Road and Cleeve Road are considered appropriate to accommodate this level of additional vehicle movements. The design of the access as shown in principle on drawing HBH10090/D21 REV B is considered acceptable.

Carter Drive Pedestrian Access

A pedestrian/cycle link is proposed from Carter Drive into phase 1 of the development. This link is shown on drawing HBH10090/ D22 REV B and has suitable geometry and provides sufficient visibility where joining the adjacent road network and is considered acceptable *'in principle'*.

Summary

Whilst it is accepted that residents of the existing Marnel Park development will be concerned about additional traffic using the proposed accesses into the development, a series of traffic calming features have been incorporated into the design of the proposed development to encourage low vehicle speeds. In addition to this the geometry and alignment of the existing roads are considered to be appropriate in engineering terms to accommodate the additional traffic movements that are anticipated. The design of the individual access points, as shown in principle on the planning application drawings identified above, are considered to be acceptable. The submission of additional details in relation to the construction of the accesses should be secured by condition and I have recommended a series of conditions at the end of my response.

Construction Traffic

In order to minimise the impact of construction traffic on the existing residential area it is proposed that construction vehicles will access phase 1 of the development via the proposed access from Jersey Close and a haul road across phase 2 of the development. This is considered preferable due to the low number of dwellings in close proximity to Jersey Close and the more suitable alignment of the road. Detailed proposals for the construction access and haul road and for managing the construction of the proposed development will need to be submitted prior to the commencement of work on-site and should be secured by condition.

It is acknowledged that a small number of construction vehicles would need to gain access to a compound within phase 1 of the development from either Hutchins Way or Hewitt Road prior to the construction of the haul road. The submission of detailed proposals to manage these limited number of construction traffic movements will also need to be submitted and this should

be secured by condition. I have recommended a condition at the end of my response to secure this.

On-site Layout

The advice in relation to the onsite layout and level of parking proposed should be provided by the engineers at your authority under the terms of the Agency Agreement.

Access to Local Services and Facilities

The Transport Assessment demonstrates that there are a number of education, retail, employment and health facilities within walking and cycling distance from the site. Whilst a number of services and facilities are within walking and cycling distance, improvements are required to these routes to encourage travel by sustainable modes. These are set out below when consideration is given to the level of mitigation required in support of the proposed development.

Consideration has been given in the Transport Assessment to the accessibility of the site to local bus services. As identified in the Transport Assessment there are bus stops located within 200 meters of the existing Barrington Drive roundabout which are served by the Jazz 3 and Service 4. The Jazz 3 provides a high frequency service to the town centre while the Service 4 provides services to the town centre, hospital and Chineham Centre.

Whilst the level of public transport provision from these stops is high it is acknowledged that phase 1 of the development falls outside of a reasonable walking distance from these stops. The County Council are currently working with local bus operators to provide public transport services along the principle route through the existing development. This would provide public transport services within an acceptable walking distance of phase 1 of the proposed development.

The primary route through phase 1 of the proposed development has also been designed to accommodate buses and it is understood that the local bus operator are supportive of diverting a bus along this primary route when the development has been built out. This would serve to further enhance the level of public transport provision for occupants of the new development.

It should however be noted that the diversion of bus services can only occur if the principal route through phase 2 of the development has been completed. That is the subject of a separate Planning Application. Should this separate proposal not come forward however, phase 1 of the development would still have a reasonable level of public transport provision provided by services that the County Council are working with local bus operators to provide along the principal route through the existing development.

Continued...//

Transport Contributions Policy

A contribution is required to mitigate against the impact of the development on the local highway and transport network. The level of contribution has been calculated in accordance with the County Council's Transport Contributions Policy that uses a formulaic approach to calculating the level of mitigation required which is based on the direct transport impact of the development.

In order to calculate the contribution the net increase in the number of multi-modal trips that the development is expected to generate has been quantified and this has been multiplied by a financial value. The financial value is based on the known cost of providing off-site transport infrastructure at new development sites across Hampshire.

The contribution will be used to deliver the highway infrastructure required to mitigate against the cumulative impact of growth within Basingstoke and will also be used to deliver improvements to the existing pedestrian, cycle and public transport infrastructure in the vicinity of the development. The contribution will be used to deliver infrastructure that is directly related to the proposed development and is considered to be reasonable in scale and kind in accordance with the impact of the development as required by CIL Regulation 122. I have provided more details in relation to these infrastructure improvements below.

Highway Infrastructure

The contribution will be used to deliver the highway infrastructure required to mitigate against the cumulative impact of growth within Basingstoke. This includes improvements to the following junctions:

- A33 Reading Road/Carpentars Down/Crockford Lane roundabout
- A33/Great Binfields Road roundabout
- A339 Ringway North/A340 Aldermaston Road/Popley Way/Oakridge Road roundabout
- A339 Ringway E/A339 Ringway N/A33 Reading Road roundabout

In order to demonstrate that the highway network can continue to operate satisfactorily with the additional traffic from the proposed development sites contained within Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's draft core strategy, improvements have been developed for the a number of junctions across Basingstoke. This includes improvements at the above junctions to mitigate against the impact of the development proposed to the north and north east of Basingstoke including the development at Marnel Park.

The improvements identified for the Crockford Lane and Binfields roundabouts include the full signalisation of the existing junctions with considerable additional flaring and widening of the circulatory carriageway to facilitate the operation of the junctions under signal control. The improvements identified at the Aldermaston roundabout and the A33/Ringway junction include additional flaring on the approaches and circulatory carriageway and amendments to the

existing signal timings to improve the operation of these junctions that currently operate under signal control.

In addition to the above improvements the contribution will be used to provide mitigation to reduce the impact of the development on the operation of the Popley Way/Chineham Lane signal junction. As identified by the assessment work undertaken by the applicant, the development at Marnel Park has an impact on the operation of this junction. The County Council have identified an opportunity to improve the operation of the junction with the provision of a left turn flare on Chineham Lane. This improvement offers an improvement to the capacity of the junction that would support the proposed development to the north of Marnel Park and the consented developments in Popley.

A contribution toward these improvements is necessary to make the development acceptable and is directly related to the impact of the proposed development on land north of Marnel Park in accordance with the CIL regulations. The contribution is also fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind of the proposed development as the contribution will be used to mitigate against the cumulative impact caused by the additional traffic from the development and will only be used to fund a proportion of the works needed at these junctions to support the planned growth in Basingstoke.

Public Transport Improvements

A number of improvements are required to the public transport interchange facilities in Basingstoke to support the additional travel demands resulting from growth in Basingstoke. These interchange facilities include the bus station, rail station and Alencon Link interchange. The improvements required to the public transport interchange facilities are identified in the Basingstoke Town Access Plan and are necessary to accommodate the additional travel demand resulting from the proposed development at Marnel Park, as well as other development in the town, and to encourage travel by sustainable modes by providing high quality public transport infrastructure.

The improvements required at Basingstoke Bus Station include access improvements to the station forecourt along with the provision of bus priority measures in the vicinity of the bus station to improve access. These works are supported by the proposals to improve public transport information available at the station. The improvements at Alencon Link interchange include the provision of improved waiting facilities to support the recently completed public realm improvements along Alencon Link. The Alencon Link interchange works also include the provision of additional bus waiting bays to accommodate new bus services required for new developments in Basingstoke including the development at Marnel Park.

The Basingstoke Town Access Plan also identifies that improvements are required to the Basingstoke Rail Station to support additional travel demand and to promote travel by sustainable modes. The scope of works to the station are currently being investigated with Network Rail and the train operators but include improvements to the stations access and forecourt.

A proportion of the overall contribution from the proposed development at Marnel Park would be used to bring forward improvements to the public transport interchange infrastructure in Basingstoke as outlined above. A contribution toward these measures is relevant to planning and necessary to make the development acceptable in that it will encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. This is in accordance with the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and Saved Policy A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan that identify that opportunities to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes should be maximised.

Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Improvements

A contribution is required toward the provision of improved pedestrian and cycle facilities that link the development to surrounding services and facilities within Basingstoke. These improvements have been identified in the Basingstoke Town Access Plan to assist with the promotion of travel by sustainable modes within Basingstoke.

To the east of the site between Popley and Chineham retail centre and business areas there are a lack of pedestrian/cycle links and crossing facilities. This includes, but not exclusively, a crossing point of the A33 Reading Road linking to Kingsland Business Park via Bilton Road, a crossing point of Crockford Lane with associated links to Hanmore Road, and the continuation of the cycle facilities along Crockford Lane into Chineham Business Park.

To the south of the site improvements are required to the links between the development and Oakridge and onward toward the town centre. This includes, but not exclusively, enhancements to the environment of the Shakespear Road subway and new off-road facilities for cyclists along Shakespear Road and on-road facilities along Oakridge Road. Improvements are also required to the footbridges across the A339 which potentially include raising the bridge parapets to address perceived safety concerns that effect pedestrians decisions to use the bridges to walk and cycle toward the town centre.

To the west of the site improvements are required to the pedestrian infrastructure that provides access from the development to the Houndmill's Industrial Estate and the hospital. These improvements include upgrading Hospital footpath, Priestley Road subway, Abbey Road subway, and Abbey Road footpath, and the Kingsclere Road subway.

These improvements to the pedestrian and cycle infrastructure in the vicinity of the site are identified within the Basingstoke Town Access Plan and will contribute toward encouraging residents of the development to travel by sustainable modes. This is in accordance with the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and Saved Policy A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan that identify that opportunities to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes should be maximised.

The agreed level of contribution will need to be secured in a Section 106 Agreement between the County Council and the applicant. As you will be aware I am currently in the process of agreeing the contribution and the payment triggers with the applicant and will update you in due course.

Travel Plan

A Travel Plan has been submitted in support of the planning application. Whilst some of the elements of the Travel Plan are considered to be particularly strong further work is required in some areas. I have written to the applicant under separate cover in relation to this. The County Council consider that these amendments could be dealt with following a decision on the Planning Application. The obligation to implement the Travel Plan should be secured within the Section 106 Agreement.

Summary

The Transport Assessment submitted in support of the planning application considers the impact of the development on the local highway network. The assessment is considered robust. A financial contribution is required to mitigate against the identified impact of the development on the surrounding highway network and improve the multi-modal accessibility of the site. This contribution will need to be secured in a Section 106 Agreement between the applicant and the County Council.

The site vehicular accesses are shown in '*in principle*' on drawings HBH10090/D20 REV B and HBH10090/D21 REV B. These access points are considered acceptable to the highway authority '*in principle*'. Further details will need to be submitted by the applicant following a decision on the application and prior to the commencement of construction of each access. The alignment and geometry of the existing Marnel Park on-site roads are considered appropriate to accommodate the additional use by multi-modal traffic anticipated as a result of the development.

Recommendation: subject to the below conditions, the provision of a contribution toward mitigating against the impact of the additional multi-modal traffic generated by the development and the securing of a bonded and monitored Travel Plan I raise no objection to the above referenced application.

Conditions:

- No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i. the parking and turning of vehicles of site operatives and visitors (all to be established within one week of the commencement of development);

- ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- iv. wheel washing facilities or an explanation why they are not necessary;
- v. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
- vi. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
- vii. a scheme for recycling and disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction work; and
- viii. the management and coordination of deliveries of plant and materials and the disposing of waste resulting from demolition and or construction activities so as to avoid undue interference with the operation of the public highway, particularly during the Monday to Friday AM peak (08.00 to 09.00) and PM peak (16.30 to 18.00) periods.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011

- No part of the development hereby approved shall be commenced until such time as the details of the accesses as shown in principle on drawings HBH10090/D20 REV B, HBH10090/D21 REV B and HBH10090/ D22 REV B have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be constructed in accordance with a programme agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interest of highway safety and in accordance with Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011

- No part of the development hereby approved shall be commenced until such time as the detail of a temporary construction access from Jersey Close and associated haul road through phase two of the development has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be constructed in accordance with a programme agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interest of highway safety and in accordance with Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011

I trust that the above is clear but I would ask you not to hesitate to contact Ben Howard should you wish to discuss this further.

Continued...//

Yours faithfully

Tim Wall
Team Leader - Highways Development Planning

cc. Owen Pocock – BDBC Transportation (email only)
cc. Hannah Baker – HCC Transport Team (email only)

Appendix 3 – Hampshire County Council’s Transport Contributions Policy

Transport Contributions Policy

A New Approach to Calculating Transport Contributions in Hampshire

September 2007

I Introduction

1.1 For some time the County Council has been considering possible methods of calculating the level of transport contributions sought from development across the County in order to adopt a clear and appropriate policy. The aim of this policy would be to achieve the following:

- Clarity
- Certainty
- Fairness
- Accountability
- Wider support amongst users

2 Background

2.1 Transport contributions are one constituent of a wider remit known as 'planning obligations'. Planning obligations are secured under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides for 'payments of money, either of a specific amount or by reference to a formula, and require periodical payments to be paid indefinitely or for a specified period'. It is under this guidance that the Highway Authority negotiates and secures financial contributions from developers towards transport infrastructure or services to mitigate for the additional transport needs and burden imposed on the existing network.

3 Circular 05/2005

3.1 Circular 05/2005 provides guidance to local authorities on the use of planning obligations and was issued on 18 July 2005 by the ODPM to replace the Department of the Environment Circular 1/97. The Circular clarifies the basis on which planning obligations should be assessed in terms of their acceptability against policy and provides further guidance on the process of securing obligations. Planning obligations are 'intended to make development acceptable which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms'. Contributions are secured in order to militate against a development's impact or to encourage more sustainable transport practices.

3.2 There are five Policy Tests which planning obligations must meet. These are that the obligations must be:

- Relevant to planning;
- Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the proposed development;
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and
- Reasonable in all other respects.

This guidance is in general accordance with that previously contained within Circular 1/97, although there are some substantive changes in approach as a result of Circular 05/2005.

- 3.3 The new guidance allows for the pooling of contributions. Where the combined impact of a number of developments creates the need for new or improved infrastructure, the guidance acknowledges that it may be reasonable for the associated developers' contributions to be pooled in order to allow the infrastructure to be secured and provided in a fair and equitable way.
- 3.4 The greatest, and possibly the most helpful, change to the guidance relates to the use of formulae and standard charges to calculate the level of contributions payable. It is stated that 'local authorities are encouraged to employ formulae and standard charges where appropriate, as part of their framework for negotiating and securing planning obligations'. These models can help to expedite negotiations and ensure predictability by indicating the likely size of contributions at the earliest possible stage. They can also promote transparency by making indicative figures public and assist in accountability in the spending of monies.
- 3.5 The guidance does, however, stipulate that standard charges and formulae applied to each development should reflect the actual impacts of the development and should comply with the Policy Tests, detailed in 3.2.

4 The Existing Arrangements within Hampshire

- 4.1 Until late 2004 Hampshire County Council was the body responsible for negotiating and collecting all transport contributions within the County. However, Highways Development Control Agency Agreements were signed with 10 out of the 11 districts within Hampshire which allow the respective planning authorities to secure transport contributions up to the sum of £50,000 (£100,000 for the Boroughs of Eastleigh and Basingstoke & Deane). Any contributions collected must be transferred to the County Council within 14 days of receipt in order that the money can be spent appropriately.
- 4.2 The County has largely relied on negotiating contributions on the basis of a Transport Assessment (TA) submitted in support of a planning application. In some cases, generally with residential developments, a figure per dwelling is informally applied to arrive at an estimated figure, which is then the subject of detailed negotiations with the developer. This approach leads to inconsistencies between the levels of contributions sought in different parts of the County and the method(s) used to derive each figure.

5 Outline of the proposed contribution policy

- 5.1 It is proposed to introduce a formulaic approach to calculating transport contribution across the County which will define the level of contribution which new development should contribute. This policy is designed to be applicable to developments of all sizes, from a single unit upwards. It is anticipated that this approach will be included in the Local Transport Plan and be adopted by each of the County's Districts.
- 5.2 The formula is proposed to be based on the transport impact of each development in accordance with Circular 05/2005. The basic measurement of transport impact will be quantified by the net increase in the of number of multi-modal trips that a development is expected to generate. A financial value will then be attached to each multi-modal trip

6 Multi-modal trips

- 6.1 A multi-modal trip rate per development will be derived from a schedule of trip rates produced by the County Council for residential uses and those in the B Use Class. For residential development, rates will be provided per dwelling size. These trip rates have been derived from the National Travel Survey and the National Transport Trends statistics of the Office of National Statistics and are, where possible, specific to the characteristics of Hampshire. The proposed schedule is included in Appendix 1. In the case of the B Use Class trip rates have been derived from the TRICS Database (Local Authorities database of trip rates).
- 6.2 Where development is proposed that does not fall within the Use Classes defined in Appendix 1 the multi-modal trip rates will be negotiated with the Development Control Engineer.
- 6.3 Where a site has a previous use, the net increase in multi-modal trips will be used to calculate the contribution. Where a site has been dormant for 5 years or more all traffic generated by a proposed new use of the site will be considered to be new to the network. This means that all multi-modal trips generated by the new development will be used to calculate the contribution.
- 6.4 The residential multi-modal trip rates apply to all residential developments within the County, regardless of size.
- 6.5 The employment multi-modal trip rates only apply to those developments which do not require a TA. Where a TA is required the agreed multi-modal trip rate will be used to calculate the contribution.
- 6.6 For all other types of development, for instance leisure, retail or a nursing home, the multi-modal trip rate will be determined by the TA or Transport Statement submitted with the planning application and the cost per trip used for the employment uses will be applied.

7 Residential Categories

- 7.1 The trip rates for residential uses have been derived from assumed household occupancy levels as shown in Appendix 1. However, there has been some debate on how to categorise residential units. It was considered too complicated to establish an occupancy level and trip rate for each separate type of residential unit and so grouping units according to the number of bedrooms is considered to be the most sensible way forward.

8 Financial value per trip

- 8.1 A financial value per trip for residential developments has been derived from the known cost of providing transport infrastructure required to serve new development. This takes the costs of providing the off-site transport infrastructure required to adequately serve new development in 2006 / 2007 transport mitigation packages at a variety of sites across the County¹. These sites are the Picket Twenty Major Development Area in Andover, Barton Farm in

¹ Whilst a transport package has been agreed in relation to planning applications which have been submitted for development at these sites, it must be emphasised that not all of these sites have received planning permission and therefore the development will not necessarily go ahead and the contributions will only be secured by the County if planning permission is granted.

Winchester, Queen Elizabeth Barracks in Church Crookham and the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area near Havant, the details of which can be seen in Appendix 2. These sites are considered to represent a best practice approach to considering the holistic impact of new development on the transport network and are located in areas which are representative of the County's diversity.

- 8.2 The average cost per residential multi-modal trip from the Major Development Areas is £534. (rounded to £535) .
- 8.3 The same approach as above has been taken for the B Use Class. The financial value per trip has been used for developments that fall within the B Use Class from three major developments within Hampshire – Andover Airfield, Solent Business Park in Whiteley and Farnborough Business Park. The average cost per multi-modal trip from the major employment sites is £227. (rounded to £230). Details of these schemes is also included within Appendix 2.
- 8.4 The financial value per trip for each of the B Use Classes is considered to be applicable to all uses which fall outside of residential and the B Use Classes. The multi-modal trip rates for these developments will be agreed with the Development Control Engineer and the financial value will then be applied.
- 8.5 In general terms the level of contributions arrived at are in tune with those being collected from developments in adjoining counties but are significantly less than the Milton Keynes Tariff, adopted in 2003 as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), which requires £18,500 per dwelling towards not only transport but improved physical and social infrastructure. It is hoped to develop a Hampshire County Council protocol in the future which will similarly cover all county functions in one contribution. A formulaic approach to transport contributions is also in line with the SE Plan strategy for ensuring the provision of the necessary infrastructure to support major new development.

9 Local weighting factor and economic viability

- 9.1 Considerable investigation was made into whether a local weighting factor should be applied to financial value per trip in order to reflect the economic differences between each district within Hampshire. It has been decided, however, not to apply a local weighting factor to the financial value per trip for residential developments. The reasons for this are firstly, that the trip rates set for each type of dwelling size will mean that in urban areas where development is denser with smaller units the contribution will be less than in a more affluent area where developments consist of mostly larger houses. Secondly, economic viability is not normally a factor in residential developments as it is considered to be the most profitable development type. Thirdly the cost to the County Council in providing infrastructure and services to mitigate impact is constant across the County, irrespective of local economic factors.
- 9.2 For developments other than residential, the economic viability of the site will be considered and there will be scope to negotiate from the starting contribution calculated using this policy. However, that case must be supported by the Planning Authority to demonstrate that there is a need for the development and

that the viability of the development will be put in jeopardy should the County Council insist on a level of contribution in line with the policy.

10 Future review of the costs

- 10.1 It is intended to use appropriate indexation to review and update the policy in forthcoming years. This indexation will be in line with that used to index the financial contributions within the S106 Agreements.

11 Section 278 Agreements and Travel Plans

- 11.1 Section 278 Agreements will identify the works required to access the site. If the package of works agreed includes some works which may be considered to have wider public benefit, for instance a section of cycleway, the cost of these works may be deducted from the contribution.
- 11.2 If a Travel Plan is produced and secured by way of a Section 106 Agreement with a bond, the elements of the plan that are bonded and may provide wider public benefit may be deducted from the contributions

12 Transport Assessments

- 12.1 Transport Assessments will still be required in accordance with the national guidance in Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 – Transport or any relevant successor government guidance to assess the impact and acceptability of new development proposals.
- 12.2 The trip rates contained within Appendix 2 of this document are for the purposes of the contribution tariff only. The trip rates for the purpose of a Transport Assessment will need to be negotiated and agreed with the relevant Highway Development Control Engineer.

13 What will the contributions will be spent on?

- 13.1 The contributions collected will be spent on improvements to transport and the highway developed through the Area Transport Strategies. The contributions menu, found in Appendix 4, outlines the type of schemes on which the County Council may spend the contributions collected.
- 13.2 The contributions will be allocated to schemes or transport improvements in accordance to the terms of the Section 106 Agreement and Circular 05/05, and will not be spent elsewhere in the County.

APPENDIX I

Trip Rate Matrix

Residential Use Class

	Trips									
	Walk	Bicycle	Car driver	Car passenger	Motor-cycle	Other private	Local bus	Surface rail/under ground	Other Public	All Modes
Commuting/business	20	5	122	19	2	1	14	12	3	198
Education/escort education	48	1	23	25	-	3	11	2	1	114
Shopping	51	2	87	44	-	1	17	2	2	206
Other escort	10	-	58	27	-	-	2	-	-	97
Personal business	26	1	46	26	-	1	7	1	1	109
Leisure	49	5	99	94	1	2	13	6	8	277
Other	41	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42
All purposes	245	14	435	236	4	9	63	23	15	1,044

Source: National Travel Statistics – Transport Statistics 2006

Household Size	Walk	Pedal cycle	Car driver	Car passenger	Other private	Local bus	Rail	Other public	Annual Rate	Daily Trip Rate
1 Occupant	245	14	435	236	13	63	23	15	1044	2.9
2 Occupant	490	28	870	472	26	126	46	30	2088	5.9
3 Occupant	735	42	1305	708	39	189	69	45	3132	8.7
4 Occupant	980	56	1740	944	52	252	92	60	4176	11.6

Employment Use Classes

Use Class	Multi-Modal Trips (per 100 sqm)
B1 Business	18.7
B2 General Industry	7.5
B8 – Warehouse and Distribution	9.4

Source: TRICS Database 2007(a)

Transport costs associated with Hampshire Major Development Areas

Picket Twenty MDA in Andover

1. **Cost per dwelling**

Total cost of transport infrastructure needed to serve the 1,200 dwelling development = £5,672,050 = **£4,727 per dwelling**

2. **Cost per trip**

1,200 dwellings x 7 multi-modal trips a day = 8,400 trips a day

To find cost per trip divide total transport cost by total multi-modal trips

i.e. £5,672,050 / 8,400 = **£675 per trip**

West of Waterlooville MDA

1. **Cost per dwelling**

Residential

2,000 dwellings x 7 multi modal trips a day = 14,000 trips per day

Employment

30ha employment (115,216 sqm) x 12.79 multi-modal trips per 100/sqm = 14,736 trips per day

(N.B – Employment uses varied across B Use Class. Appropriate trip rate was agreed with Development Control)

Total multi-modal trips for the site = 28,736 trips

Residential portion = 14,000 / 28,736 = 49% of the transport demand from the site and so £10,769,600 x 49% = £5,277,104

Proportionate cost of transport mitigation package required to serve the 2,000 dwellings is £5,277,104 = **£2,639 per dwelling**

2. **Cost per trip**

To find cost per trip divide the proportional transport cost by number of residential multi-modal trips

i.e. £5,277,104 / 14,000 = **£377 per trip**

Barton Farm in Winchester

1. **Cost per dwelling**
Total cost of transport infrastructure needed to serve the 2,000 dwelling =
 $£6,055,000 = \underline{£3,028 \text{ per dwelling}}$
2. **Cost per trip**
2,000 dwellings x 7 multi-modal trips per day = 14,000 trips
 $£6,055,000 / 14,000 \text{ trips} = \underline{£433 \text{ per trip}}$

Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Church Crookham

1. **Cost per dwelling**
Total cost of transport infrastructure needed to serve the 1,055 dwelling development = $£4,800,000 = \underline{£4,549 \text{ per dwelling}}$
2. **Cost per trip**
1,055 dwellings x 7 multi-modal trips per day = 7,385 trips per day
 $£4,800,000 / 7,385 = \underline{£649 \text{ per trip}}$

Andover Airfield Business Park

1. **Cost per square metre**
Total cost of transport infrastructure needed to serve the 69,000 square metre business park development = $£2,900,000 = \underline{£42 \text{ per square metre}}$
2. **Cost per trip**
69,000 square metre business park x 18.7 multi modal trips per 100/sqm = 12,903 trips per day

To find cost per trip divide total transport cost by total trips

i.e. $£2,900,000 / 12,903 \text{ trips} = \underline{£225 \text{ per trip}}$

Solent 2 Business Park Whiteley

1. **Cost per square metre**
Total cost of transport infrastructure needed to serve the 35,656 square metre business park development = $£1,150,000 = \underline{£32 \text{ per square metre}}$
2. **Cost per trip**
35,656 square metre business park x 18.7 multi modal trips per 100/sqm = 6,668 trips per day

To find cost per trip divide total transport cost by total trips

i.e. $£1,150,000 / 6,668 \text{ trips} = \underline{£172 \text{ per trip}}$

Farnborough Business Park

1. **Cost per square metre**

Total cost of transport infrastructure needed to serve the 155,000 square metre business park development = £8,190,000 = **£53 per square metre**

2. **Cost per trip**

155,000 square metre business park x 18.7 multi-modal trips per 100/sqm = 28,985 trips per day

£8,190,000 / 28,985 trips = **£283 per trip**

APPENDIX 3

Calculating contributions

C3 - Residential	Cost per Trip (£)	Household Occupancy	Multi-Modal Trips (per dwelling)	Cost per dwelling (£)
1 Bed Dwelling	535	1.3	3.7	1980
2-3 Bed Dwelling	535	2.42	7.0	3745
4+ Bed Dwelling	535	3.5	10.2	5457
B - Employment	Cost per Trip (£)		Multi-Modal Trips (per 100sqm)	Cost per 100 sqm (£)
B1 Business	230		18.7	4301
B2 General Industry	230		7.5	1725
B8 Warehouse & Distribution	230		9.4	2162

**Suggested Menu for Transport Schemes and Initiatives Suitable for
Funding by Developers Contributions**

Contributions Menu

LTP:

Schemes which are in the LTP. For example:

- Town centre accessibility projects (e.g. Andover)
- Quality Bus Partnerships
- Rail interchanges (e.g. Farnborough)

Safety Engineering:

Junction alterations

Signing and lining schemes

Surface Treatments

Chicanes

Road Narrowing

Passenger Transport:

Bus Service contributions

- Maintain a service
- Increase the Frequency of a service / Formalise services
- Implement a new service or new stop / section to an existing route.

Bus Shelters

Bus Stop poles

Timetables on bus stops

Information points -ITS

Cycling and Pedestrian schemes:

Shared surfacing, cycleways (on and off carriageways), footways

Cycle Storage - rail, bus stations, places of work and shops etc

Cycle maps and information - indicating cycle facilities (shops, lockable areas, travel information)

Cycle interchanges - improving access to cycles at rail stations etc

Cycle training for children

Traffic speed reduction

City bikes, bike stations, bike bridges

Signing of cycle routes

Pedestrian crossings – refuges, dropped kerbs.

Traffic Management:

Major Elements:

Son of SHRT

Junction Improvements

Capacity improvements

Junction Changes

Route Capacity Improvements

Major highway schemes

Major public transport infrastructure improvements

Minor Elements:

TROs

Residential parking schemes

Physical measures in support of existing or proposed TROs

Traffic signs improvements

Real time travel information - ITS

Vehicle speed indication signs

Pavement parking controls

Pedestrian/cycle crossing

Safety schemes - school zones, home zones, traffic calming for environmental and safety purposes

ITS:

CCTV

Upgrading traffic lights and crossings

Real time information and information points

Bus priority measures (bus gates etc)

Safer Routes To School:

Park and walk

Parents waiting shelters and cycle shelters in school grounds

Footways, cycleways, bridges

Pedestrian and cycle crossings

Coloured surfaces, anti-skid

Information and maps

Incentive schemes (e.g. prizes for pupils)

Yellow jackets etc.

Traffic calming and management

Flashing amber lights with a school sign

Travel Plans:

Incentives : Bus vouchers, Cycle vouchers, travel discounts.

Personalised Travel Plans

Car clubs

Monitoring of impact of development using counters etc.