



Report to the Secretary of State for Transport

by **B M Campbell BA(Hons) MRTPI**
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Date: 12 March 2019

HIGHWAYS ACT 1980

ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981

**THE HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (B3334 STUBBINGTON BYPASS)
COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2018**

**THE HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (B3334 STUBBINGTON BYPASS
CLASSIFIED ROAD) (SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2018**

Inquiry Held on 26 & 27 November 2018
Inspections were carried out on 4 December 2018.

File Ref: NATTRAN/SE/LAO/151 (DPI/Q1770/18/17)

Contents

CASE DETAILS	1
PROCEDURAL MATTERS AND STATUTORY FORMALITIES	1
Objectors	1
The B3334 Stubbington Bypass Classified Road Scheme	2
The Order Lands	2
Requested modifications to the CPO and SRO	3
THE CASE FOR THE COUNCIL	3
Unlocking the economic potential of the Fareham-Gosport Peninsula	3
Other positive impacts	5
Compliance with the tests in legislation and guidance	5
Conclusion	6
THE CASE FOR THE REGISTERED OBJECTOR	6
Consultation and process	7
Claimed benefits	7
The designated strategic gap, countryside and the environment	8
Ranvilles Lane crossing	8
REPRESENTATIONS FROM INTERESTED PERSONS	9
Mr W Hutchison – Chairman of the Hill Head Residents’ Association	9
Mr J Pillai	9
Mr G Salvidge	9
Mr R Hopkinson	9
Mr D Green	10
Mr G Duggan	10
RESPONSE BY THE COUNCIL	10
Consultation and process	10
Claimed benefits	10
The designated strategic gap, countryside and the environment	12
Ranvilles Lane crossing	12
Other matters of relevance raised	13
INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS	14
Introduction	14
Matters for consideration – CPO	14
Clear idea of how the land is to be used	15
Necessary resources available to achieve the outcome	16
Any physical or legal impediments	17
Reasonable steps to acquire the land by agreement	18
Human rights and the public sector equality duty	18
Matters for consideration – SRO	19
Overall conclusion	20
RECOMMENDATIONS	20
APPENDIX 1 – APPEARANCES	21
APPENDIX 2 – DOCUMENTS	22

CASE DETAILS

The Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO)

- The Compulsory Purchase Order is made under sections 239, 240, 246, 250 and 260 of the Highways Act 1980 and is known as the **Hampshire County Council (B3334 Stubbington Bypass) Compulsory Purchase Order 2018**
- The Compulsory Purchase Order was made on 8 February 2018
- Hampshire County Council submitted the Order for confirmation to the Secretary of State for Transport.
- In brief, the Order, if confirmed as made, would authorise the compulsory purchase of land to enable the construction of a new 3.5km section of single carriageway road between the B3334 Titchfield Road and the B3334 Gosport Road.
- At the start of the inquiry there was one non-statutory objector.

Summary of Recommendation: that the Order be confirmed with modification

The Side Roads Order (SRO)

- The Side Roads Order is made under Sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980 and is known as the **Hampshire County Council (B3334 Stubbington Bypass Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2018**.
- The Side Roads Order was made on 5 February 2018.
- Hampshire County Council submitted the Order for confirmation to the Secretary of State for Transport.
- In brief, the Order, if confirmed as made, would authorise the improvement and stopping up of highways and the stopping up of private means of access and provision of new means of access to premises, all within the vicinity of the proposed Stubbington Bypass.
- At the start of the inquiry there was one statutory objector.

Summary of Recommendation: that the Order be confirmed with modification

PROCEDURAL MATTERS AND STATUTORY FORMALITIES

1. The inquiry opened on 26 November 2018 and sat for two consecutive days. An accompanied site visit was carried out on 4 December 2018.
2. The promoting authority, Hampshire County Council confirmed at the start of the inquiry that all statutory formalities had been complied with.
3. This report contains a brief description of the proposals (the subject of the Orders) and the land affected, the gist of the cases presented and my conclusions and recommendations. Lists of inquiry appearances and documents are attached.

Objectors

4. There were initially two objectors to the Orders. Southern Electric Power Distribution PLC was a statutory objector to the CPO but its objection was withdrawn on 31 October 2018.¹ Mrs Christophersen was the sole objection when the inquiry opened – a non-statutory objector to the CPO and a statutory objector to the SRO. However, on opening, a number of other interested persons

¹ See Inspector's Dossier, tab 8

expressed a wish to make their views known. A summary of those representations is included within this report.

5. The main grounds of objection are the effect on the designated strategic gap, countryside and environment; the traffic situation will be worsened rather than improved, the obvious traffic problems in the area are not being addressed and there is no need for a bypass; the public consultation process was flawed and the Local Plan is being ignored; the business case for the Scheme requires scrutiny and the Council's key decision report was biased; and the new road will result in pressure for development to either side of it.

The B3334 Stubbington Bypass Classified Road Scheme

6. The Scheme has the benefit of full planning permission granted in October 2015.² The planning application supporting material included a comprehensive Environmental Statement (ES).³
7. A major part of the Scheme is the construction of the bypass around the northern and eastern sides of Stubbington and to the south of Fareham predominantly through farmland lying within a strategic gap between settlements as identified in the Fareham Borough Council Local Plan. The road would be 3.5km in length, single carriageway, unlit and with a 50mph speed limit. A shared use footway/cycleway would be provided along its length. Three major junctions would connect the new road to the existing highway network at Titchfield Road, Gosport Road and Peak Lane.
8. The Scheme includes about 1km of on-line widening of the existing B3334 from the point where the northern end of the bypass connects with Titchfield Road (to the north of Stubbington) to the Titchfield Gyratory junction with the A27. A new shared use footway/cycleway is also to be provided along this length.
9. The Scheme also includes about 700m of on-line widening and realignment of the existing B3334 from the point where the southern end of the bypass connects with Gosport Road to the Peel Common Roundabout junction with the B3385.
10. Existing vehicular and pedestrian accesses to all affected landholdings are to be maintained or otherwise re-provided where necessary.
11. A full description of the scheme is provided in the Council's Statement of Case⁴ and shown on general arrangement drawings ECCCC/RJ504603/02/022D, 023D & 024D.⁵

The Order Lands

12. In order to implement the Scheme, it would be necessary to acquire land along the route of the improved and new road including within the Titchfield Gyratory, to the east and west of Titchfield Road, to the north and east of Stubbington to

² Document 1(i)

³ Document 1(q) and document INQ6

⁴ Document 1, section 6

⁵ Document 1(j)

accommodate the new stretch of road, and to the north and south of Gosport Road.

13. The land required comprises predominantly open arable farmland together with a section of wooded landscape bund associated with Peel Common Sewage Treatment Works, and small sections of dense scrub, broadleaved plantation woodland, varying types of grassland and hedgerow with scattered trees. A detailed description of the Plots is to be found at 3.3 of the Council's Statement of Case, with the purpose for acquiring each plot (to construct the highway, for landscaping, for ecological mitigation) at 3.5 and 3.6.⁶ A single dwelling needs to be demolished to widen Titchfield Road but acquisition of that was completed in December 2017.
14. The extent of the land to be acquired is illustrated on the CPO Map and cross referenced with the Schedule.⁷ The map is divided across seven plans to enable all the land to be shown in sufficient detail.
15. In order to implement the scheme it is also necessary to improve a length of highway, to stop up four sections of highway, to close a number of private means of access and to create a number of new accesses. These are particularised in the Schedule to the SRO and cross referenced to the accompanying Site Plans.⁸

Requested modifications to the CPO and SRO

16. A number of modifications are requested for both Orders including a number of substitute plans. Document INQ4 sets these out in detail and the reasons for them. In the main they are to correct minor errors or for clarification and they also respond to the assessment of the Orders made by the Department for Transport.⁹

THE CASE FOR THE COUNCIL

17. There is a compelling case in the public interest for confirming the Orders required to facilitate the Stubbington Bypass; the principal reason being the effect that the bypass will have in unlocking growth in a part of Hampshire which has suffered economic decline and which policy at all levels seeks to revitalise. There is also the more local positive effects that the bypass will have on the village of Stubbington and southern Fareham.

The main points are:

Unlocking the economic potential of the Fareham-Gosport peninsula

18. The economic context for the bypass is demonstrated particularly by the Transport Business Case. The Gosport peninsula contains pockets of high unemployment and deprivation, with Gosport performing significantly below regional and national averages, and in the bottom 20% of authorities nationally in terms of its employment rate.¹⁰ It lost 7,000 jobs between 2000 and 2010, a

⁶ Document 1

⁷ Documents 1(a) and (b)

⁸ Documents 1(c) & (d)

⁹ Document INQ7

¹⁰ Document 1(p) 2.2.2

dramatic drop of 21%, due in particular to the weakening of the Ministry of Defence sector. Parts of Gosport are included in the 2014-2020 Assisted Areas Map by the European Commission.¹¹

19. Central and local government have made reversing this troubling picture a policy imperative. The Daedalus Airfield Solent Enterprise Zone (SEZ) was designated by central government in 2011 as one of 24 Enterprise Zones nationally. Planning permission has been granted for some 50,000sqm of commercial floorspace. Projected job figures are substantial: some 3,700 jobs are anticipated to be created at the SEZ by 2026.¹² There are also other employment sites in and around Gosport, for which access is currently a barrier to growth.¹³
20. Driving economic growth in the Fareham-Gosport peninsula is also a priority in local policy and the SEZ is a strategic development site in the Fareham Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy 2011) and the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2036.¹⁴
21. Site allocation alone, however, will not remedy the problems. Businesses must be able to access those sites efficiently and reliably. The geography of the peninsula creates the risk of a cul-de-sac effect and presently there are significant access issues. High levels of delay exist in the current road access from the west through the village of Stubbington.¹⁵
22. The proposed scheme is part of a wider package of works intended to improve access to Fareham and the Gosport Peninsula by unblocking the constraints along the key transport corridor of the A27 and at the Peel Common roundabout. All measures with the exception of the bypass have been completed or programmed to start. The bypass is the final and most significant piece of the jigsaw and will make the biggest difference to traffic flows.
23. The bypass is needed to provide a new western access onto and off the peninsula. The current B3334 through Stubbington is the key access westwards, but it is not fit for purpose: it does not provide the efficient, reliable and strategic access required to support economic growth. Newgate Lane and the A32 provide a north – south route from Gosport and the SEZ to Fareham and the Newgate Lane works have been undertaken to improve that route. But going west, the only current realistic option is the B3334.
24. The bypass will provide what is required and dramatically improve the current situation. It will attract the bulk of the traffic accessing the peninsula to and from the west. Strategic traffic will no longer have to contend with over-capacity junctions and the 30mph speed limit in Stubbington to get to the SEZ. Journey times will significantly improve.¹⁶
25. When the impacts on traffic flows and journey times are converted into monetised and non-monetised benefits, the picture is very positive. The

¹¹ Ibid 2.2.5

¹² Document 2H page 2

¹³ Document 1(p) 2.2.11, table 2-1 & fig 2-4

¹⁴ Document 2G Fareham Local Plan 2036 4.11

¹⁵ Document 1(p) Figure 2.6

¹⁶ Document 1(o) Tables 6.10 & 6.11

Transport Business Case shows that the bypass has a benefit cost ratio (BCR) of 2.07 (alongside the Newgate Lane south scheme), which the Department for Transport categorise as 'high' value for money.¹⁷ Updated economic evidence shows that this monetised benefit may in fact now result in a BCR of 4.18 (on a core case; 3.31 on a low growth case and 10.11 on a high growth case).¹⁸ The Department for Transport categorise a figure above 4 as 'very high' value for money. These monetised benefits are principally due to enhanced travel time, and it is also important to consider the benefits which the Transport Business Case does not monetise, particularly in terms of reliability and regeneration, both of which show further positive impacts.¹⁹

26. The importance of the scheme is evident in the fact that it is integral to, and supported by, the policy framework, particularly the Hampshire Local Transport Plan 3, Local Plans (the Fareham Local Plan Parts 1 and 2, the emerging Local Plan 2036, and the Gosport Local Plan), the Fareham and Gosport Infrastructure Plan and the Solent Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan.²⁰ (Transport Business Case section 2.8, p.26-35). The bypass is needed to realise the objectives of this policy framework. In a plan-led system, with plans subject to public scrutiny and democratic adoption, realising the objectives of the policy framework is a powerful consideration in favour of the bypass.
27. The extent of the benefits and the importance of the scheme are further illustrated by the fact that the Department for Transport has awarded £25.5m of funding to the scheme (in February 2017). Work to obtain full approval and release of the funds is ongoing (one of the conditions being confirmation of the CPO so as to secure all the necessary land). The Council is contributing the remaining £8.5m required, which means that the scheme is fully funded.

Other positive impacts

28. The bypass must first and foremost be seen as a strategic scheme with strategic economic benefits, as set out above. However the bypass also has positive impacts at a more local level which further contribute to the compelling case in the public interest.
29. Stubbington village suffers from high traffic flows. The 2015 figures show two way flows between 7am and 7pm in the centre of Stubbington of 17,622 vehicles and 517 HGVs. In 2019 the figure rises to 19,436 vehicles and 547 HGVs. The bypass scheme has been designed to draw traffic away from the Stubbington bottleneck, and flows are predicted to drop significantly in 2019 to 7,749 vehicles and 137 HGVs.²¹
30. High traffic flows have inevitable environmental impacts in terms of noise and air quality, as well as social impacts in terms of severance, and economic impacts in terms of the attractiveness of the village as a place to live and work. The evidence also indicates that Stubbington has a high road traffic accident rate,

¹⁷ Document 1(p) 3.3.3 – 3.2.4

¹⁸ Document 2I, sections 4, 6 & 7

¹⁹ Document 1(p), page 69, Table 3-2

²⁰ Document 1(p) pages 26 - 35

²¹ Document 1(o) page 28, Table 3.1 & page 61 Table 6.3

which would appear to be a consequence of these high traffic flows.²² The environmental, social and economic benefits of the reduction in traffic flows are obvious and weighty.

Compliance with the tests in legislation and guidance

31. The requirement in *Guidance on Compulsory purchase process and The Criche Down Rules* to show a compelling case in the public interest has been dealt with above. There is also compliance with the other aspects of the Guidance, in particular that:
- a. **The purposes for which the Order is made justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected.** In light of the compelling case outlined above, this is satisfied. The absence of any objection from any landowners is further evidence of this point.
 - b. **The AA has a clear idea of how it intends to use the land which it is proposing to acquire.** The design of the scheme has been established after extensive optioneering and full planning permission has been obtained.
 - c. **The AA can show that all the necessary resources, including funding for both acquiring the land and implementing the scheme, are likely to be available to achieve that end within a reasonable time-scale.** As set out above, the scheme is fully funded.
 - d. **The scheme is unlikely to be blocked by any physical or legal impediments to implementation, including the need for planning permission.** The scheme has planning permission. It is also embedded in planning policy, with both Fareham's and Gosport's Local Plans supporting the scheme and safeguarding land to allow it to come forward. The scheme is free from impediments.
 - e. **Genuine and meaningful negotiations have taken place with landowners.** Such negotiations with landowners have been diligently undertaken by the Council and no landowners have objected to the CPO.²³
32. With regard to the **Side Roads Order** alternative reasonably convenient routes are available or will be provided before the highway is stopped up as required by s14 of the Highways Act 1980. Similarly, where means of access to premises are to be stopped up another reasonably convenient means of access will be provided as necessary as required by s125 of the Act. Where private means of access are affected, alternative provisions have been discussed and agreed with the relevant parties.²⁴

Conclusion

33. There is a powerful case for confirming the Orders and the requirements of legislation and guidance are satisfied. There is a clear and pressing need for the Scheme, for which funding and planning permission are in place, and which does not suffer from any impediments. There is a compelling case in the public

²² Ibid page 45

²³ Document 2A

²⁴ Document 2, section 8

interest. The Orders should be confirmed, as proposed to be modified in the tables of modifications.

THE CASE FOR THE REGISTERED OBJECTOR²⁵

34. The Objector is a resident of Ranvilles Lane.
35. The need for and benefit of the proposed bypass have not been proven. The line of the existing B3334 between the roundabouts at the junction of Titchfield Road/Mays Lane to the north and Gosport Road/Stubbington Lane to the south already provides a bypass which was intended to prevent traffic having to travel through the centre of Stubbington village and to discourage the use of other local rat-runs. It is not fulfilling its purpose because of the presence of pedestrian controlled traffic lights at each end and the absence of any feeder lanes to enable traffic to merge on to it. The Council has not proved that building a further bypass is the appropriate solution and has made errors in the preparation of their plans especially with regard to Process, Data Gathering and Equalities. The new bypass will simply move traffic from one bottleneck to another.

The main points are:

Consultation and process

36. The 2014 consultation process was poorly executed and misleading. It focussed on the package of improvements rather than asking whether specific aspects, such as the bypass, were supported. Less than 500 responses to a 54,000 consultation was a complete process failure and this was used to draw conclusions which are not supportable.²⁶ The Council failed to ensure that the firm commissioned to deliver consultation leaflets did its job properly such that people negatively affected, including those living along Ranvilles Lane, did not receive one.
37. Little more than lip service was paid to provision of facilities for minority groups during the consultation process with nothing mentioned in the publicity handout.²⁷
38. The number of signatures on the petition against the bypass was unfairly rebuffed by viewing it qualitatively rather than quantitatively and dismissing some people as living out of the area or having been coerced to sign.²⁸ This influenced the outcome of the exercise as inclusion of the petition would have reduced those in favour from 75% to 53%.
39. The 2017 Equalities Impact Assessment used only qualitative data when the survey process requires the generation of quantitative data.²⁹

Claimed benefits

²⁵ See in particular documents O(i), (iii), (iv) & (v), INQ2 and INQ12

²⁶ Document O(iii) page 2

²⁷ Document INQ2 (2 of 2)

²⁸ Document O(iv) page 16

²⁹ Document O(iii) page 5

-
40. The Council's case has not been proved, with reliance placed on paper-based studies and computer modelling – real time data is needed. The methodology is flawed and the results suspect. The conclusion in the Mott Gifford Report 2010 that the benefits of a bypass compared to its costs/impacts are likely to result in a poor business case should not be ignored.³⁰
 41. Since neither traffic nor population has doubled³¹ since the first business case in 2016, it is not credible that the Benefit to Cost Ratio can have more than doubled as claimed by the Council.
 42. The Council considers the 2-3.5 minute saving on journey time as significant but cannot say how long the current journey time is or what "significant" is meant to quantifiably mean. The existing Stubbington bypass issues could be resolved by replacing the crossings with under or overpasses and providing feeder lanes at the roundabouts which would achieve similarly significant time savings at a fraction of the cost.
 43. The much more serious problems for accessing the Gosport peninsular are on the northern route especially at the Quay Street roundabout but no attempt is being made to address that. Rather than address two small pinch points on the existing Stubbington bypass it would be better to direct the funds to a larger, more general scheme collecting all Gosport traffic and delivering it to Junction 11 of the M27 from where it could then go east and west.
 44. The new bypass is claimed to be a gateway to and from the west to allow traffic from the future village of Welborne to reach Daedulus. However, Welborne is intended to be a self-contained village with local jobs for local residents and Daedulus has been described as the means to create new jobs for Gosport residents. A commuter route between the two should not, therefore, be necessary. Moreover, to date very few additional jobs – possibly only two – have as yet been created at Daedulus.

The designated strategic gap, countryside and the environment

45. Driving the bypass through farmland will damage the economic viability of local farming.
46. Local communities will lose character as currently Ranvilles Lane and the strategic gap provide vital separation whilst also providing essential association between villages. There will be pressure for further development either side of the bypass route. The bypass is in conflict with the strategic policies of the Fareham Local Plan which recognises the protection of the strategic gap as vital to the prevention of coalescence and to maintaining the separate identity of settlements.³²
47. Protected species will be adversely affected, in particular Brent Geese who can be found in the area between September and March each year. The harmful effects of noise and vibration and on air quality have not been properly assessed.

³⁰ Document O(iii) pages 16 & 17

³¹ Document INQ10

³² Document O(iv) page 2

Ranvilles Lane crossing

48. Ranvilles Lane is much valued for its countryside environment and as a safe route for pedestrians and cyclists. The severance of Ranvilles Lane by the bypass and the proposed uncontrolled pedestrian/cyclist crossing point with central ghost island and the equestrian corral on the southern side will not be safe for users.
49. The counter aimed at quantifying current usage of Ranvilles Lane by pedestrians and cyclists was poorly positioned and ill timed.³³ It would not have picked up users coming from the south (including RSPCA dog walkers from the animal shelter on the lane) who did not walk as far as the counter or who turned off before it onto the public footpath. A more realistic estimate of daily usage is 380 people a day rather than the 174 – 320 indicated by the Council.
50. The crossing will discourage use of Ranvilles Lane as a through route for pedestrians and cyclists and so discourage sustainable means of transport and the promotion of health and wellbeing. It would only be safe for able bodied adult users and is thus discriminatory.

REPRESENTATIONS FROM INTERESTED PERSONS

Mr W Hutchison – Chairman of the Hill Head Residents’ Association³⁴

51. The Residents’ Association is strongly in favour of the bypass. Whilst accepting that it will go through the strategic gap, there is an overriding need to reduce the amount of traffic going through Stubbington. With Fareham Borough under pressure to provide more housing, the need for the bypass is likely to increase. Without it the use of rat runs through Stubbington and Hill Head will intensify with unacceptable consequences.
52. The Council should monitor traffic flows on the bypass once built to ensure that it remains attractive to users so that they do not seek alternative routes. Adjustments to traffic light timings might be necessary and the Council should be open to suggestions from the public.
53. Few new jobs have, as yet, been created at Daedalus because it is still early days. There is a huge amount of building work going on.

Mr J Pillai

54. Mr Pillai lives on the north side of the A27 between St Margret’s Roundabout and the Titchfield Gyratory. He described the difficulties experienced during the recent widening of the A27 and the poor response from the County Council.

Mr G Salvidge

55. Mr Salvidge lives on the B3334 to the north of Stubbington and he is generally in favour of the bypass although he also wishes to see the strategic gap maintained.
56. He is concerned about current congestion at the traffic lights at the junction with Bridge Street which does appear to be being addressed. In addition, he is also of

³³ Document O(iii) pages 28-30 (counter Hants 18)

³⁴ Document INQ3

the view that the actual footfall along Ranvilles Lane has been underestimated due to no counter having been placed to register people approaching from the south and that, as a consequence, the proposed crossing is not adequate.

Mr R Hopkinson³⁵

57. Mr Hopkinson lives in South Fareham. He says he set up his own online poll in 2016 to find out who wanted a bypass. Although he produced nothing to support it, he says the outcome was that people were overwhelmingly against it.
58. The bypass is not justified by the two jobs which, to date, have been created at Daedulus. The balance should weigh in favour of the environment and in particular the preservation of Brent Geese who visit the area.

Mr D Green

59. Mr Green is a resident of Ranvilles Lane and he wishes to know why residents of his road were not included in the consultation process. He asks what effect the restrictions through Stubbington village will have on the route down to Lee on Solent and also asks whether the cost benefit ratio included the gyratory system at Titchfield.

Mr G Duggan – Senior Parliamentary Assistant to Ms C Dinenage MP for Gosport

60. He spoke only to emphasise the importance of a timely decision in this matter.

RESPONSE BY THE COUNCIL³⁶

Consultation and process

61. The scheme itself has been subject to two rounds of consultation and has been considered and approved by the democratic process. Southern Fareham and Ranvilles Lane were not excluded from the leaflet drop in the second consultation in 2014 and, indeed, responses were received from that area. Numerous other forms of communication were also used.³⁷ It is incorrect to say people were only asked about the overall package. The 75% in favour was taken from the question "Do you support the preferred route for the Stubbington Bypass".
62. The petition with 151 signatures was not 'dismissed' as suggested. It was reported and considered in the November 2014 report. It was not included in the quantitative assessment of answers to the consultation questionnaire questions as it did not give answers to those questions. The same treatment was applied to supportive responses which were not in the consultation questionnaire format, for example the positive letters from Fareham and Gosport Borough Councils.³⁸
63. In addition, the planning application was consulted upon and democratically approved, and the Scheme has also been considered through the examinations in public of the Local Plans.

³⁵ Document INQ11

³⁶ See in particular document 2(ii)

³⁷ Document 1(r) page 7 and 9 and Document O(iii) page 20

³⁸ Document 2F pages 12 & 13

64. Equalities assessment has taken place and there has been compliance with the Council's public sector equality duty under s.149 of the Equality Act 2010. The 11 and 18 July 2017 HCC reports, and the 4 November 2014 report³⁹ all consider compliance with the duty and there is also a standalone 15 May 2017 equality impact assessment which supported the July reports.⁴⁰ The word "qualitative" in that report is self-evidently a typographical error.

Claimed benefits

65. The suggestion that the highways modelling was 'paper based' and used 'national statistics' for traffic growth are unfounded. The traffic impact has been modelled and assessed using the Sub-Regional Transport Model (SRTM), which is a suite of linked computer models, built and validated using locally collected traffic data. Local TEMPro traffic growth factors are applied in conjunction with known local information on planned and committed development sites. Reliance on the outdated Mott Gifford report is also misplaced. It has been superseded by the implementation of recent improvement schemes and by several other more recent studies which have demonstrated in much more detail the benefits and wider transport impact of the bypass.⁴¹

66. It is wrong to characterise issues in Stubbington as just "*two minor congestion points*". The delays are significant and deter inward investment. The Transport Assessment shows the Mays Lane and Stubbington Lane roundabouts in Stubbington both operating at or above capacity, with modelling indicating very substantial queues (over 100 cars and in some cases over 200).⁴² More recent information indicates peak queues in Stubbington of between 375m and over 1.5km.⁴³

67. Reduction in average journey time is only one of the benefits of the Scheme. Equally important is resilience, ensuring that in the event of an accident or road works the system does not grind to a halt. At present, in a westerly direction, there is no realistic alternative to the Stubbington route, making the system prone to failure.

68. The reduction in journey times of between 2 and 3.5 minutes are significant.⁴⁴ From the tables, the savings for the journeys between Rowner Road and the M27 J9 with the bypass in place can be calculated and are between 9% and 18%. Further, the bypass scheme only involves works to a portion of that overall journey distance which extends about half the distance again from the A27 Titchfield Gyratory to the M27 J9. Accordingly, the actual impact of the bypass scheme is clearly greater.

69. It is incorrect to say that the real problems lie elsewhere and that the need for the bypass could be avoided if those problems were addressed. There are other highway capacity issues elsewhere on the peninsula, but a package of works has been put in place (and for the most part are now completed) in order to address

³⁹ Appendix B of documents 1(g) & (h) and 2F

⁴⁰ Document O(iii) page 5

⁴¹ Document 2(ii) section 7

⁴² Document 1(o) page 77, tables 6.19, 6.20, 6.21 and 6.22

⁴³ Document 2(ii) para.8.6

⁴⁴ Document 1(p) page 63

those issues. The Newgate Lane corridor congestion issues have led to recent works on Newgate Lane north and south. The status of the other schemes the Fareham-Gosport BRT; Peel Common roundabout; St Margaret's roundabout; and A27 corridor improvements have been detailed.⁴⁵ It is accepted that the Quay Street roundabout in central Fareham does suffer from constraints, but the difficulty of those problems is no reason not to grasp solutions elsewhere. The bypass scheme is specifically intended to address access to and from the west.

70. The bypass will not displace traffic northwards. In terms of traffic flows, south Fareham actually is a significant beneficiary of the scheme. Two way 7am – 7pm vehicle flows on Rowan Way are anticipated to drop from 11,901 to 6,938 and on Longfield Avenue from 13,864 to 7,543.
71. The suggestion that reduction in congestion could be achieved by removing pedestrian crossings in Stubbington and replacing them with underpasses or walkovers are simply not practical or acceptable solutions.⁴⁶ They would exacerbate rather than alleviate the noise, air quality and severance impacts of traffic flows in Stubbington. Walkovers would require significant land take, as would the expanded roundabouts and approach lanes necessary to accommodate the existing and forecast levels of traffic.
72. More fundamentally, these 'alternatives' misunderstand the purpose of the scheme. The purpose is to create a new strategic access which does not route vehicles accessing strategic employment sites through the village of Stubbington. That purpose can only be achieved by the bypass.
73. The suggestion of a net job creation of two at the SEZ, raised for the first time orally at the inquiry, is entirely un-evidenced. The SEZ at Daedalus is in its early stages, with the main access road in the SEZ, Daedalus Drive, only having been completed in the last year or so. One would not expect to have anything like the full potential of the site realised as yet.

The designated strategic gap, countryside and the environment

74. The impact on the strategic gap was considered during the assessment of the planning application. The scheme was not considered to significantly affect its integrity or the physical and visual separation of settlements.⁴⁷ Indeed, the Local Plans, which contain the strategic gap policies, specifically envisage the bypass being constructed.⁴⁸ The bypass is not being provided with an intention of serving or facilitating new housing development.⁴⁹
75. The environmental impacts have been fully appraised through the ES that was produced in support of the 2015 planning application. In respect of air quality and noise there will be material benefits due to the reduction in traffic flows

⁴⁵ Document 2 para.14.15

⁴⁶ Document 2(ii) section 10

⁴⁷ Document 2 para.12.16

⁴⁸ Document 2G – policy DSP49 of the adopted Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 2 (2015) supports and safeguards the bypass land, as does INF3 of the emerging Fareham Local Plan 2036; the supporting text to LP21 of the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 is also supportive (para.10.15)

⁴⁹ Document 2G Fareham Local Plan 2036 para.11.45 and document 2 paras.2.18-24

through Stubbington. Further, the acceptability of these environmental impacts has been determined favourably by the 2015 grant of planning permission.⁵⁰

76. The same is true in respect of the issue raised regarding Brent Geese. The ES, which was consulted upon as part of the 2015 application, included a very full winter bird study. Extensive wintering bird surveys were conducted over two winters (2013/14 and 2014/15), but no Brent Geese were observed.⁵¹ The County ecology team has confirmed that more recent strategic surveys have not recorded the species in the Scheme area either. Further, there is no expert basis for the suggestion that the bypass will have an unacceptable impact on any such geese that do arrive. Indeed the evidence is to the contrary.⁵²

Ranvilles Lane crossing

77. The counter for measuring usage of Ranvilles Lane was positioned at the northern end of that part closed to traffic to capture the busiest section of the Lane as it was observed that many people route between southern Fareham and the public footpath connecting to Peak Lane rather than continuing south to Stubbington. That route would not be affected by the bypass.
78. A controlled crossing would potentially encourage use of the lane but would not connect to a safe onward route south of the RSPCA shelter. The crossing has been designed to make it as safe as possible; it has been the subject of two Road Safety Audits, neither of which has raised any safety issues.⁵³
79. Alternative signal controlled crossings would be available 400m to the west (Titchfield Road junction) and 500m to the east (Peak Lane junction). Those signal controlled junctions would also provide natural gaps in the bypass traffic at Ranvilles Lane thus assisting crossings.
80. The acceptability of this matter has been assessed in the determination of the planning application. Compliance with the statutory tests of provision of reasonably convenient alternative accesses/routes where required, which is a proper matter of concern to this inquiry, is clearly achieved.

Other matters of relevance raised

81. The Bridge Street/Titchfield Road junction is to be modified so as to increase capacity on approaches and exits. It will still be traffic light controlled so traffic will be stopped on occasion but the Transport Assessment indicates it will not operate over capacity (raised by Mr Salvidge).
82. The aim of the traffic management measures within Stubbington is to ensure that local traffic is not unduly hindered but that strategic traffic is sufficiently deterred to make sure it uses the bypass. Titchfield Gyratory is a component part of the scheme and as such was included in the cost benefit ratio assessment (matters raised by Mr Green).

⁵⁰ Document 2(ii) section 11

⁵¹ Document 1q Chapter 9 p.8 Table 9-3 sets out the survey periods; paras.9.4.22-23 at p.28 summarises the results of the surveys

⁵² Document 2(ii) para.2.10

⁵³ Document 2 para.8.8 and document 2(ii) para.3.4

INSPECTOR'S CONCLUSIONS

[Numbers in square brackets [n] denote source paragraphs]

Introduction

83. The Acquiring Authority, Hampshire County Council seeks confirmation of a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) made under sections 239, 240, 246, 250 and 260 of the Highways Act 1980. It would facilitate the construction of a single carriageway bypass some 3.5km in length around the northern and eastern sides of Stubbington together with 1km of improvements from its northern end stretching to the Titchfield Gyratory and 700m of improvements from its southern end stretching to the Peel Common roundabout. [7-14]
84. The Council also seeks confirmation of the associated Side Roads Order (SRO) made under sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980 to enable the necessary alterations to existing highways and private accesses required by the Scheme to be made.[15]
85. All statutory formalities have been complied with. [2]
86. Modifications to the wording of both Orders are requested including the substitution of a number of plans so as to correct minor errors and in the interests of clarity. [16]
87. At the close of the inquiry one registered objector remained who is a non-statutory objector to the CPO and a statutory objector to the SRO. However, a number of individuals also took the opportunity to express their views during the course of the proceedings. [4, 51-60]

Matters for consideration – CPO

88. Government Guidance⁵⁴ advises that a CPO should only be made when there is a compelling case in the public interest to do so. Considerations to be taken into account so as to reach a conclusion in relation to that matter in this case are as follows:
 - Does the acquiring Authority have a clear idea of how it intends to use the land which it is proposing to acquire? (paragraph 13 of the guidance)
 - Are all the necessary resources likely to be available to achieve the outcome within a reasonable time scale – sources and timing of funding? (paragraphs 13 and 14 of the guidance)
 - Whether the Scheme is likely to be blocked by any physical or legal impediments. (paragraph 15 of the guidance)
 - Whether reasonable steps have been taken to acquire all of the land and rights by agreement. (paragraph 2 of the guidance)
 - Does the purpose for which the CPO is made justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected and whether the

⁵⁴ MHCLG Guidance on Compulsory purchase process and the Crichel Down Rules

Public Sector Equality Duty has been complied with. (paragraph 2 and 6 of the guidance)

Clear idea of how the land is to be used

89. The Fareham-Gosport peninsula is recognised as having suffered from economic decline and a strategy is in place to reverse this trend by fostering economic growth and regeneration. Included within it is the designated Solent Enterprise Zone (SEZ) on the former Royal Navy site of HMS Daedalus where some 3,700 jobs are expected to be created. [18, 19]
90. The growth strategy for the area is embedded in national and local policy. Successful delivery, however, depends upon high quality transport infrastructure. The Fareham-Gosport peninsula forms a cul-de-sac which experiences significant traffic congestion particularly during peak periods. [20-21]
91. The need to improve access is a key priority in order to remove transport barriers to economic growth and to encourage new investment and development in the area. The bypass Scheme forms part of a wider package of proposed transport measures aimed at improving access to the Fareham and Gosport area. All measures in the package other than the bypass have been completed or are under construction. [22, 69]
92. The existing B3334 through Stubbington village has limited network capacity and several junctions and two controlled pedestrian crossing points in close proximity. Combined with high traffic flows, these features lead to significant levels of congestion and poor journey time reliability particularly at peak times. [29]
93. The Scheme extends from the A27 to the north down to the north side of the SEZ to the south bypassing the village of Stubbington. It is intended to provide an improved western access onto and off the peninsula enhancing journey time reliability and reducing traffic congestion. It would also improve the resilience of the peninsula's strategic road network by providing a reliable alternative north-south route. [23, 24]
94. With a significant volume of traffic removed from Stubbington village, measures can be taken to improve the village environment, such as reducing severance arising from the line of the current B3334 and improving air quality and pedestrian accessibility. In addition, measures can be introduced to ensure the village does not become an attractive alternative to the bypass for through traffic. [29,30]
95. The Council's Business Case provides an assessment of impacts and demonstrates that the Scheme offers good value for money. This is endorsed by more recent work undertaken in connection with the production of the Full Business Case required for the release of funds. The Transport Assessment, an integral part of the planning application for the bypass, sets out the anticipated transport impact of the bypass and associated works. [24, 25, 66-68]
96. The criticisms made of the Council's use of paper-based studies, inappropriate computer modelling and flawed methodology to make out its case are unfounded and not substantiated by any tangible evidence to demonstrate that the results cannot be relied on. Indeed, the Council's traffic modelling has been undertaken

-
- using accepted industry standards. The conclusion in the outdated 2010 Mott Gifford report of a poor business case for a bypass should not be relied on in the light of more recent studies and changed circumstances. [40-42, 65]
97. The suggestion that the traffic problems through Stubbington could be resolved by replacing the two controlled pedestrian crossings with under or overpasses and introducing feeder lanes at the roundabouts ignores the environmental problems associated with physically severing the village with a heavily trafficked road. It is not an alternative that has been worked up in any way, costed or assessed for impact. Similarly, the other suggestion of collecting all Gosport traffic and delivering it to Junction 11 of the M27 from where it could go east or west is not a practical proposition and has not been thought through having regard to the constraints of the existing road network. [42, 43, 71]
98. The Council fully accepts that there are other highway capacity issues elsewhere which hamper access to and from the peninsula, such as at the Quay Street roundabout. However, the bypass is but one of a package of measures aimed at improving connectivity and providing additional network resilience across the Gosport peninsula. The Scheme is specifically aimed at western access and should not be discounted simply because of problems elsewhere. [43, 72]
99. The suggestion that the SEZ has only resulted in a net job creation of two is not supported by any empirical evidence but the SEZ is, in any event, in its early stages. [44, 53, 58, 73]
100. The Scheme is entrenched in local planning policy and the detail has been developed to the extent that full, albeit conditional, planning permission has been granted. The Scheme has been fully drawn up so that each parcel of land can be shown to be required for: the purpose of constructing the new/improved highway; for landscaping works in connection with the new/improved highway; or to accommodate necessary ecological mitigation work. There can be no doubt that the Council has a very clear idea of how it intends to use each parcel of land that it is proposing to acquire. The Scheme cannot be implemented without acquiring all the necessary land interests. [6, 12-14, 26, 31d]
101. The objective of the Scheme as part of a package of measures aimed at improving access to and from the Gosport peninsula is of long standing. The Scheme has undergone thorough testing and assessment and a compelling case in the public interest demonstrated.

Necessary resources available to achieve the outcome

102. The estimated cost of the Scheme is £34m. It is fully funded. The Department for Transport awarded £25.5m of the necessary monies in February 2017. One of the conditions for the release of those funds is the confirmation of the CPO so as to ensure the necessary land can be secured. The Full Business Case, required before the money is released, is under preparation and the economic appraisal forecasts Benefit Cost Ratios in excess of those in the Transport Business Case of 2016 representing "high" (low growth scenario) or "very high" (core and high growth scenarios) value for money. [25, 27]
103. The Council is contributing the remaining £8.5m required. [27]

104. It has been demonstrated that all the necessary resources are likely to be available to achieve the outcome within a reasonable time scale.

Any physical or legal impediments

105. The Scheme benefits from a full conditional planning permission granted on 23 October 2015. As part of the planning process and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, a comprehensive Environmental Statement (ES), presenting the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment undertaken, was produced to inform the planning application. [6]

106. The ES presents the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme during construction and following completion. It identifies mitigation measures to prevent, reduce, and where possible, offset any significant adverse effects on the environment. Its findings were taken into account in the determination of the planning application and measures detailed were incorporated into the conditions imposed on the permission granted. [75, 76]

107. The Scheme lies wholly within Fareham Borough. All planning applications are to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.⁵⁵ In this instance the application was found to accord with the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 1 (2011) and Part 2 (2015) and with the development plan for the adjoining borough, the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (2015). Of particular relevance was policy DSP49 of Part 2 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan which safeguards the alignment of the Stubbington Bypass to improve and maintain the effectiveness of the Strategic Road Network. In addition, the Gosport Borough Local Plan says it is desirable to provide a bypass to Stubbington and to improve the western access. [6, 26, 74]

108. The planning merits of the Scheme have thus twice been the subject of formal scrutiny: firstly, when an alignment for the bypass was incorporated into the Development Plan for the area and latterly when planning permission was granted. In both instances the acceptability of routing the bypass through the strategic gap and the effect it would have was addressed and found to be acceptable. Assessed against policy CS22 in particular, the bypass was found not to significantly affect the integrity of the strategic gap. With regard to concerns about pressure for further development along its route, policy CS22 resists proposals that would affect the physical and visual separation of settlements. It is not the role of this report to re-conduct an assessment of compliance with planning policy. [46, 63, 74]

109. Similarly other concerns raised, such as the loss of farmland and the effect on highway safety, air quality, noise and protected species are all matters that would have been relevant to the determination of the planning application. Having been found to have been satisfactorily addressed then, there is no reason to repeat the assessment here. However, in response to some specific points raised it might be noted that no farmer has raised an objection to the loss of farmland or argued that the bypass would affect the viability of any farm. In

⁵⁵ Section 38(6) of The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

addition, whilst a photograph provided by the registered objector shows Brent Geese on a field affected by the Scheme, that field was under active cultivation at the time of my visit with a winter crop. The ES and subsequent surveys have not recorded the presence of Brent Geese. Moreover, the Council's ecology team indicates that they are more likely to be affected by sudden disturbance such as dogs running free rather than background traffic noise. [45-48, 74-76]

110. It is not the purpose of this report to either revisit the appropriateness of including the bypass in the statutorily adopted Development Plan for the area or the appropriateness of granting planning permission for the Scheme. The assessment of the planning merits leading to its inclusion in adopted policy and to a full planning permission have been dealt with under separate formal procedures.
111. Other than confirmation of the SRO, which is also the subject of this report and on which the Scheme relies, no physical or legal impediments to the implementation of the Scheme have been identified.

Reasonable steps taken to acquire the land by agreement

112. Preliminary discussions and meetings with affected landowners were carried out between early 2014 and mid-2015 and resumed in February 2017 following the award of funding. Formal negotiations to acquire all land interests by agreement commenced in July 2017. A summary of the progress of negotiations for each plot as at 3 October 2018 has been provided. The intention is that negotiations will continue preferably to acquire all land interests by agreement.

[31e]

113. No affected landowner has objected to the Order.
114. The evidence demonstrates that the Council has taken and is continuing to take reasonable steps to acquire all of the land and rights included in the Order by agreement.

Human rights and the public sector equality duty

115. In confirming the CPO, the rights of those with an interest in the land to be acquired would be engaged and in particular rights under Article 1 of the First Protocol *Protection of Property*. Such rights are, however, qualified rights and interference might be justified in the public interest.
116. In this case, such interference is necessary and justified by the clear need for the Scheme as part of a package to improve connectivity and access to Fareham and Gosport so as to facilitate economic growth and regeneration of the area. No more land than is necessary to facilitate the Scheme would be acquired and the purpose to which each parcel of land would be put is evident. [12-15]
117. All those with an interest in the land to be purchased were given the opportunity to make representation before the Order was confirmed and could have appeared at the inquiry. However, with the exception of Southern Electric Power Distribution PLC who withdrew its objection before the inquiry opened, none has done so. The requirements of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights *Right to a fair trial* are satisfied. [4, 31a]

-
118. With regard to the public sector equality duty and the impact of the scheme on groups with protected characteristics, the Council has undertaken Equality Impact Assessments at various stages in progressing the Scheme and has concluded no or low impact on such groups. The statutory duty under s149 of the Equality Act 2010 has complied with. [39, 64]
119. The Scheme is intended to benefit all road users. Some elements of the scheme such as the Ranvilles Lane crossing (addressed below) may be less convenient for users of that lane rather than no crossing as at present. However, the overall package and public benefits, which have been well documented and include, for example, substantial enhancements for the village of Stubbington and its residents, would result in an overall positive impact on all groups in society. [28-30 48, 50]
120. There is no clear evidence from which to draw a conclusion that the public was not adequately consulted during progression of the scheme. The 2014 consultation process was clearly aimed at reaching as many people as possible with the inclusion of a 54,000 leaflet drop over a wide area, news media coverage and manned and unmanned exhibitions. The offer of providing the questionnaire in large print or in another language was made and the Council confirmed that it is well equipped to provide information in Braille, Easy Read or audio tape/CD/DVD when asked to do so. [36, 37, 61]
121. Low levels of response are not necessarily an indicator that people were not reached during the consultation process and there is no evidence that any specific group was excluded. Indeed the findings of the exercise showed responses were received from elderly and disabled people. In addition, responses received from residents of southern Fareham and Ranvilles Lane do not bear out the claim that those locations were omitted from the leaflet drop. There is nothing of substance from which to draw a conclusion that the consultation process or the way in which the results were reported was in any way discriminatory. [38, 61, 62]

Matters for consideration – SRO

122. Sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980 require that the SRO is not confirmed unless, in the case of stopping up, another reasonably convenient route is available or will be provided before the highway is stopped up and, in the case of stopping up private means of access, that either no access to the premises is reasonably required or another reasonably convenient means of access is available or will be provided.
123. There is no suggestion that these tests have not been met other than in relation to the stopping up of Ranvilles Lane where the bypass crosses it. Specifically the objector's concern relates to the need for a new road crossing for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians travelling along Ranvilles Lane where previously there was none. [48-50]
124. Ranvilles Lane is a narrow country lane largely unaffected by traffic due to the existence of a Traffic Regulation Order and this makes it an attractive route for non-vehicular users and particularly, as I saw, for recreational use such as dog walking. It is undoubtedly the case that any new requirement to cross a road

creates a potential hazard in highway safety terms and in this case the bypass intersecting the lane will also affect users' enjoyment of that route.

125. Nonetheless, provision would be made for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians to cross the bypass so that their ability to travel the length of Ranvilles Lane would be maintained. The suggestion that the arrangements made for these groups to cross the bypass would not be safe is not borne out by the two Road Safety Audits carried out. Neither audit raised any issue in relation to the safety of users of the new crossing point. There is no evidence of substance from which to draw a conclusion to the contrary. Alternative signalled controlled crossings of the bypass would also be available 400m to the west and 500m to the east of Ranvilles Lane. [78-80]
126. Criticism is made about the positioning of the counter aimed at recording current use of Ranvilles Lane by pedestrians and cyclists. However, it seems to me that the Council did locate the counter on the busiest section of the lane given the proximity of the extensive residential area immediately to the north. Whilst it would not have picked up users coming from the south who did not walk as far as the counter or who turned off before it onto the public footpath, that would be compensated for by picking up those travelling in a southerly direction who did not walk as far as the line of the bypass because they either turned back beforehand or turned onto the public footpath before it. [49, 56, 77]
127. Having regard to the statutory test as set out in the Highways Act, it has been demonstrated that another reasonably convenient route would be provided before the relevant section of Ranvilles Lane was stopped up.

Overall conclusion

128. In respect of the CPO, for the reasons given above, a compelling case in the public interest has been demonstrated for confirmation of the Order. The Council knows precisely how it intends to use the land that it is proposing to acquire; all the necessary resources have been shown to be available to achieve the outcome; there are no known physical or legal impediments to block the Scheme; and reasonable attempts have been, and will continue to be, taken to acquire by agreement. The purpose for which the CPO is made justifies interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected such that the action is proportionate. The Public Sector Equality Duty has been complied with.
129. With regard to the SRO, the tests set out sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980 for another reasonably convenient route to be available or provided before the highways are stopped up and another reasonably convenient means of access be made available where required where a private access is to be stopped up have been met.
130. The CPO and SRO, subject to the modifications proposed, should be confirmed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

131. I recommend that the Hampshire County Council (B3334 Stubbington Bypass) Compulsory Purchase Order 2018 be confirmed with the modifications as set out in inquiry document INQ4.

132. Provided the Hampshire County Council (B3334 Stubbington Bypass) Compulsory Purchase Order 2018 is confirmed, I recommend that the Hampshire County Council (B3334 Stubbington Bypass Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2018 be modified as set out in inquiry document INQ4 and subsequently confirmed.

B M Campbell

Inspector

APPENDIX 1 - APPEARANCES

For the Council as Promoting Authority:

Mr H Flanagan of counsel, instructed by Ms B Beardwell, Head of Law and Governance, Hampshire County Council

He called:

Mr J Tipler Principal Transport Planner

Objector to the Orders:

Mrs R Christophersen Private individual

Interested persons:

Mr W Hutchison Chair of the Hill Head Residents' Association

Mr D Green Private individual

Mr J Pillai Private individual

Mr G Salvidge Private individual

Mr R Hopkinson Private individual

Mr G Duggan Senior Parliamentary Assistant to Ms C Dinenage MP

APPENDIX 2 – DOCUMENTS

Council's Statement of Case and Appendices

- 1 Statement of Case
 - 1(a) CPO (including CPO Schedule)
 - 1(b) CPO Maps
 - 1(c) SRO (including SRO Schedule)
 - 1(d) SRO Maps
 - 1(e) Extracts from the Acquisition of Land Act 1981
 - 1(f) Extracts from the Highways Act 1980
 - 1(g) Reports to and resolution of the Council's Executive Member for Policy & Resources dated 18 July 2017 (excluding Exempt appendix)
 - 1(h) Reports to and resolution of the Council's Executive Member for Environment & Transport dated 11 July 2017
 - 1(i) Planning Permission notice for the Scheme
 - 1(j) General Arrangement Drawings for the Scheme numbered EC/RJ504603/02/022, 023 and 024
 - 1(k) Traffic Regulation Order on Ranvilles Lane
 - 1(l) Letters of Objection received ((two parties, four letters)
 - 1(m) The Council's responses to letters of objection from SEPD
 - 1(n) The Council's responses to letters of objection from Mrs Christophersen
 - 1(o) Transport Assessment for the Scheme
 - 1(p) Transport Business Case for the Scheme
 - 1(q) Environmental Statement for the Scheme
 - 1(r) Consultation Report from summer 2014 public consultation, referenced in the Council's Key Decision Report of 4 November 2014

Council's evidence submitted before the inquiry opened

- 2 Jason Tipler Proof of Evidence
 - 2(i) Jason Tipler Summary Proof of Evidence
 - 2(ii) Jason Tipler Rebuttal Proof of Evidence
- 2A Supporting Statement – Land Negotiations
- 2B Engineering Plans relating to the Side Roads Order numbered EC/CJ008773/03/199, 200 & 201
- 2C Revised Side Roads Order Plan – EC/CJ008773/03/197D

-
- 2D Route Option Appraisal Report – May 2014
 - 2E Transport Assessment of Route Options – June 2014
 - 2F Report to and resolution of the Council’s Executive Member for the Environment and Transport – 4 November 2014
 - 2G Relevant policies/maps from local planning policy documents
 - 2H Extract from Fareham & Gosport Intermediate Infrastructure Programme Business Case – March 2015
 - 2I Stubbington Bypass Economic Summary Technical Note – July 2018
 - 2J SEPD Notice of Objection Withdrawal
 - 2K The Council’s responses to local resident objection letters dated 26 March & 9 April 2018

The Objector’s evidence submitted before the inquiry opened

- O(i) Summary of Presentation Criteria
- O(ii) Power point presentation with notes
- O(iii) Appendix to Objection – Part 1
- O(iv) Appendix to Objection – Part 2
- O(v) Appendix to Objection – Part 3

Documents submitted during the course of the inquiry

- INQ1 List of Appearances for the Council
- INQ2 Objector’s power point presentation with notes (revised) and accompanying document
- INQ3 Speaking Notes (x2) – Chair of Hill Head Residents’ Association
- INQ4 Proposed modifications to CPO and SRO
- INQ5 Council’s opening statement
- INQ6 Non-Technical Summary to the Environmental Statement
- INQ7 Council’s response (with attachments) to DfT’s letter of 8 October assessing the Orders
- INQ8 Letter dated 1 November from the Council to the Objector
- INQ9 Site visit schedule and map
- INQ10 Department for Transport traffic estimates
- INQ11 Documents submitted by Mr Hopkinson
- INQ12 Closing Statement for the Objector
- INQ13 Closing Submissions for the Council
