

**Longsight Road, Langho**

**784-B075154**

PINS Ref: 6002485 | LPA Ref: 3/2025/0196

## **Volume 3: Proof of Evidence of Peter Blair on Highways, Transportation and Accessibility**

**In Respect of Outline Planning Application for up to 300 Residential Dwellings, Associated Access, Rail Station Car Park, Green Infrastructure and Sustainable Drainage Systems (all matters reserved except for access)**

At Land South of Longsight Road, Langho

**Date: 31<sup>st</sup> March 2026 | Tetra Tech Ref: 784-B075154**

PINS Ref: 6002485 | LPA Ref: 3/2025/0196

**Revision 01 – Final**

**On behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd**

# **Volume 3: Summary Proof of Evidence**



# Document Control

<b>Volume</b>	Volume 3: Summary Proof of Evidence
<b>Document:</b>	Volume 3: Proof of Evidence of Peter Blair on Highways, Transportation and Accessibility
<b>Project:</b>	Longsight Road, Langho
<b>Client:</b>	Hallam Land Management Limited
<b>Project Number:</b>	784-B075154
<b>File Origin:</b>	Y:\784-B075154_Long sight_Road__Langho\60_Output\61_WIP\6103_Reports\

<b>Revision:</b>	01	<b>Prepared by:</b>	P Blair
<b>Date:</b>	31/03/2026	<b>Checked by:</b>	M Connolly
<b>Status:</b>	Final	<b>Approved By:</b>	P Blair

## 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 Preamble

---

- 1.1.1 This Highways and Transport Proof of Evidence has been prepared by Peter Blair, Head of Transport North at the international consultancy Tetra Tech. This document summarises my Highways and Transport evidence, considerations and findings.

### 1.2 Experience of Witness

---

- 1.2.1 My name is Peter Blair. I have a degree in Civil Engineering and a diploma in Industrial Studies, both from the University of Ulster. I am a Chartered Engineer, a Fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers and a Fellow of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation.
- 1.2.2 I am Head of Transport North at the international consultancy Tetra Tech (TT). I have over 35 years' experience of working in the field of traffic engineering, acting both for Public Authorities and Private Clients.
- 1.2.3 I am familiar with the development site and the highways and transport operational conditions in the local area.
- 1.2.4 My evidence is given in accordance with the requirements of my professional bodies. I can confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions, irrespective of by whom I am instructed.

### 1.3 Appointment

---

- 1.3.1 I am instructed on behalf of Hallam Land Management Limited, thereafter referred to as the appellant, to present evidence relating to Highways and Transportation matters in respect of the appeal, submitted pursuant to Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, concerning development of Land south of Longsight Road, Langho ("the appeal site").

## 2.0 Summary Proof of Evidence

### 2.1 Summary

2.1.1 This report forms my Summary Proof of Evidence.

2.1.2 In approaching this project, in relation to highways, traffic, transportation and accessibility issues, I have :

- Checked the transportation work submitted alongside the application;
- Undertaken further investigations and updates to data;
- Found that the previous work which supported the application is sound and robust;
- Reviewed the Officer Report to Committee and its findings;
- Reviewed the points made by objectors to the application;
- Reviewed the proposals against the requirements of local policy, the NPPF and Draft Consultation NPPF;
- Considered the attributes of the proposals in terms of Sustainable development and accessibility;
- Reviewed the proposals against the stated Reason for Refusal 2;
- Reviewed the proposals against the single transport related main issue raised by the Inspector; and
- Entered into Highways Statements of Common Ground with the Highway Authority and the Planning Authority.

2.1.3 The agreements set out within the HSoCGs are extensive. The Highway Authority have no points of disagreement, and agree that the proposals offer safe and suitable access, prioritise sustainable travel, suitably integrate the development with the village, meet the sustainable travel and accessibility tests in the NPPF and have no unacceptable traffic related impacts.

2.1.4 The HSoCG with RVBC records that the only point upon which the parties are not in agreement is RfR2.

#### **Review of Submitted Transport Work and Additional Survey Data**

2.1.5 The HSoCGs (CD 4.2.1 and CD 4.18) and the transport related main issue to be addressed before the Inquiry, acknowledge that matters of highways and traffic related impact are acceptable. In advance of reaching that position, I had reviewed the previously submitted work and undertook additional surveys of traffic volumes, trip generations and traffic speeds, pedestrian numbers and parking at rail stations. I include that evidence for completeness.

2.1.6 My review of the highways and transport work submitted with the application concludes that it is sound. New additional data validates that work and shows that the assessments of operational conditions are robust.

2.1.7 New pedestrian and rail station parking data informs the extents to which the proposals would benefit existing pedestrians and would promote and accommodate demand for rail travel.

### **Review of the Proposals against Local and National Policy**

2.1.8 My review gauged the proposals and the 18 sustainable travel improvements and 16 sustainable travel measures / funding against local policy, the NPPF and the Draft NPPF. To set that process out efficiently and clearly, PoE Appendices 5 and 6 contain tabulations of the various elements of the proposal, their benefits and how they fare when considered against policy. My review concludes that:

- The proposals are not contrary to the cited local policies, nor to the NPPF;
- The proposals in fact comply with, and positively deliver the requirements of those policies;
- Although at the time of preparing this proof it is not a requirement to comply with the NPPF Consultation Draft, that document perhaps indicates the direction of travel of policy and my review has found that the proposals do comply with the transport and accessibility aspects of it;
- Had proper weight been given to positive aspects of the proposals as required by policy DMG3, that could only serve to affect the planning balance positively in favour of the proposals.

2.1.9 It can be seen in the HSoCG with the HA that they are in agreement that the sustainable travel and accessibility tests in the NPPF are satisfied by the proposals.

### **Addressing the Transport Related Main Issue identified by the Inspector and the RfR2**

2.1.10 My review considered the proposals against a main issue identified by the Inspector, i.e. the developments “effect on sustainable modes and patterns of transport” and also against RfR2.

2.1.11 Both of those aspects mention sustainability and so my evidence addresses that too.

2.1.12 In terms of the developments “*effect on sustainable modes and patterns of transport*”, I consider that it will be beneficial. The multiple sustainable travel infrastructure improvements, funding provisions, increased public transport patronage, provision of a carpark for the rail station, safe guarding land for step-free access improvements at Langho Railway Station and other enhancements (e.g. travel plan) will all serve to encourage sustainable modes of travel both for residents of the development and the local public. That point is agreed in the HSoCG with the HA.

2.1.13 In relation to RfR2 I consider it to be flawed. The scale of development does not harm transport related sustainability, if anything, larger developments have more ability to enhance it.

2.1.14 Policy advises that there should be recognition of the challenges in achieving accessibility in rural areas, and as rural sites go, the proposed site is well connected and accessible. That point is agreed in the HSoCG with the HA. CD 4.2.1

2.1.15 Many forms of private car travel are sustainable so it is incorrect that the RfR2 should state that a reliance on the private car automatically results in an unsustainable development.

2.1.16 My evidence shows that residents will have a significant range of alternative travel mode choices and so will not be reliant on the private car. Moreover, the modern efficient digital connectivity in each home will reduce the need to travel and will give access to employment, services, facilities, retail and social interactions. That point is agreed in the HSoCG with the HA.

- 2.1.17 In terms of sustainability (relating to transport), my evidence also describes how the on-site layout, the interfaces between site the wider area, the public transport facilities, digital connectivity, an increasingly sustainable car fleet and elements such as the new rail station car park, the travel plan and funding, all serve to enhance development sustainability. Noting of course that transport is just one aspect of the environmental and social strands of sustainability.
- 2.1.18 The site could not be regarded as being isolated or locationally unsustainable from an access or social perspective. That point is agreed in the HSoCG with the HA.
- 2.1.19 In transport terms the proposals are sustainable and the increasing prevalence of ultra-low emission and zero emission cars, the reducing trend in need to travel and the future promotion of public transport and sustainable initiatives such as those in the draft Lancashire Local Transport Plan all align with vision-led aspirations for sustainable transport.

## 3.0 Conclusions

3.1.1 In consideration of my evidence, I conclude the following:

- The proposals provide safe and suitable access for all modes of travel.
- The site designation as being in a rural location means that reduced opportunities for sustainable accessibility should be taken into account when planning decisions are made. As rural sites go, the site is adjacent to a settlement with good accessibility. The proposals enhance that and offer good accessibility both on site, connecting to adjacent networks and via sustainable travel modes to a significant number of facilities, services and towns.
- The proposals will not have any significant traffic impacts on the local highway network.
- The residual cumulative impacts on the road network will not be severe.
- The transport and highways aspects of the proposals support sustainable development and promote and prioritise sustainable travel.
- Residents of the development will not be reliant upon the unsustainable private car.
- The proposals comply with local and national policy and guidance.
- The proposals comply with the NPPF draft consultation.
- In terms of the main issue within the Inspectors CMC summary note, the proposals will have a positive and beneficial effect on sustainable modes and patterns of transport.

3.1.2 The development proposals should be considered to be acceptable in highways, traffic, transport accessibility and sustainable travel terms.