

**Inquiry to be held into a draft stopping up Order for part of the A3057 Western Avenue,
Andover**

Commencing on 30 June 2026

Inquiry Reference:

PROOF OF EVIDENCE

Adrian Truss, Resident.

- 1 I am Adrian Truss, of Chantry Lodge, Chantry Street, Andover, I am a solicitor with many years experience in local government service of planning, highways and related areas of the law. Prior to qualification, I worked for the Public Policy and Road Safety Departments of the Automobile Association as a Legislation Analyst for approximately 4 years and then as Parliamentary Officer for the Royal College of Nursing before commencing employment with Buckinghamshire County Council in 1992.
- 2 This matter involves planning application number 25/01047/FULLN which was submitted by the Test Valley Borough Council (“the Council”) for determination by its Northern Area Planning Committee at its meeting on 23 September 2025.
- 3 At around the same time or shortly afterwards, the exact date is not significant, the Council made an application to the Secretary of State for an Order stopping up part of Western Avenue and part of West Street Andover under S.247 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (“the Act”).
- 4 The draft Order was published, erroneously, in the Salisbury Journal, when this was pointed out to the Department for Transport, this was readily corrected by them and a revised date for submission of objections agreed by the Department.
- 5 As far as I am aware, the objections which were duly made were, as usual, passed to the Council for their consideration and the Council duly responded to objectors. However, as far as I am aware, no objections were withdrawn and therefore a public inquiry was ordered.
- 6 I have read the planning file for application 25/01047/FULLN up to the decision notice. I have not considered documents added to the file after that point unless specifically drawn to my attention by the applicants. For instance, I am aware that the applicants have requested a modification of the draft stopping up order, I intend to deal separately with the Council’s and our proposed modifications of the draft order, following my evidence on the subject of the original draft order.
- 7 **Road Safety and highway layout of the scheme**
 - 7.1 A report on the scheme is being produced by Charles and Associates, Traffic and Transport Planning. As mentioned at the pre-inquiry meeting this report will not be available for inclusion in this proof of evidence but will form the subject of a supplementary proof. The company has a sizeable team of experienced traffic and transport planners. The brief given to them was to consider and report on the Stantec Transport Study commissioned by the Council.
 - 7.2 The highway report from Charles and Associates is expected momentarily and will be forwarded when received.

- 7.3 The scheme as set out by the Council in their Statement of Case, paragraph 6.8, deals with highways, transport and safety considerations. I emphatically disagree with some of the statements made in that paragraph;
- 7.3.1 Council, paragraph 6.8.3 makes two claims of doubtful soundness, one is that the scheme would not have an adverse impact on the local and strategic network. This is simply wrong as is the second claim that there are benefits to be had.
- 7.3.2 In terms of West Street, there would be an additional four new right turn manoeuvres created
- 1) exiting from the West Street car park (currently left turn only),
 - 2) exiting from Chantry Street (currently left turn only),
 - 3) exiting the 'Waitrose' goods yard (currently left turn only)
 - 4) exiting the parking to the front of the Leisure Centre (although that is to some extent yet to be designed into the scheme).
- 7.3.3 In West Street, according to the Council's plans, if a vehicle is unwise enough to proceed beyond Portland Grove there is no opportunity for it to turn round lawfully unless it performs a three point turn in two way traffic, no provision appears to have been made to prevent this.
- 7.3.4 It is well known in road safety circles that right turns are much more dangerous than left turns in UK configured roads, a generic figure is that these are 55 times more dangerous than a 'with flow' turn. Data on this issue is hard to come by, the Department for Transport does not provide data but, the Science Direct Accident Analysis and Prevention study, David D. Clarke, Richard Forsyth and Richard Wright A statistical profile of road accidents during cross flow turns. 10.01016.jaap.208.03.013 contains the following passage [*Note that in Britain, drivers use the left side of the road, so a right turn involves crossing the oncoming stream of traffic when turning off a major road, and crossing one stream of traffic and merging with the second when turning onto a major road. In general, the implications and hazards of this manoeuvre are the same as a left turn in countries such as the USA and mainland Europe, where drivers use the right side of the road.*] A copy of this study can be obtained. The unnecessary creation of right turns is a major harm resulting from the Council's scheme.
- 7.3.5 Of the claimed benefits, the first is that there would be improvements in terms of active travel. Since the ability of local residents to walk or cycle in the vicinity of their homes in Chantry Lodge or Portland Place along with the loss of cycling connectivity along Chantry Street into West Street from elsewhere in the town would disappear, that claim does not stand examination.
- 7.3.6 The second, improved junction arrangements, depends entirely on viewpoint, since West Street is currently one way there are no significant improvements to junctions to be had. Following on from that, as stated above the creation of up to four new right turn points is not improvement.
- 7.3.7 The last claim made is that reduced traffic speeds are a benefit, again this is of questionable validity. Science Direct Accident Analysis and Prevention study, Evaluating the safety and speed impacts of the 20 mph speed limit in the UK: Evidence and insights Mohammed Quddus, Athanasios Theofilatos, Mingjie Fent, Rune Elvik contains the following passage in relation to their meta study; *Our analyses show that 20mph speed limits reduced traffic crashes by an average of 26.45%, with a 21.64% reduction for schemes with signs only.*

Casualties decreased by 22.92% for all schemes, compared to 10.91% for sign-only schemes. Furthermore, the introduction of 20mph speed limits with physical measures resulted in greater reductions in crashes and casualties than sign-only schemes. Additionally, sign-only schemes reduced mean speed by 1.63 mph. These findings are expected to assist policymakers to make informed decisions on implementing 20mph speed limits. These statistics do not take into account changes in traffic patterns, there are no studies I am aware of where a 20 mph limit is introduced on a road that was formerly one way and then made to carry two way traffic; if only because such a change is in all likelihood vanishingly rare. It is likely that retaining a one way traffic pattern on a road would make a far greater contribution to its safety than would introducing a 20 mph limit for an effective 1 mph speed reduction. In any event, quite apart from any statistical elements, it is obvious that it is difficult to exceed 20 mph is West Street as it is currently laid out so formalising a 20 mph limit is of doubtful value. 20 mph limits are far more effective when combined with traffic calming measures. The Council's proposed layout would prevent that. Therefore, I do not agree that the introduction of a 20 mph limit can be regarded as a benefit to offset against retaining an inherently safer road layout.

- 7.3.8 Paragraph 6.8.4 states that the local highway authority did not object to the stopping up, if they had objected, as I have had occasion to do in the course of my employment, there is no real chance that a stopping up order would be considered so this cannot be considered a benefit or harm.
- 7.3.9 Paragraph 6.8.5 relies on the adequacy and accuracy of the Transport Assessment and Road Safety Audit. These matters are discussed elsewhere in the light of the report from Charles and Associates. The key point is that there are obvious road safety issues created by the Council's scheme described above.
- 7.3.10 Paragraph 6.8.5 goes on to claim that the Council's scheme somehow improves accessibility. That is plainly not the case, no particular expertise is needed to see that removing the cycle lane in West Street and removing a large proportion of the pavement for pedestrians to walk over is the opposite of enhancing accessibility. The changes to Western Avenue enhance the provision of cycle tracks to the detriment of all other types and modes of transport, sustainability is a worthy aim but the same issue exists, removing existing cycle routes and preventing pedestrian use of the network cannot be described as improving sustainability.
- 7.3.11 Paragraph 6.9 of the Council's statement of case, mentions the Council's air quality and noise assessments. In particular, it states that changes to vehicle movements were modelled in terms of impact on air quality and noise nuisance. In terms of noise the Council make (paragraph 6.9.3) two odd claims, one that the changes are not sufficiently severe to give rise to a statutory claim for compensation or mitigation and at the same time there is a benefit to be had in terms of noise in the park. This is extraordinary. Next, the report from Kalaco on air quality issues quite clearly states that the council's approach is not sound and does not take into account a number of key factors and should not be relied upon.
- 7.3.12 There would inevitably be a worse situation in terms of air pollution at Chantry Lodge and Portland Grove, the starting point is that air pollution from point sources (such as vehicles) is widely assumed to fade into the background at two hundred metres horizontal distance. Therefore, moving several thousand vehicle movements 100 metres nearer to people's homes cannot possibly have a negligible effect, even if it may not be sufficient to give rise to statutory compensation. Secondly, the Council is claiming a benefit in ambient noise in the

park being reduced, where nobody lives, while increased noise in a residential area is apparently acceptable.

- 7.3.13 Paragraph 6.10.1 claims that there would be improved pedestrian and cycling connectivity as a result of the park. This overlooks a number of matters, first, the scheme removes cycling connectivity from West Street and the higher areas of the town. Second, a dedicated cycle route does not assist pedestrians or wheelchair users unless the fully metalled. In addition, local residents, from Chantry Lodge and Portland Grove and the higher area of the town centre would find it difficult, if not impossible for some of them, to access the park at all when faced with the newly created carriageway hazards put in place by the Council.
- 7.3.14 Paragraph 6.10.2 makes a strange claim, effectively the Council is claiming that providing crossings, altering speeded limits and changing road layout is a benefit attributable to the park, the local highway authority has a statutory duty to provide these, S. 16 Traffic Management Act 2004 & S.122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, regardless of any park.
- 7.3.15 Paragraph 6.10.3 Moving bus bays from one side of the bus station to the other cannot be considered an improvement or benefit unless undertaken to mitigate some other harm which is not mentioned.
- 7.3.16 The Council discuss a permissive pedestrian access from the park into the Lidl site, this is not relevant for the inquiry as there is no requirement for it to be actually provided and is irrelevant to the modification proposed by either the residents or the Council. It does not appear on the planning application for a revised car park and access layout for the Lidl site as far as I can see, in any case.
- 7.3.17 Paragraph 6.10.5 states that there have been no public objections to bus operations and the bus company has not objected. None of that is surprising, buses are typically subsidised by local authorities and the public are generally unaware of the changes proposed so do not know to object.
- 7.4 The decision notice for application number 18/03331/VARN contains the following condition:
The works to remove the existing layby and extend the footway on West Street shall be completed in substantial accordance with approved plan P1008-01 prior to occupation of the 4th apartment hereby approved.
Reason: To minimise the impact on pedestrian users of the highway in accordance with Policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
That planning condition can reasonably be supposed to meet the tests for a valid planning condition. There are other approvals for Chantry Lodge and there is also a S.278 agreement on the planning file between Churchill Estates and Hampshire County Council requiring payment to the Council and the execution of works to alter the footway outside Chantry Lodge which is also expressed to be a public benefit, in the Recitals.
- 7.5 The same condition appears in the decision notice for 18/00481. There is also mention on one of the planning files (Chantry Lodge has a convoluted planning history as well as having a varying address for planning purposes) approving the conversion of the ground floor of Chantry Lodge from commercial to residential which imposes a condition requiring the widening of the pavement and the removal of a loading bay on the grounds of residential amenity to prevent pedestrians from disturbing residents.

- 7.6 The site of Chantry Lodge has, on a number of occasions been subject to planning conditions and legal agreements requiring the widening of the footway which the Council, now that it has a scheme of its own to advance, proposes to remove. This is illogical and inconsistent.
- 7.7 A final irony of the situation at Chantry Lodge is that the Council required the payment to them of a substantial sum for the improvement of local transport and amenities. Thus we have the prospect of money being paid by a developer being used to harm the interests of the residents of that development.
- 7.8 The Leisure Centre site, permission number 18/02807 contains the following condition;
27. The leisure centre hereby permitted shall not be occupied or brought into use until a layby has first been provided on West Street for deliveries, servicing, customer pick-up and drop-off, and informal crossing arrangements have been provided on the north side of West Street, in accordance with the approved plan ZPFPLANDOVER.2/10 Rev. C, unless subject to such amendments as are required by the Highway Authority under any agreement or licence with that body.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety having regard to policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan
That condition is clear enough, the intention is to allow deliveries to be made safely. The situation is complicated by the fact that the pavement was widened and strengthened to allow delivery vehicles to stop on the pavement which is what happens currently. Other consents relating to the Leisure Centre contain broadly similar terms. (17/01435 etc.)
- 7.9 The key point is that both the Council and the local highway authority have repeatedly imposed planning conditions and financial and other requirements on developers, including themselves, that the pavements in West Street be widened or strengthened on the basis that it was necessary in the interests of highway safety or residential amenity or the interests of pedestrian safety. The same authorities now propose to ignore their own requirements in order to facilitate a scheme involving imposing two way traffic on a road that is manifestly unsuited to it.

8 Public Benefit and the Public Interest

- 8.1 Paragraph 6.11.1 of the Council's statement of case makes the statement that people would like more green space which is obvious, of more interest is as part of that, access to the river Anton is desired by the public, a single look at the landscape where the park would be reveals that the river is several feet below the level of the surrounding land, geography rather than highway hinders access to the river.
- 8.2 Paragraph 6.11.2 claims that the riverside park would 'enhance the arrival experience into the town centre from the West'. I admit to being unsure of the meaning of the whole paragraph. There are two potential routes into Andover town centre from the West, one is Western Road, the other is Charlton Road, neither of them is within at least 200 m of the proposed park which cannot therefore be described as influencing the process of arrival in Andover. The Council make references to the park being in the town centre, the entirety of the park lies outside the town centre boundary which put in place by the Council and is to the East of the park.

- 8.3 Paragraph 6.11.3 is concerned with supposed social, environmental and economic benefits from the park. It is possible there may be environmental benefits from the park and some enhanced opportunities for casual outdoor recreation but any economic benefit is doubted.
- 8.4 Paragraph 6.11.4 lists the intended benefits
- 8.4.1 6.11.4 a) creation of public space, is an undoubted benefit to the local community. What is more difficult is to see how that turns into increased footfall. Increased footfall requires a destination, is it being claimed that the park is intended to become a destination? If so, any destination requires a purpose, other than providing an opportunity for casual recreation there is no direct purpose to the park.
- 8.4.2 6.11.4 b) Enhanced, dedicated, cycleway, given the unfortunate publicity surrounding the sums being spent by other authorities on these the Council's commitment in that regards is fortunately relatively modest. However, it does not provide an alternative to the West Street cycle way that is intended to be removed under the Council's plans.
- 8.4.3 6.11.4 c) Pedestrian crossings, the provision of these is separate from the provision of the park and/or stopping up the highway. Crossings are a matter for the local highway authority under the Highways and Road Traffic Regulation Acts under its statutory duty and have no necessary connection to the provision of the park and cannot be claimed to be a benefit derived from the park.
- 8.4.4 6.11.4 d) Repeats what has already been covered and needs no specific response.
- 8.4.5 6.11.4 e) PSV parking on the highway is governed by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 which allows for the provision of parking for specific classes of PSVs, the community bus could be accommodated on the highway in that way, so a specific bay within the bus station precinct is not an identifiable benefit of the scheme.
- 8.4.6 6.11.4 f) This is accepted save that this is more than offset by the harm to health experienced by the residents in the area due to vehicle re-routing and greatly increased vehicle movements in West Street.
- 8.4.7 6.11.4 g) Since any planning permission is required to enhance bio-diversity it is not accurate to claim this as a particular benefit of this consent and should be disregarded in terms of stopping up the highway, or not.
- 8.4.8 6.11.4 h) Improved crossings on West Street, the highway authority has a statutory duty to secure the safe and expeditious movement of traffic including pedestrians in its area. As mentioned above, providing what it is legally required to provide is not a benefit related to the planning permission or the stopping up.
- 8.4.9 6.11.4 I) In terms of Western Avenue, a 30 mph limit would be automatic once the 40 mph traffic regulation order is revoked so that is not a benefit attributable to the approved development and is unconnected.
- 8.4.10 6.11.5 and 6.11.12 Are intended as a summary of the foregoing section, that there are some benefits to having the park is undeniable. The concept of material considerations is normally confined to the context of the determination of planning applications. However,

taken in the round, my view is that the corresponding dis-benefits of the stopping up of West Street outweigh those benefits and suggest that West Street ought not to be stopped up.

- 9 I introduce the Kalaco West Street Andover Stopping up Order; Review of Air Quality Assessment. As I read it the conclusion of the report is that the air quality assessment relied upon by the Council is fundamentally unreliable and the health effects of the proposed stopping up do not comply with Policy E8 of the Local Plan therefore the stopping up order should be refused.
- 10 I turn to the approved drawings which formed part of the application, the reason for doing so is that Council officers have indicated their opposition to amendments to approved plans, in this case, if the residents proposal were recommended to the Secretary of State, a total of 6 of the approved drawings would require modification and some others become irrelevant. In my view these changes may fairly be regarded as meeting the criteria to be treated as non-material amendments to the overall scheme.
 - 10.1 Drawing no. CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-1022-S2-PO2, Proposed Highway Geometry. This drawing would require modification should the Secretary of State in due course agree to any modification of the draft Order.
 - 10.2 Drawing no. CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-1021-S2-PO2, Proposed Highway Geometry. This drawing would not be required at all, if the Secretary of State agrees the modification proposed by residents as it depicts changes to West Street Andover that would be unnecessary.
 - 10.3 Drawing no. CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-1023-S2-PO1, Proposed Highway Geometry. This drawing would not need modification.
 - 10.4 Drawing no. CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-1015-S2-PO2, Vision Splays etc.,. This drawing would not be required if the Secretary of State agrees the modification proposed by residents as it depicts changes that would be unnecessary.
 - 10.5 Drawing no. CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-1017-S2-PO1, Vision Splays etc.,. This drawing would require modification if either the modification proposed by objectors or that proposed by the applicants were accepted by the Secretary of State.
 - 10.6 Drawing no. CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-1020-S2-PO1, Proposed Highway Geometry. This drawing would not require modification in the event the Secretary of State determined to retain the original scheme or accepted either of the proposed modifications to the draft Order.
 - 10.7 Drawing no. CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-1018-S2-PO1, West Street Forward Visibility would not be required if the Secretary of State accepted the modification proposed by residents but should be retained if the original scheme or the modification proposed by the applicant were accepted.
 - 10.8 Drawing no. 12766-LUC-XX-XX-DR-L0010 – P02, Central Square General Arrangement. This drawing would not require modification and it is indicative in any event.
 - 10.9 Drawing no. 12766-LUC-XX-XX-DR-L0002. PO4, Landscape Masterplan. This drawing is illustrative and no modification would be required in any event.

- 10.10 Drawing no. 12766-LUC-XX-XX- DR-L-0601-P01 Section Northern entrance. This drawing is illustrative and no modification required.
- 10.11 Drawing no. 12766-LUC-XX-XX-DR-L-0602-P01 Section Southern Entrance. This drawing is illustrative only and would not require modification.
- 10.12 Drawing no. 12766-LUC-XX-XX-DR-L-0603-P01 Section, Central Square. This drawing is indicative only and would nor require modification
- 10.13 Drawing no. 12766-LUC-XX-XX-DR-L-0604-P01 Section Play Area. This drawing is indicative only and would not require modification.
- 10.14 Drawing no. 12766-LUC-XX-XX-DR-L-0605-P01 Section Meadow Area. This drawing is indicative only and would not require modification.
- 10.15 Drawing no. 12766-LUC-XX-XX-DR-L-0607-P01 Section northern river area. This drawing is indicative only and would not require modification.
- 10.16 General Arrangement Drawings 1 of 4 CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-0001-S2-P01 this might require some minor amendment.
- 10.17 General Arrangement Drawings 2 of 4 CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-0002-S2-P02. This drawing would not be required at all if the modification proposed by the objectors is agreed by the Secretary of State but would be required if the modification proposed by the applicant were accepted.
- 10.18 General Arrangement Drawings 3 of 4 CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-0003-S2-P02. This drawing would require modification in the event the Secretary of State were minded to accept either of the proposed modifications from the objectors or from the applicant.
- 10.19 General Arrangement Drawings 4 of 4 CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-0004-S2-P03. This drawing would require modification under either of the proposed modifications to the draft Order.
- 10.20 General Arrangement Overview and sheet layout drawing no. CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-0010 S2 P03 would require minor modification should either modification of the draft Order be accepted.
- 10.21 Drawing no. CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-1011-S2-P04. Proposed Layout for Leisure Centre Deliveries. This is theoretically possible under the Council's scheme but a HGV in situ would effectively block the entirety of the reduced pavement width. This issue is addressed elsewhere.
- 10.22 Drawing no. CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-0102 S2 P02. Proposed Maintenance Access, this should not require modification in the original scheme nor if the Secretary of State were minded to approve either of the modifications proposed.

- 10.23 Drawing no. CJ009625-HEH-HGN-40012558-DR-CH-1014 S2 P01. Visibility Splays and stopping distances. Where does the second pedestrian crossing from the main road go to or come from?
- 11 In the planning statement there is a proposed time limited loading bay in Chantry Street adjacent to Chantry Lodge living and bedroom room windows. This is an ill-thought out proposal, given that the loading bay on the other side of Chantry Lodge was removed by the Council in the interests of residential amenity and pedestrian safety.
- 12 The planning statement refers to paras 96, 98 and 103 of the NPPF. 103 is especially galling, “development should connect places” and the planning statement mentions connection to the Town Mills park as a reason for removing the route out of West Street to the south. This is simply not the case, there is a two lane road called variously West Street or Waterloo Court serving the area, depending on which plan is used.
- 13 HCC Highways Comments, in the introduction mentions that the scheme, in their view is ‘not trip generating’. That may be the case but it is not something that is in favour of the Council’s scheme which requires many additional trips that run right past residents windows that currently go into the open areas to the West and South.
- 14 HCC also mention their design manual and the subject of active travel and seem to equate that with cycle track provision. West Street on the other hand seems not to matter nor does the fact is it used as a connecting route by many local residents including cyclists, something that would become effectively impossible under the Council’s scheme. HCC Highways file ref = 057390 dated 11/5/25.

MODIFICATION OF THE DRAFT ORDER

- 15 The Council has proposed a modification to the draft Order, their modification simply removes part of West Street from the Schedule to the draft Order and the substitution of a revised plan to reflect that proposed change. However, that is disingenuous, this would make West Street a cul de sac and thus continue the Council’s scheme in its present form. In my view, the Council’s proposed modification is a transparent attempt to avoid scrutiny.
- 16 The description of the approved development under reference 25/01047/FULLN makes no mention of West Street being stopped up, no consultation on that issue has been undertaken by the Council, nor was it mentioned in the pre-application consultations as far as I am aware. Unless some of the papers I have yet to see reveal otherwise, the Council never gave themselves the authority to make that application. I can only assume that the proposed removal of West Street from the stopping up application is a belated recognition on the part of the Council and their advisers that they had no lawful basis to apply to stop up West Street in the first place.
- 17 The Council’s original proposal retained West Street in its current layout and traffic pattern and allowed vehicles to exit the area at the edge of the park. I am aware that 2 plans retaining this feature were offered to the Council, one by Mr Briggs and one by Mr Roger Edgell, a former strategic planner for local and central government, who is not present as he [REDACTED]
- 18 Paragraph 6.10.4 of the Council’s statement of case deals with access to the Lidl site, it is obvious that the closure of Western Avenue would require the re-routing of traffic to the site.

If West Street were made two way, vehicles could only enter the site by making a right turn opposite Chantry Lodge in the face of oncoming traffic. One consequence is that queuing would occur from time to time in West Street, southbound which is not apparent from the Council's modelling. Right turns are inherently dangerous. Second, vehicles departing from the Lidl site under the Council's scheme would turn left but would also contribute to queuing at the entrance by slowing down right turns. The proposal we put forward in terms of modification to the draft Order would make the right turn at the new entrance to the site free from oncoming traffic and the right turn at the revised exit would be safer as there is only one way traffic to contend with. That, in my view, would on its own justify the proposed modification. Since the current entrance to Lidl would no longer exist there would be a substantial increase in vehicle movements in West Street, all motorists and delivery vehicles entering as well as exiting via West Street, one count done by residents showed 96 vehicles in one hour entering the Lidl car park.

- 19 The current exit from the Lidl site is tight for HGVs, but manageable, the Council's proposal instead would virtually guarantee that goods vehicles exiting the site would encroach on the bus station forecourt see photograph attached to the proof of evidence of Ann Truss.
- 20 The Council's proposal is based on flawed evidence, would more than double the vehicle movements in West Street particularly that of buses and cause, rather than reduce, congestion. An extra 332 bus movements daily would be generated in West Street by the Council's proposals.
- 21 The Council's modification does not allow one way traffic in West Street which is why residents have proposed their own modification scheme and provide to the Inspector and this inquiry a draft Order of their own together with a modified plan, for inclusion in the Order. The residents modification plan shows what is currently the three lane section of the southbound Western Avenue reduced to a single lane of one way traffic and the entire remainder of Western Avenue incorporated into the park. A draft modification Order and plan is attached.
- 22 The reasons behind this alternative proposal are;
 - 22.1 West Street is demonstrably unable to accept two way traffic safely. My wife and I were standing on the widened pavement outside Chantry Lodge on 5 November 2025 when a bus swept the pavement. We had to move back quickly to avoid being injured. If the pavement were narrower as proposed by the Council then we would have been killed or badly injured.
 - 22.2 West Street currently has reasonable pavements in front of the Leisure Centre which would be adversely impacted and made less safe for pedestrian use and less inclusive if West Street were made two way.
 - 22.3 West Street currently has reasonable pavements in front of Chantry Lodge on the side facing West Street, these would be adversely affected by the Council's proposals harming pedestrian safety and residential amenity and are less inclusive, if West Street were made two way.
 - 22.4 I am informed that the window cleaning contractors for Chantry Lodge consider that the Council's proposals would make it impossible for them to carry out pavement based cleaning operations using extending tools and that it would not be safe for them to go over to

tower based operations due to the lack of space. A 'cherry picker' could not be used either as it would be in breach of the traffic regulations applicable in the area rendering them unable to carry out their work.

- 22.5 If West Street remains substantially as it currently operates, there would be a substantial reduction in the roadworks and infrastructure changes required to bring the Council's scheme into effect in other respects resulting in considerable savings in time, environmental and financial terms.
- 22.6 The fact that West Street is currently used as a connecting route for cyclists, pedestrians and others between the higher area of the town centre and the West of Andover is not given any weight in the Council's proposals.
- 22.7 In my view the balance between the harms of the Council's scheme and benefits, is heavily tilted against, it while the proposal put forward by the residents reduces the cost of the scheme in health terms, environmental terms and financial terms.
- 22.8 I end by asking that the residents proposals be considered favourably and that they are endorsed in the recommendation made to the Secretary of State.

DRAFT

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

THE STOPPING UP OF HIGHWAYS (SOUTH EAST)(NO.) ORDER 202_

The Secretary of State makes this Order in exercise of powers under Section 247 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1900 ("the Act").

- 1 The Secretary of State authorises the stopping up of the highway described in the Schedule to this Order and shown on the Plan annexed to this Order, to enable development to be carried out in accordance with planning permission granted by Test Valley Borough Council ("the Council") under the reference 25/01047/FULLN.
- 2 The Council shall to the reasonable satisfaction of Hampshire County Council as local highway authority provide:-
 - a) new highways as proposed and detailed in the planning permission development plans and associated legal agreements with the local highway authority; and
 - b) improvement of the highways as proposed and detailed in the approved planing permission, development plans and associated legal agreements with the local highway authority.
- 3 Where immediately before the date of this Order there is any apparatus of statutory undertakers under, in, on, over, along or across any highway authorised to be stopped up pursuant to this Order then, subject to Section 261(4) of the Act, those undertakers shall have the same rights as respects that apparatus afer that highway is stopped up as they had immediately beforehand.
- 4 This Order shall come into force on the _____ 202__.

Signed by authority of
the Secretary of State

TIM BRIMELOW
An Official in the
National Transport Casework Team
Department for Transport

THE SCHEDULE

DESCRIPTION OF HIGHWAYS TO BE STOPPED UP

The highway to be stopped up is at Andover in the Borough of Test Valley shown on the Plan edged in purple and is:-

- 1 A length of the A3057 Western Avenue commencing at its junction with Waterloo Court and extends in a generally north westerly direction for a maximum length of 206 metres.

PLAN
TO BE INSERTED
FROM SEPARATE SOURCE

AT Proof of Evidence.odt