



Head of Development Planning
Fareham Borough Council
Civic Offices
Civic Way
FAREHAM
Hampshire
PO16 7AZ

Tel: 0300 555 1375 (General Enquiries)
0300 555 1388 (Roads and Transport)
0300 555 1389 (Recycling Waste & Planning)
Textphone 0300 555 1390
Fax 01962 847055

www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries to	Nick Gammer	My reference	6/3/10/224 (APP10135)
Direct Line	01962 846877	Your reference	P/19/0460/OA
Date	23 rd May 2019	Email	nick.gammer@hants.gov.uk

For the Attention of Jean Chambers

Dear Madam

Land at Newgate Lane (South), Fareham – Outline planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and development of up to 125 dwellings, open space, vehicular access point from Newgate Lane and associated and ancillary infrastructure, with all matters except access to be reserved.

Thank you for consultation on the above planning application. An application was submitted in October 2018 for Land at Newgate Lane (North) P/18/1118/OA supported by a Transport Assessment (TA). Initial comments were provided by the highway authority on this application 6th November 2018 and a further Updated TA (Transport Assessment Rev A) was submitted. Further comments requesting additional information and clarification were provided by the highway authority 11th April 2019 in response to this Updated TA. The TA and Updated TA submitted supporting Land at Newgate Lane (North) P/18/1118/OA review both the northern and southern applications as one site.

Regarding this application, Land at Newgate Lane (South) P/19/0460/OA, a very similar TA has been submitted to the Updated TA submitted under the northern application, again considering the cumulative transport impacts of both sites coming forward for a combined total of 200 dwellings. As such, many of the comments are similar or identical to the highway comments dated 11th April 2019 in relation to the northern application. It is understood that this application is to be considered in conjunction with the northern application, P/18/1118/OA.

The recent realignment and upgrade of Newgate Lane makes up part of the 'Improving Access to Fareham and Gosport' strategy. The technical assessment for this strategy assumed development of existing brownfield regeneration sites and not development of greenfield sites along the Newgate Lane corridor. The primary aim of the strategy is to stimulate the provision of employment and investment in employment opportunities within Gosport.

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

Access Proposal

This application for 125 dwellings proposes a single point of access via a simple T-junction arrangement on old Newgate Lane. It is stated within the TA that this site and the southern proposals will be separate, with no vehicular through route and two separate accesses onto old Newgate Lane. The highway authority believe that both developments should be limited to a single point of vehicular access, with a secondary pedestrian/ cycle/ emergency access. This is considered sufficient for the total proposed scale of development, including both the northern and southern sites. A single point of access limits impact on Newgate Lane, which is a lightly trafficked cycle friendly route. Furthermore, using the proposed northern access as the vehicular access results in a shorter distance where the additional traffic generated by the proposed developments overlaps with the cycle route from Peal Common Roundabout to Fareham. Should both developments be permitted, the highway authority will accept two vehicular access points in the short term, if required to accommodate development buildout programmes. However, when the northern access is operational and an internal vehicular link between the northern and southern sites is complete, the southern access should be downgraded to pedestrian/ cycle/ emergency only.

Details of the southern access proposals have been provided within the TA. The engineering principles of this access have been reviewed and the following comments can be made.

1. During the speed data collection period (27th January to 2nd February 2019), there was snow on two days (31st January & 1st February). As such the data does not comply with the requirement of TA22/81 and hence HCC's Technical Guidance Note TG3. Either the speed surveys should be repeated, or the 31st January and 1st February should be removed and the 85th percentile speeds recalculated. The proposed visibility splays at 2.4m by 120m are acceptable in principle, however the extent of land to be dedicated as highway proposed on drawings figure 8 and figure 9 is too extensive and should be limited to that required for visibility splays in accordance with TG3.
2. Forward visibility on old Newgate Lane should be provided for the proposed junctions as this may impact on their location and potential land take.
3. The location of the proposed pedestrian crossing points on both drawings requires review in terms of likely pedestrian desire lines and to minimise land take for visibility splays.
4. Regarding the land required for visibility splays for both vehicular accesses and pedestrian crossings, consideration should be given to restrictive covenants or easements as HCC would not wish to adopt as highway the extents of land indicated.
5. It should be noted that there is existing vegetation along the frontage which would obstruct the achievable visibility. It is also noted visibility splays run through the site. From the masterplan it is not clear what the proposals for the site boundary with Newgate Lane will consist of. The full visibility splays compliant with HCC's Technical Guidance Note TG3, will need to be secured free from obstructions and planting. Required visibility splays cannot be part of any public open space dedication.
6. The proposed accesses are wider than normally expected. The 7m wide access could be reduced in width to reduce the pedestrian crossing distance

at the junction with old Newgate Lane. Section 7.10 of the Update TA states different widths from those shown on the drawings; clarification is required.

7. Tracking of the southern access is acceptable as submitted, however tracking of a 16.5 artic should be provided to demonstrate construction traffic can safely enter and egress the proposed development.
8. Works to the River Alver will require EA approval; the planning authority should consider the environmental impact of this and whether EA approval should be sort prior to any planning permission being granted.

Due to forecast capacity issues, alternative arrangements have been suggested for the junction of Newgate Lane East/ old Newgate Lane. Regarding the two-stage right turn design shown at Figure 12 and the roundabout design shown at Figure 14, the applicant acknowledges these designs are inappropriate and as such these proposals have not been reviewed. Comments on the engineering aspects of the remaining two proposals are given below.

Banned Right Turn

Drawing figure 13 proposes a restrictive turning movement in the form of a left turn only when egressing the old Newgate Lane. The following comments can be made with respect to this design:

- This will require a TRO, which is unlikely to be supported by the police unless significant measures were taken to physically prevent right turns out, as this is likely to create an ongoing enforcement issue.
- The proposed physical measure of the formation of an island on the new Newgate Lane present a hazard for a vehicle entering the right turn lane late.
- There are safety concerns regarding inappropriate manoeuvres at the junction itself to egress to the south or U-turning movements at inappropriate locations north to the north to avoid travelling to Speedfields Park roundabout, which can experience queuing at peak times.

Signalisation

Drawing figure 15 proposes signalisation of the junction. The following comments can be made with respect to the engineering aspects of this design:

- Provision for pedestrians and cyclists should be considered.
- There is concern regarding the two accesses to the south of the junction causing late braking when travelling southbound on a green wave.
- This option impacts on highway ditches (OWC) and street lighting.
- There will be a negative impact on the free flow of traffic, contrary to the design objectives of Newgate Lane realignment.

Sustainable Travel

Isochrones and specific destinations have been provided, which gives a suitable assessment of walking and cycling distances to specific locations.

Walking and Cycling

Provision of walking and cycling facilities from the site to local amenities is generally of an acceptable standard, however there are notable exceptions. Firstly, the width

of footways on the northern side of Newgate Lane has been reviewed as requested and is 1.5m – 1.8m in width. While acceptable, this is narrower than the optimal provision and an alternative north – south pedestrian and cycle link should be provided internally to the site.

The second concern is in relation to the Woodcote Lane/ Brookers Lane link, including the crossing of Newgate Lane East. As stated in the TA, Peel Common Infant and Junior Schools, accessed via this route, are not currently the catchment schools for the proposed development site. However, it is understood that the school strategy is still developing. It is possible that catchments will change should the site come forward, making the infant/ junior and secondary schools to the east the catchment schools for the application site. However, even if this were to occur, it is considered likely that children from the development will attend a selection of schools in the area. More generally, future residents of the proposed developments will use this link to access bus services and local amenities in Bridgemaury. Given the development will increase both crossing movements and traffic flow, a suitable contribution towards improved crossing facilities would be considered adequate mitigation for the development related increase in pedestrian, cycle and traffic movements at this location.

The above further supports the need for a north – south pedestrian and cycle link through the site and from the southern site to Woodcote Lane. This should be secured should this application come forward.

Finally, the route to the current catchment schools of Crofton Anne Dale Infant and Junior schools should be reviewed. It is noted the following improvements have been identified as required, however this may not be an exhaustive list. This will be considered following review of the route.

- Extension of off carriageway cycle provision from Crofton Secondary School to Eric Road.
- Improvements to the crossing facilities at the Eric Road/ Stubbington Lane/ Bells Lane junction to accommodate cycles and tying in cycle facilities to the existing provision on Bells Lane.

A contribution will be required for delivery of these works, proportionate to the total dwellings proposed for both parcels.

It is noted that a contribution to provide footway connections from the site access to the Old Newgate Lane/Newgate Lane junction has been proposed in order to provide connections to the HA2 site access should this site come forward. It is considered beneficial to secure this to ensure suitable links can be provided should HA2 come forward. The applicant should provide a design and cost estimate of these works for review.

Public Transport

Bus services 21 and 21A are subsidised and therefore measures should be considered by the applicant to ensure that the service is secured via private funding. The TA states the applicant is willing to enter into discussions with the bus operator.

Evidence of a service level agreement or similar arrangement between the applicant and bus operator is required to ensure the site continues to be served by bus.

Distributions and Assignment

Traffic survey data has been collected by the applicant and surveyed turning proportions of existing traffic have been used to inform the distribution. It has been confirmed that all traffic flow data was collected Wednesday 30th January. The distribution and assignment methodology presented in the TA are agreed.

The highway authority has undertaken recent data collection for the completed scheme including traffic flows on Newgate Lane East. The PM southbound flows appear low. The raw survey data, including queue length surveys, should be provided for review.

Internal Layout and Parking

The TA states that the internal roads will be offered for adoption under section 38 of the Highway Act. HCC's Road Adoptions Team should be consulted on the internal proposals at the earliest opportunity.

It is noted a planning condition securing pedestrian connections between this site and the proposed site to the south is suggested by the applicant. As stated previously, the applicant should provide an internal vehicle link between the northern and southern application to allow a single point of access to be achieved.

Car parking requirements are a matter for the planning authority. However, it is noted that details of the parking requirements have not been put forward within the TA and are stated to be a matter to be dealt with as reserved matters. These should be set out and agreed with the planning authority to ensure suitable levels of parking are provided within the site.

Construction Traffic Management Plan

It is noted that within the TA the applicant makes a commitment to provide an appropriate construction traffic management plan and suggests this is secured via an appropriately worded condition. This is acceptable to the highway authority.

Background Traffic Growth and Committed Development

It is proposed to utilise TEMPro to determine background traffic growth. This approach is considered robust, however, further consideration must be given by the applicant to the inclusion of committed development within any growth forecasting of traffic and therefore within the input flows to junction modelling. It is considered that development traffic from the Gosport Waterfront and Daedalus developments should be manually assigned to the network. Distribution diagrams should be provided

showing committed development flows, which will be added to the TEMPro growthed base flows to give the forecast future year traffic flows. Gosport Waterfront and Daedalus can be removed from TEMPro to avoid double counting. This approach should be applied to both the 2024 and 2036 (sensitivity test) future year assessments.

Junction Assessment

Junction assessments include the following:

- Old Newgate Lane /proposed site access junction
- Newgate Lane East/old Newgate Lane priority junction
- Speedfields Park roundabout and HMS Collingwood signal junction
- Newgate Lane/Longfield Avenue/ Davis Way roundabout
- Peel Common signalised roundabout

The assessment years provide a forecast year 5 years post application (2024) and include a sensitivity test to 2036.

It is noted that junction assessments have been undertaken based on with and without Stubbington Bypass scenarios. The methodology regarding the redistribution of traffic due to the opening of Stubbington Bypass is acceptable, with the differences in SRTM output flows with and without the bypass used to factor the base, forecast and development flows.

It is also noted that the capacity assessments have been undertaken to include both this application's development traffic and traffic generated from the proposed development to the south, totalling 200 dwellings rather than the 125 dwellings proposed in this application. The highway authority is only able to comment on the submitted information.

As detailed above, the forecast network traffic flows are not agreed and therefore the below modelling comments concentrate on the technical build of the junction models. Further comments will be made on the acceptability of the performance and operation of the junctions only after the technical accuracy of the models has been confirmed and the traffic flow data has been agreed.

Old Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East (current layout)

- A FLAT profile has been used, with a 90-minute time period. Single time segment only has not been ticked as per the Junctions 9 user guide.
- It is noted that the traffic flows have been inputted as vehicles and not PCU's.
- The base flows appear correct; however, the other scenarios do not appear to align with the provided traffic flow diagrams.
- No commentary has been provided on the model validation methodology. In addition, modelled queues do not appear to reflect existing traffic conditions.

Until further clarification is provided the models cannot be considered as a sound basis upon which to assess the future operation of this junction during the various traffic flows scenarios as set out within the TA.

Old Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East (Proposed left out only layout)

The future operation with the left turn only layout highlights that the junction will operate within capacity for all scenarios. No Traffic flow diagrams were provided for this option; however, a calculation of the flows appears to show discrepancies in the flows coded into the model. Due to the absence of a scaled drawing, geometries have not been checked and cannot be verified. Further information is therefore required before future modelling results can be considered as reasonable. However, given the concerns raised above with the operation of this junction arrangement, it is not considered appropriate to pursue this design as a possible resolution of future 'with development' capacity issues.

Old Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East (Proposed signalisation)

- Lane 1/2 (Newgate Lane northbound offside lane) – a 10 PCU flare length has been included in the model for this lane. This grossly overestimates the use of the flared lane and provides an unrealistic capacity on this approach. Based on the flare length of 60 metres, the 115 metre downstream merge on the exit, it is considered that very few drivers would use the offside lane. Drivers within 60 metres of the junction will realise that they will proceed through at the next green and therefore will see little benefit from using the offside lane. Those familiar with the route will realise that using the offside lane will require them to re-join the main traffic stream quickly downstream. Experience at other junctions indicates that drivers are reluctant to use the offside lanes as they derive little personal benefit on the approach yet find themselves having to force their way back to re-join the main flow on the exit. The traffic/lane flows in the model have been assigned on delay based balancing which places 49% of Newgate Lane northbound into the nearside lane and 51% into the offside lane for all scenarios. This lane distribution will not reflect actual lane usage. The model should be changed in two ways to reflect this behaviour;
 - Reduce the actual use of the flared lane to 1 PCU per cycle to provide a realistic usage reflecting the short flare and merge lengths.
 - Lock the traffic assignment on the Newgate Lane northbound approach to 90% nearside lane and 10% offside lane.
- Lane 2/1 (Old Newgate Lane nearside lane) – a 7 PCU flare length has been included in the model. Physically the flare lane is no more than 1 or 2 PCU long and the flare length should be reduced accordingly.
- Lane 2/1 (Old Newgate Lane nearside lane) – the saturation flow does not include the turning radius for this movement. This should be included in the saturation flow measurements. Its inclusion would reduce the saturation flow for this movement.
- Only the cyclic order stage change intergreen values have been checked (stage change 1-2-3-1). The following intergreens require changing;
 - Phase A to D intergreen should be 6 seconds and not 4 seconds as modelled.
 - Phase C to A intergreen should be 6 seconds and not 4 seconds to match that for phase C to B intergreen
 - Phase D to C intergreen should be 6 seconds to match that for the phase B to C intergreen.

No review has been made of the results (forecast traffic delays and queues) pending changes to the model and verification of the traffic flows.

Newgate Lane/ Longfield Avenue / David Way Roundabout

- The traffic flows have been inputted as vehicles and not PCU's.
- No commentary has been provided on model validation methodology and queue length surveys have not been provided. In addition, modelled queues do not appear to reflect traffic conditions on site. Further clarification is required on modelled inputs before the models can be considered as validated.

Peel Common Roundabout

HCC ITS Group supplied two agreed base models for Peel Common roundabout to the applicant's transport consultant;

1. Current partially signalised Peel Common roundabout layout (Gosport Road give way entry)
2. Proposed fully signalised Peel Common roundabout layout (Gosport Road signalised for Stubbington bypass)

The TA has only reviewed layout 2. The model set up of this arrangement is acceptable. However, no model has been supplied for the existing partially signalised roundabout, with Gosport Road as a give way entry (layout 1). An assessment of the current layout should be provided.

There is no summary included with in the TA and only the base scenario modelling outputs appear to have been included in Appendix 10. For any future submission, a summary of modelling results should be provided within the main body of the document and full modelling outputs appended.

No assessment has been made of the traffic delays and queues pending agreement of the input traffic flows.

HMS Collingwood Signalised Junction and Speedfields Roundabout

A number of Linsig models have been submitted, containing both the HMS Collingwood signal junction and Speedfields roundabout. These appear to cover the 2024 and 2036 scenarios and to include a review of increased U-turn movements resulting from the Old Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East proposed left out only layout. The modelling set up is considered acceptable, however the different scenarios are not clearly defined or explained. This should be corrected with any future submission and a summary of modelling results should be provided within the main body of the document.

No assessment has been made of the traffic delays and queues pending agreement of the input traffic flows.

HA2 Emerging Allocation

For clarity, HA2 is an emerging allocation and is subject to an objection from the highway authority within the Local Plan process. It has not been subject to the full

local plan assessment process and therefore should not be considered as committed development. Regarding the junction of old Newgate Lane/Newgate Lane East, the form of junction would change as a result of development on the HA2 site, with a roundabout arrangement proposed. The proposals for a roundabout cannot be considered as secured for the purpose of this application. Regardless, the applicant was requested by officers at Fareham Borough Council to consider NMU connectivity between the development site and HA2. A possible design has been submitted in Figure 12; this has been reviewed and the following comments are made.

- It has not been confirmed within the TA that the proposed roundabout is a compliant design to TD16/07.
- More detailed information is required to ascertain if the proposal is acceptable in geometric terms.
- Vehicle tracking and confirmation that the proposed footways are “shared use” is required.
- This option impacts on highway ditches (OWC) and street lighting.

Personal Injury Accident Analysis

A full PIA assessment has been undertaken within the submitted Transport Statement for the most recent available 5-year period. The highway authority does not consider there are any accident patterns that will be exacerbated by the forecast development traffic in the area surrounding the site.

Travel Plan

The Travel Plan has been reviewed against initial comments and there remain a number of items that require resolution before this Travel Plan can be approved.

- The developer’s own policies regarding sustainable travel should be included in the policy section of the Travel Plan and can take the form of either a statement of support or a quote from the developer’s website.
- All figures are missing from the main body of the travel plan. These must be included.
- Appendix 2 - Footway/ Highway Improvements, appears to relate to the northern application.
- Photos of the surrounding highway network should be included in the site audit.
- An example survey must be appended to the travel plan.
- Appendix 4 “COSTS OF TRAVEL PLAN MEASURES” is blank. This is required in order to set out the Travel Plan Bond.
- The Travel Plan must include a commitment to pay HCC’s monitoring and approval fees.

The Travel Plan will require further work, as set out above, as it does not meet the minimum standards set out in HCC’s “A guide to development related travel plans”. The issues raised should be addressed in a new revision of the Travel Plan before it

can be considered acceptable for submission in conjunction with the proposed residential site.

Recommendation

Additional information is required in order to support the application.

- Address comments in relation to the access proposals.
- Address comments in relation to the proposed alternative arrangements for the junction of Newgate Lane East/ old Newgate Lane.
- Confirmation of a single vehicular access point and provision of an internal north/ south pedestrian, cycle and vehicular link.
- Agreement of a suitable contribution towards improved crossing facilities at the Woodcote Lane/ Brookers Lane crossing of Newgate Lane East.
- Agreement of a suitable contribution towards mitigation of the route to Crofton Anne Dale Infant and Junior schools.
- Agreement of a suitable contribution to provide footway connections to HA2, should this site come forward.
- Evidence of a service level agreement or similar arrangement between the applicant and bus operator.
- Inclusion of committed development within traffic forecasts.
- Consideration of junction modelling comments.
- Resolution of the remaining Travel Plan comments.

Should you be minded to determine the application before this information has been supplied for review, the highway authority should be contacted for reasons for refusal.

I trust the above is clear, but please do not hesitate Nick Gammer on the above number should you wish to discuss anything further.

Yours Sincerely,

Ben Clifton
Transport Team Leader – Highways Development Planning