



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

<i>Enquiries to</i>	Nick Gammer	<i>My reference</i>	6/3/10/202 (APP11234)
<i>Direct Line</i>	01962 846877	<i>Your reference</i>	P/18/1073/FP
<i>Date</i>	20 <sup>th</sup> July 2020	<i>Email</i>	nick.gammer@hants.gov.uk

**For the Attention of Richard Wright**

Dear Sir

**Land to the South of Romsey Avenue, Fareham – Hybrid Planning Application For Residential Development Of 225 Dwellings And Bird Conservation Area, Seeking Full Planning Permission For 58 Dwellings And Outline Planning Permission For 167 Dwellings With All Matters Reserved Except For Access.**

Thank you for consultation on the above planning application. The application seeks full planning permission for 58 dwellings and outline permission for the remaining 167 dwellings with all matters reserved except for access. An initial response on highway matters, responding to the submitted Transport Assessment, was provided 29<sup>th</sup> October 2018 requesting further information. Following extensive discussions with the applicant in the interim and submission of further information, a second response was provided dated 19<sup>th</sup> December 2019, concluding that many of the outstanding highway matters had been addressed. However, the following items remained outstanding and the Highway Authority requested further information was provided to satisfy these concerns:

1. Impact at A27/ Downend Road/ Shearwater Avenue signalised junction
2. Internal layout
3. Parking.

A technical note dated 18/03/2020 has subsequently been submitted to the LPA aimed at addressing point 1 above, but did not address points 2 and 3. It is worth noting that further information has been provided to the Highway Authority directly in relation to points 2 and 3; with the exception of the footpath spur connecting to the adjacent development (planning approval P/17/1170/RM) to ensure both developments link; this information addressed the remainder of the concerns raised within points 2 and 3. However, this information does not form part of this consultation and would require submission to the local planning authority in order to be formally considered or commented upon.

## **Impact at A27/ Downend Road/ Shearwater Avenue Signalised Junction**

The improvement scheme proposed through the Land East of Downend Road planning application (P/18/0005/OA) was tested with the forecast flows from the Romsey Avenue development to ascertain the impact on the improved junction. A contribution was previously agreed towards this junction, based on additional improvements to those proposed under application P/18/0005/OA. However, application P/18/0005/OA was refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal, meaning these improvements are not secured. Given the improvements under application P/18/0005/OA are no longer relevant and no operational assessment of the existing junction layout in the future year had been carried out, the Highway Authority requested that the impact of the Romsey Avenue development on the existing junction layout is assessed and, should capacity issues be demonstrated, mitigation should be presented. The submitted Technical Note aims to provide this assessment and is commented on below.

### Existing Junction

Modelling of the existing junction forecasts this to operate over capacity in the future year without development traffic. The addition of development traffic worsens the operation of the junction and substantial queuing and delay are forecast. Queue lengths on many arms of the junction are forecast to increase due to development traffic, in the worst case by 22 vehicles.

### Land East of Downend Road (P/18/0005/OA) Proposed Improvements

The submitted Linsig models have been reviewed against the previously agreed base model produced in support of the Land East of Downend Road application. The submitted models when compared to the previously agreed models introduce inconsistencies in the derivation of the saturation flows. The agreed base models used geometrically calculated saturation flows, while the submitted have used directly entered values. Furthermore, the directly entered saturation flows often vary across the different flow groups; this is unusual and unexpected, particularly as the physical layout remains unchanged. These inconsistencies require resolution prior to further Highway Authority comment on the junction performance and therefore appropriate mitigation at the A27/ Downend Rd junction.

### Proposed SMA junction improvements

As stated in the Highways Authority's response dated 19th December 2019, the alternative scheme proposed (Appendix B of the Technical Note), converting the pedestrian crossings from the existing Pelican to a Puffin crossings and providing a staggered crossing arrangement, is unacceptable. The change from far side to near side pedestrian signals, the loss of an audible pedestrian signal and the capacity of the stagger/ island to accommodate pedestrian demand at the end of the school day have unacceptable safety implications.

## **Parking and Internal Site Layout**

Comments raised in the Highway Authority's response dated 19<sup>th</sup> December 2019 (copied in italics below) have not been addressed in any formal material available for review as part of this application. As such, an objection based on the comments below remains.

### *Internal Layout*

*The road widths are broadly 6.0m wide throughout the development, with all provided footpaths 2.0m wide. It is noted that plots 30-31 and plots 40-44 have no direct access to a footpath, and residents are forced straight onto the road which is not acceptable. Plots 32-39 appear to be served by an area of shared space, although this should be confirmed. The shared space is also segregated from any footpath to the south.*

*A footpath spur is noted to the east of the site with a desire to connect to the adjacent development (planning approval P/17/1170/RM). Further discussions with the adjacent site should be made to allow both developments to tie-in together and form a fully connected pedestrian network.*

*Forward visibility splays should be shown for the corners adjacent to plots 17 and 44. these should be maintained at all times. Tracking drawings should be provided showing the updated layout to the front of plots 32-39 is serviceable by fire tender and refuse collection vehicles. Bin collection points should be indicated on the updated site plan.*

### *Parking*

*The parking standards for the site are laid down by Fareham Borough Council (FBC) as the local parking authority, in accordance with their Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as adopted in November 2009. These standards require one allocated space for 1 bed dwellings, two for 2-3 bed dwellings and three for 4+ bed dwellings. As no spaces are proposed to be unallocated, these standards have not been referred to.*

*It is noted that full provision has been made in line with the above standards. Similarly, an acceptable level of provision has been made in regard to the provision of visitor spaces. However, there are no visitor spaces serving plots 32-39 or plots 40-50. There are also a significant number of remote allocated parking spaces; specifically plots 5, 17, 40, 41, 46, 49 and 52. These issues will both lead to on street parking and potentially cause access issues for emergency and refuse collection vehicles.*

*A significant level of tandem parking is prevalent throughout the site. Whilst in some situations this would be acceptable, the level of tandem parking along the principle access road (i.e. plots 1-11 and plots 52-55) would involve a level of manoeuvring on the highway which would hinder access to and from the development. Tandem parking is also prone to displaced parking on the highway due to end users not wishing to shuffle vehicles around. This raises access concerns to the development in terms of convenience and also access for larger vehicles, including emergency services.*

*No cycle storage is noted on the site plans; however, this can be secured through a suitably worded condition. It is also noted that no provision has been made for accessible spaces or infrastructure for electric charging points.*

## **Recommendation**

The Highway Authority requests further information is provided to satisfy the following outstanding concerns:

1. Impact at A27/ Downend Road/ Shearwater Avenue signalised junction
2. Internal layout
3. Parking.

Should you be minded to determine the application before this information has been supplied, reasons for refusal are included below.

### **IMPACT ON THE SURROUNDING ROAD NETWORK**

In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with the National Planning Policy Framework in that the significant movements generated could not be accommodated adequately on the existing transport network. This would result in a severe impact on the operation of the local transport network contrary to the NPPF.

### **INTERNAL LAYOUT**

In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposal has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the internal layout can be traversed by all users safely or all areas can be suitably accessed by emergency and refuse collection vehicles.

### **PARKING PROVISION**

In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposal does not provide a suitable arrangement of parking for residents and visitors which would lead to unnecessary parking on the highway to the detriment of other road users and restricted access for larger vehicles including emergency services.

I trust that the above is clear, but I would ask you not to hesitate to contact Nick Gammer should you wish to discuss anything further.

Yours Sincerely,

Gemma McCart  
Transport Team Leader – Highways Development Planning