

## Kneen, Peter

---

**Subject:** FW: 048.0013 Oakcroft Lane, Stubbington - Addendum Transport Assessment Works

---

**From:** Jessica Lloyd <[jessica@paulbashamassociates.com](mailto:jessica@paulbashamassociates.com)>

**Sent:** 11 November 2020 11:04

**To:** Spinney, Fraser <[Fraser.Spinney@hants.gov.uk](mailto:Fraser.Spinney@hants.gov.uk)>; McCart, Gemma <[Gemma.McCart2@hants.gov.uk](mailto:Gemma.McCart2@hants.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Dave Buczynskij <[dbuczynskij@icloud.com](mailto:dbuczynskij@icloud.com)>; Mark Smith <[mark@paulbashamassociates.com](mailto:mark@paulbashamassociates.com)>

**Subject:** 048.0013 Oakcroft Lane, Stubbington - Addendum Transport Assessment Works

Good morning,

Please treat this email as formal submission of revised information required by Hampshire County Council (HCC) Highways to address comments dated 4<sup>th</sup> September 2020 against planning application reference P/20/0522/FP for a 'Development comprising 206 dwellings, access road from Peak Lane maintaining link to Oakcroft Lane, stopping up of a section of Oakcroft Lane (from Old Peak Lane to access road), with car parking, landscaping, substation, public open space and associated works'.

Following receipt of HCC comments, a meeting was held on 22/09/20 between HCC Highways, Persimmon Homes and Paul Basham Associates to discuss the comments and agree a scope of works moving forward. The agreed meeting minutes and subsequent actions following this meeting is attached to this email.

This Addendum response clarifies and summarises the work undertaken since the comments were issued, which have been split into the chapters outlined in HCC's response.

### Pedestrian Network

- It is confirmed that the PRow route which runs to the south of the development would remain as existing and therefore there are no proposals to alter this
- Whilst we still contest the necessity of a traffic management contribution as highlighted in para's 4.42-4.45 of the Revised Transport Assessment (RTA) HCC have since advised a contribution of £5,000 is sought to address the 'large stretches of Bells Lane that are currently unrestricted which raise issues locally' and this issue will be considered as part of the s106 drafting.

### Public Transport

- Similar to the above and as referenced in para 4.56 of the RTA we do not believe measures should be required to upgrade the local bus stops as these would not alter the distance of them to the site residents and we are proposing to improve the walking routes to the stop instead. However, HCC have since confirmed two bus shelters would be expected of normal size and type (3 bay size – Arun Type), which cost £9,000. In addition Fareham Borough Council would require £1,500 as an ownership budget. A £10,500 contribution is therefore sought against Public Transport Improvements. This issue will also be considered as part of the s106 drafting.

### Highways Safety

- Highway safety concerns were raised at the Peak Lane/Rowan Way/Longfield Avenue Roundabout however as confirmed in para's 3.22 and 3.23 of the RTA vehicle movements through this junction are expected to reduce through this roundabout following the Stubbington Bypass and thus the number of accidents is also likely to reduce. To confirm, the percentage distribution diagrams submitted with the RTA identify a 20% reduction in trips associated with the development routing through this junction from 57% to 37% as a result of the bypass (with the additional trips associated with the development being less than the reduction from the baseline caused by the Stubbington Bypass). It is therefore not considered necessary for mitigation measures at this junction.

- Following discussions with between HCC Highways and HCC Road Safety Team – as a result of the reduction in movements through this junction no highway safety improvements are required at this junction

Site Access

- A number of comments were raised against the proposed access design, which had not altered since the previous planning application submission and were therefore new comments. Paul Basham Associates provided a detailed response to each comment and following a further meeting on 23/10/20 it was agreed that a Departure from Standard (DfS) application should be submitted for the proposed 2.4m X-distance. The departure was submitted on 27/10/20. HCC have since informed that the DfS application will be required to support a Section 278 along with an updated Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, but they ‘are satisfied that the principle of the access is acceptable and given the timescales would be prepared to set out of formal position’. An updated Stage 1 RSA would be required to support any updated DfS which ensures the Auditor is aware of any departures and reflects the latest drawing (with the removal of the footway/cycleway, see below)
- HCC also confirmed that a second Departure from Standard application would be required for the footway/cycleway due to the lack of separation between the footway/cycleway and adjoining carriageway (a design comment which had not been raised before through the pre-application process or previous planning application). To address this, the 3m wide footway/cycleway has been removed from the access design and instead the access would be flanked by a 2m wide footway only. It is therefore confirmed that cyclists would utilise the eastern section of Oakcroft Lane to access Peak Lane and travel along the main carriageway, the nature of which will significantly change as a result of the planning application. It is proposed that driving rights will be prohibited along Oakcroft Lane for a short section west between the existing residential dwellings which are accessed from the Peak Lane/May’s Lane junction and east of the proposed development site with a turning head provided to service the existing residential dwellings. These works would restrict vehicular access into the proposed development from the Oakcroft Lane/May’s Lane junction however pedestrian and cycle links would remain. The route would therefore be subject to low traffic flows and slow speeds (posted 30mph limit) and as such is considered suitable as a cycle link out of the site. At the junction of Oakcroft Lane/May’s Lane there is existing cycle infrastructure with an on-road cycle lane northbound. For those wishing to travel south cyclists would use the existing pedestrian/cyclist crossing circa 50m to the north to access a shared footway/cycleway southbound which becomes an on-road cycle lane at the Oakcroft Lane/May’s Lane junction.
- The revised set of access design drawings are attached for reference.

Junction Capacity Assessment

**Peak Lane/A27/Catisfield Road Signal Junction**

- A revised Capacity Assessment at the Peak Lane/A27/Catisfield Road signal junction has been completed to include Catisfield Road within the model. To support the modelling of this junction the traffic flows and LinSig outputs provided as an Appendix to the HCC Stubbington Bypass TA have been used. This includes the junction flows for ‘2019 Do Something 1 (Bypass)’ – which directly reflect those included within the HCC TA for Baseline 2019 with a growth factor then applied to account for the future 2025 assessment year. The LinSig model also reflects the outputs included within the TA including cycle time and flow connectors for example and updates to the intergreen times (as per HCC comments). The results are presented in **Table 1** and full LinSig outputs attached to this email.

Scenarios	Arms	AM (0800-0900)			PM (1700-1800)		
		DOS	Max Q (Vehs)	Avg Delay (s)	DOS	Avg Q (Vehs)	Max Delay (s)
Baseline 2019	A27 Eastbound @ Catisfield	48.9%	5.7	32.1	30.0%	4.5	15.0
	Catisfield Road	26.9%	2.8	23.5	42.7%	3.2	39.0
	A27 Westbound @ Peak	45.0%	4.1	29.0	46.2%	4.9	10.6
	Peak Lane	51.1%	5.0	29.1	31.5%	1.9	37.3
	A27 Westbound @ Catisfield	41.0%	10.5	14.6	45.4%	11.3	13.7
	A27 Eastbound @ Peak	27.4%	2.5	6.7	27.9%	1.3	10.1
Baseline 2025	A27 Eastbound @ Catisfield	53.4%	6.4	33.1	33.3%	5.0	16.0
	Catisfield Road	29.4%	3.1	3.9	48.8%	3.6	41.9
	A27 Westbound @ Peak	49.2%	4.5	18.0	49.7%	5.4	16.0

	Peak Lane	55.6%	5.7	30.0	50.0%	2.4	41.3
	A27 Westbound @ Catisfield	45.7%	10.7	15.1	50.4%	12.0	13.7
	A27 Eastbound @ Peak	29.9%	3.1	6.7	30.9%	1.9	10.6
Baseline 2025 + CD	A27 Eastbound @ Catisfield	53.4%	6.4	33.1	33.3%	5.0	16.0
	Catisfield Road	29.4%	3.4	23.9	48.8%	3.6	41.9
	A27 Westbound @ Peak	49.2%	4.5	29.2	50.6%	5.5	16.2
	Peak Lane	55.7%	5.7	30.0	50.0%	2.4	41.3
	A27 Westbound @ Catisfield	45.1%	10.7	15.1	50.4%	12.5	12.9
	A27 Eastbound @ Peak	29.9%	3.1	6.7	30.9%	1.9	10.6
	Baseline 2025 + CD + PD	A27 Eastbound @ Catisfield	61.8%	6.9	38.5	34.2%	5.1
Catisfield Road		29.4%	3.1	23.9	48.8%	3.6	41.9
A27 Westbound @ Peak		53.8%	4.8	32.7	51.2%	5.5	16.7
Peak Lane		67.7%	6.5	33.1	52.6%	2.8	41.4
A27 Westbound @ Catisfield		45.2%	10.7	14.1	50.4%	12.0	13.6
A27 Eastbound @ Peak		31.6%	3.6	6.7	31.4%	1.9	10.6
Baseline 2025 + CD + PD + Newlands Farm	A27 Eastbound @ Catisfield	61.8%	6.9	38.5	34.2%	5.1	16.7
	Catisfield Road	29.4%	3.1	23.9	48.8%	3.6	41.9
	A27 Westbound @ Peak	53.8%	4.8	32.7	52.1%	5.5	16.7
	Peak Lane	67.7%	6.5	33.2	52.6%	4.1	41.4
	A27 Westbound @ Catisfield	45.2%	10.7	14.1	50.4%	12.0	13.6
	A27 Eastbound @ Peak	31.6%	3.6	6.7	31.4%	1.9	10.6
Baseline 2025 with Bypass	A27 Eastbound @ Catisfield	47.9%	5.9	30.1	39.8%	5.7	22.2
	Catisfield Road	26.4%	2.7	25.1	33.1%	2.7	33.6
	A27 Westbound @ Peak	22.4%	2.4	27.2	19.8%	1.7	19.9
	Peak Lane	49.5%	4.3	30.3	38.0%	2.2	35.2
	A27 Westbound @ Catisfield	42.3%	10.7	16.8	39.1%	10.0	24.9
	A27 Eastbound @ Peak	29.7%	2.5	6.9	32.0%	2.5	8.7
Baseline 2025 with Bypass + CD	A27 Eastbound @ Catisfield	47.9%	5.9	30.1	39.8%	5.7	22.2
	Catisfield Road	26.4%	2.7	25.1	33.1%	2.7	33.6
	A27 Westbound @ Peak	22.4%	1.0	27.2	19.8%	1.7	19.9
	Peak Lane	49.5%	4.3	30.3	38.0%	2.2	35.2
	A27 Westbound @ Catisfield	42.3%	10.7	16.8	39.1%	10.0	24.9
	A27 Eastbound @ Peak	59.7%	2.5	6.9	32.0%	2.5	8.7
Baseline 2025 with Bypass + CD + PD	A27 Eastbound @ Catisfield	57.5%	6.5	36.1	41.1%	5.8	23.2
	Catisfield Road	26.4%	2.7	25.1	33.1%	2.7	33.6
	A27 Westbound @ Peak	27.8%	2.6	31.5	21.2%	1.8	20.7
	Peak Lane	60.5%	4.8	32.1	39.6%	2.4	34.9
	A27 Westbound @ Catisfield	42.4%	10.7	15.3	39.1%	10.0	24.4
	A27 Eastbound @ Peak	31.9%	3.1	6.9	32.6%	2.5	8.7
Baseline 2025 with Bypass + CD + PD + Newlands Farm	A27 Eastbound @ Catisfield	42.6%	5.6	26.5	41.4%	5.8	23.2
	Catisfield Road	37.5%	3.1	34.4	33.1%	2.7	33.6
	A27 Westbound @ Peak	19.8%	2.3	24.3	21.2%	1.8	20.7
	Peak Lane	44.1%	2.8	32.5	39.6%	2.4	34.9
	A27 Westbound @ Catisfield	37.2%	10.5	22.5	39.1%	10.	24.4
	A27 Eastbound @ Peak	32.6%	2.5	8.9	32.6%	20.5	8.7

: Peak Lane/A27/Catisfield Road Signalised Junction Modelling

- **Table 1** demonstrates that the Peak Lane/A27/Catisfield Road Signalised Junction operates sufficiently under capacity in all scenarios modelled with the DoS, queue and delay values all decreasing as a result of the bypass implementation. This therefore confirms the development does not have a 'severe' impact on the operation of this junction.

#### Rowan Way/Peak Lane/Longfield Avenue Roundabout

- Updates to the geometries of this roundabout have been completed as per the HCC feedback relating to flare lengths and entry lane widths. In addition, lane simulation mode has been used as requested by HCC.

- As identified by HCC’s modelling comments Peak Lane South experiences unequal lane usage and as such once lane simulation is used this roundabout operates under more constrained conditions in both the without and with the bypass scenarios. In the ‘with bypass’ scenarios Peak Lane South is shown to experience some capacity issues with longer vehicle queues and higher delay values in the AM peak which begin prior to committed development and proposed development traffic being added to the model. This then has an exponential effect once traffic is added, which can be seen in **Table 2**, with outputs attached to this email.

Scenarios	Arms	AM (0800-0900)		PM (1700-1800)	
		Max Q (Vehs)	Max Delay (s)	Max Q (Vehs)	Max Delay (s)
Baseline 2018	Longfield Avenue	1.5	12.03	2.5	19.70
	Peak Lane South	195.3	819.37	1.3	10.57
	Rowan Way	2.9	23.63	5.6	32.19
	Peak Lane North	5.9	45.64	103.9	646.34
Baseline 2025	Longfield Avenue	2.2	14.74	3.6	25.86
	Peak Lane South	318.3	1237.96	1.5	12.02
	Rowan Way	4.0	28.93	15.8	72.53
	Peak Lane North	10.0	64.21	193.6	1116.77
Baseline 2025 + CD	Longfield Avenue	2.1	14.50	3.6	25.13
	Peak Lane South	313.0	1208.70	1.5	12.15
	Rowan Way	4.1	28.90	15.9	73.00
	Peak Lane North	10.4	69.07	197.1	1131.71
Baseline 2025 + CD + PD	Longfield Avenue	2.1	14.74	4.1	28.35
	Peak Lane South	406.4	1469.03	1.6	12.76
	Rowan Way	3.6	27.64	16.5	78.14
	Peak Lane North	11.3	74.14	231.6	1302.92
Baseline 2025 with Bypass	Longfield Avenue	1.2	10.53	1.4	11.29
	Peak Lane South	15.4	71.53	1.6	13.67
	Rowan Way	1.5	15.02	1.2	10.74
	Peak Lane North	2.0	15.98	1.2	12.16
Baseline 2025 with Bypass + CD	Longfield Avenue	1.2	10.81	1.6	14.38
	Peak Lane South	15.8	73.58	1.6	13.81
	Rowan Way	1.5	14.42	1.0	10.47
	Peak Lane North	1.9	15.74	3.9	22.69
Baseline 2025 with Bypass + CD + PD	Longfield Avenue	1.1	10.91	1.6	14.97
	Peak Lane South	26.9	114.57	1.7	14.49
	Rowan Way	1.5	15.44	1.2	10.97
	Peak Lane North	1.9	17.04	5.5	32.62
Baseline 2025 + CD + Newlands Farm + PD	Longfield Avenue	11.4	60.02	12.8	68.78
	Peak Lane South	440.1	1557.41	1.9	15.72
	Rowan Way	99.7	65.15	105.5	503.60
	Peak Lane North	22.8	133.10	309.3	1605.64
Baseline 2025 with Bypass + CD + Newlands Farm + PD	Longfield Avenue	1.1	11.94	2.2	20.09
	Peak Lane South	117.5	546.55	3.4	23.94
	Rowan Way	2.0	15.92	2.0	14.13
	Peak Lane North	2.5	19.91	11.0	64.59

**Table 2:** Rowan Way/Peak Lane/Longfield Avenue Roundabout Modelling

- In order to address the constraints on Peak Lane South, we propose an amendment to the lane markings to allow both lanes to cater for the straight on manoeuvre. This would result in the need for changes to white lining on Peak Lane South and also merge marking/signage on the Peak Lane North arm. Peak Lane north has a wide exit lane width (circa 10m) and should therefore be able to accommodate a merge here which would help improve the overall operation of this roundabout and alleviate the capacity concerns generated by the baseline traffic movements. Given the minimal scale of works involved we would recommend the

works (i.e. white lining and signage) would be completed through a contribution to HCC. The results of this modest improvement are demonstrated in **Table 3**.

Scenarios	Arms	AM (0800-0900)		PM (1700-1800)	
		Max Q (Vehs)	Max Delay (s)	Max Q (Vehs)	Max Delay (s)
Baseline 2018	Longfield Avenue	1.4	12.12	2.5	20.70
	Peak Lane South	66.4	200.54	0.9	7.48
	Rowan Way	3.8	32.39	6.1	33.58
	Peak Lane North	7.7	55.40	103.5	646.43
Baseline 2025	Longfield Avenue	1.9	14.25	3.7	26.84
	Peak Lane South	138.3	506.87	0.9	8.06
	Rowan Way	5.6	46.60	15.3	69.57
	Peak Lane North	14.1	90358	193.1	1109.74
Baseline 2025 + CD	Longfield Avenue	1.9	14.55	3.9	25.60
	Peak Lane South	137.3	501.14	1.0	8.05
	Rowan Way	6.1	45.92	14.2	66.19
	Peak Lane North	13.6	86.54	193.3	1119.77
Baseline 2025 + CD + PD	Longfield Avenue	2.0	14.85	4.1	58.89
	Peak Lane South	193.1	684.51	1.2	8.58
	Rowan Way	5.3	42.81	19.0	83.50
	Peak Lane North	15.5	94.13	234.9	1308.57
Baseline 2025 with Bypass	Longfield Avenue	1.1	11.43	1.3	11.71
	Peak Lane South	3.6	15.12	1.0	7.57
	Rowan Way	1.6	14.72	1.1	10.74
	Peak Lane North	2.0	17.22	1.5	12.79
Baseline 2025 with Bypass + CD	Longfield Avenue	1.2	10.41	1.8	13.95
	Peak Lane South	3.4	13.74	0.8	7.46
	Rowan Way	1.9	14.77	1.2	11.04
	Peak Lane North	1.8	17.17	3.9	24.36
Baseline 2025 with Bypass + CD + PD	Longfield Avenue	1.2	10.85	1.7	15.31
	Peak Lane South	3.9	17.59	0.9	7.38
	Rowan Way	1.8	16.66	1.5	10.92
	Peak Lane North	1.9	17.45	4.9	32.53
Baseline 2025 + CD + Newlands Farm + PD	Longfield Avenue	11.0	54.93	12.7	69.56
	Peak Lane South	225.9	796.10	1.1	9.27
	Rowan Way	20.1	124.07	101.8	471.70
	Peak Lane North	28.7	176.96	307.9	1590.89
Baseline 2025 with Bypass + CD + Newlands Farm + PD	Longfield Avenue	1.2	11.69	2.4	21.35
	Peak Lane South	13.1	48.62	1.5	8.79
	Rowan Way	2.2	19.22	2.0	14.89
	Peak Lane North	2.5	21.10	10.4	62.41

**Table 3:** Rowan Way/Peak Lane/Longfield Avenue Roundabout Modelling With Mitigation

- **Table 3** demonstrates that when both Peak Lane South arms can accommodate straight over movements the roundabout operates sufficiently under capacity when the impact of the bypass is considered.
- Summary: Following a review of the two revised modelling outputs the previous conclusions within the RTA stand with the impact of the development not being considered as 'severe' particularly when the impact of the Bypass is considered. No works are required at the Peak Lane/A27/Catisfield Road Signalised Junction whilst some minor improvements are proposed to the Rowan Way/Peak Lane/Longfield Avenue Roundabout in the form lane re-allocation and associated signage and white lining. However, it is important to emphasise that the delays and queues seen in the modelling of the Peak Lane/Rowan Way/Longfield Avenue Roundabout are experienced in the baseline 2025 scenario before committed development or proposed development is added and the addition of the development traffic would still not be considered to result in a 'severe' impact on the operation of this junction.
- The raw modelling files have also been submitted to HCC on 02/11/20

### Other Junctions

- Comments were raised regarding the pedestrian crossings at the May's Lane/Titchfield Road/B3334 Gosport Road Roundabout and the Stubbington Green/Stubbington Lane/B3334 Gosport Road Roundabout. The pedestrian crossings were not included within the models, as the models replicate those submitted and found acceptable within the HCC TA for the Stubbington Bypass which did not include any pedestrian crossings. It was therefore not considered necessary to include if these were not included within other previous models, prepared by and approved by HCC. HCC has since confirmed these do not need to be included for the modelling of this development. No further amendments have therefore been made to this junction model.
- The requested changes to the Ranvilles Lane/A27 model were considered minor, updating the flare length from 1.0m to 0.0m and revising the width of the central kerbed reserve. It is therefore confirmed that such changes would not have a fundamental impact on the operation of the junction or modelling results and therefore no revised information is required.
- Comments on the Site Access/Peak Lane Model included ensuring the modelling parameter 'C-B traffic blocks C-A traffic should be used, despite the access having a right turn lane feature. It has been further clarified that the modelling results demonstrate a maximum vehicle queue length of 0.6 vehicles (Table 13 of the RTA). With the length of the right turn lane at circa 55m, this could accommodate a queue of 9 vehicles. No blocking back is therefore anticipated when the modelling results are compared with the access design. No further amendments have therefore been made to this junction model.
- Concerns were raised regarding the altering of the Stubbington Bypass/Peak Lane signal junction, where the alterations related to the northbound arm of Peak Lane and the shortening of the right turn lane, however it was explained to HCC that no traffic was anticipated to use the right turn lane based on the traffic flow data by HCC. As confirmed by HCC, 'the Stubbington bypass model forecasted no traffic would turn right here [from Peak Lane South to the Stubbington Bypass East] as in modelling terms there is no reason for it to, based on the situation with the bypass in place. Traffic coming from Stubbington would not route north to go east, as this would be much longer than just going through Stubbington and out east on Gosport Road. The right-turn lane was still included because for whatever reason there could still be requirement for traffic to turn right e.g. if there was a road closure or accident. As you [Paul Basham Associates] have used a model that has no traffic turning right, then decreasing the length of the right turn lane in LinSig would not have any effect of the modelling so this does not need to be amended'. No further amendments have therefore been made to this junction model.

This Addendum Transport Assessment Works Email is to act as a formal submission of revised information prepared between 04/09/20 and 11/11/20 to address HCC comments. The work builds upon 2 meetings and email correspondence within this time to confirm what additional works were required. This email should therefore address all outstanding queries and comments and we hope HCC as the local highway authority are now in a position to look favourably upon this application with respect to highways.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind Regards,

Jessica Lloyd

**Principal Transport Planner**

BSc Geography, MSc Transportation Planning and Engineering



**Fareham Office**

☎ t +44 (0) 1329 711000

☎ m +44 (0) 7340 018838

📍 p The Bothy, Cams Hall Estate, Fareham, PO16 8UT

🌐 w [www.paulbashamassociates.com](http://www.paulbashamassociates.com)





 Follow Us

 Please support our fundraising for  
Pancreatic Cancer UK. [Click to donate!](#)

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

Registered in England No. 7013956  
VAT: 980 0742 22

**DISCLAIMER**

This email is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient and you have received this email in error, any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and you should contact the sender by return and then delete all material from your system.

We are proud to be an official partner of Team GB.



Persimmon Homes is proud to support local communities. Every year our Community Champions scheme donates £750,000 to local groups and our Building Futures scheme supports young people with donations of over £1 million. [Find out more...](#)



**Disclaimer**

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient please contact the sender and delete the message.

Our privacy policies for our customers, employees and job applicants are available at <https://www.persimmonhomes.com/corporate/corporate-responsibility/policies>

Persimmon Homes Limited is registered in England number 4108747, Charles Church Developments Limited is registered in England number 1182689 and Space4 Limited is registered in England number 3702606. These companies are wholly owned subsidiaries of Persimmon Plc registered in England number 1818486, the Registered Office of these four companies is Persimmon House, Fulford, York YO19 4FE.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).