



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

*Economy, Transport and Environment Department  
Elizabeth II Court West, The Castle  
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD*

Tele: 0845 603 5638 (General Enquiries)  
0845 603 5633 (Roads and Transport)  
0845 603 5634 (Recycling Waste & Planning)

Textphone 0845 603 5625

Fax 01962 847055

[www.hants.gov.uk](http://www.hants.gov.uk)

<i>Enquiries to</i>	Fraser Spinney	<i>My reference</i>	6/3/10/231
<i>Direct Line</i>	01962 845103	<i>Your reference</i>	P/20/0522/FP
<i>Date</i>	4 <sup>th</sup> September 2020	<i>Email</i>	Fraser.spinney@hants.gov.uk

**For the attention of Peter Kneen**

Dear Sir,

**Land East Of Crofton Cemetery And West Of Peak Lane, Stubbington  
Fareham**

**Development comprising 209 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.**

Thank you for the consultation on the above application. The proposal is for 209 dwellings to be accessed from Peak Lane and changing the highway rights of section of Oakcroft Lane. An application (P/19/0301/FP) was previously reviewed in this location with a number of highway matters remained outstanding. The application was refused and included a number of highways reasons for refusal. Following review of the submitted documents the highway authority would like to make the following comments.

**Policy**

This application falls with the South of Fareham Strategic Growth Area (SGA) in the emerging Fareham Local Plan. HCC have an objection to the emerging Local Plan policy for development in this area due to the negative impact on the operation and function of the approved Stubbington bypass.

The South of Fareham SGA straddles the Stubbington bypass which is now under construction. The strategic business case for the by-pass was approved by Government on the basis of supporting improved access to the Gosport peninsular, which is currently significantly constrained by congestion on key routes, in order to aid regeneration in Gosport which is one of the most

deprived areas in Hampshire. It should also be noted that the technical work related to Clean Air Zone (CAZ) designation in Fareham identifies the by-pass as having an important role in bringing the CAZ into legal compliance. Achieving compliance is the subject of a binding Secretary of State instruction. If development next to the bypass were to have a detrimental impact on the efficient flow of traffic along the bypass, then this could potentially have severe economic and environmental consequences.

Additionally, the County Council is seriously concerned that the introduction of significant further development anywhere within the general area outlined within the South of Fareham SGA is likely to have a highly detrimental impact on the Stubbington bypass, whether the development accesses the bypass directly or the traffic generated by the development accesses the route indirectly. For this reason the County Council objects to the principle of the designation of a SGA in this area.

Fareham Borough Council's draft local plan (January 2020) included the following policy which also relates to the SGA.

*'Any development proposals in the Strategic Growth Area should come forward in conjunction with a masterplan for the area, that reflects the principles of the Local Plan, developed by all relevant landowners, to ensure that comprehensive development can be achieved.'*

*Proposals will not be permitted which would prejudice the delivery of a comprehensive development in advance of a robust masterplanning process.'*

This application has not been accompanied by the wider master plan set out in the draft Local Plan and would therefore be contrary to the draft policy.

### **Pedestrian Network**

In HCC's response to the previous planning application at this site (planning ref P/19/0301/FP) dated 10/05/2019 it was requested that the applicant undertake a review of the pedestrian connectivity of the site. It was mentioned that due to the distance of the site from the catchment primary and secondary schools, Crofton Anne Dale Infant and Junior Schools (1.9km) and Crofton Secondary school (2.7km) respectively, it is likely that a proportion of families will drive to the schools. It was stated that there is already a relatively high number of families driving to the schools which has been reflected in the travel to school data obtained by the applicant. This results in a number of cars parking locally, particularly on Bells Lane. This is an issue which has been highlighted locally and may be exacerbated by the proposed development. A contribution towards traffic management and car parking measures is required, to manage any additional pressures as a result of the development should permission be granted.

Previously it was suggested that a transport contribution may be required due to the lack of pedestrian refuge islands to assist with crossing Mays Lane. However, the applicant's review of the local pedestrian routes has demonstrated that this is not required.

The proposals regarding the Public Right of Way (PRoW) that runs through the site should be provided so that this can be reviewed.

### **Public transport**

The closest bus stops to the site are located on May's Lane, circa 560m to the east for the northbound bus stop (via Peak Lane) and 680m for the southbound bus stop (via Peak Lane) (measured from the centre of the site). Given that the bus stops are 560m and 680m away from the centre of the site (above the recommended maximum distance of 400m as stated in IHT, 2000), to encourage use of the local bus services, upgrades to these stops should be explored making utilising the bus services available a more attractive option to residents of the site and supporting sustainable modes use.

### Train Services

Fareham Rail Station is located 3.7km from the proposed site and can be accessed via a 10 minute journey on the Solent Ranger X5 bus service. This station provides regular services to Southampton, Portsmouth, London and Brighton.

It is also possible to access Portsmouth Harbour Rail Station via a 45 minute journey on the Solent Ranger X5 bus service. This station provides the same links as Fareham Rail Station as well as a service to Cardiff Central.

### **Highway Safety**

Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data was obtained from Hampshire Constabulary for the most recent 5 year period available which is the accepted method. This assessment showed that there has been a total of 27 incidents both north and south of the site, which is considered high. From an independent highway safety assessment of the area the current injury accident sites are the Longfield Avenue/Peak Lane/Rowan Way roundabout and at various locations along Longfield Avenue.

The Transport Assessment (TA) proposes that 57% of development traffic would turn left out of the proposed development access onto Peak Lane, travelling north on Peak Lane towards the Peak Lane/Rowan Way/Longfield Avenue junction. As such it is considered that this development would exacerbate the safety concerns in this area. Therefore, mitigation will need to be provided to improve this junction. The applicant should explore how this could be provided.

### **Site Access**

In order to access the site the applicant has proposed a new access road connecting the site from Oakcroft Lane onto Peak Lane in the form of a bellmouth junction and right turn lane. A new road is proposed between the site and Peak Lane, crossing Oakcroft Lane. This would also include a change of highway rights on Oakcroft Lane to the east of the new access and west of the existing residential dwellings accessed from Peak Lane/Mays Lane.

Following review of the proposed access arrangements the highway authority would like to make the following comments. The prohibition of driving will require a Traffic Regulation Order, this is open to public consultation and the outcome is not guaranteed.

Stubbington bypass is a committed scheme currently under construction. The applicant's proposals reduce both the length of the ahead and right turn lanes on the southern Peak Lane arm of the Stubbington bypass junction. This is also likely to hamper potential access to the right turn lane onto the bypass heading eastbound. The Stubbington bypass junction is a committed development and the layout of the southern Peak Lane arm of this bypass junction has been modelled and designed to provide adequate capacity and a safe and suitable arrangement. As such, the layout should not be altered by the proposed development as part of this application. The potential for right turners queueing into development blocking back to the bypass junction may also need consideration via PICADY.

Regarding the junction of Peak Lane/ site access road, the bellmouth radii of 10m needs to be retained but the initial section of the access road should be increased to at least 6.5m as informed by updated swept path analysis. In terms of construction vehicles, the revised layout should be tracked for all manoeuvres by 16.5m HGV's and provided for HCC review.

Driver visibility splays have been provided for review. The 'y' distances are acceptable for the site access, however the secondary splay needs to be drawn tangentially to the western channel. In addition, whilst it's recognised that introduction of signals could have an effect on northbound vehicle speeds, this is difficult to quantify, and for a robust assessment the applicant is required to demonstrate that the Sight Stopping Distance (SSD) of 132m is achievable on the northbound junction approach from a distance equal to 1.5 x SSD; that is, from a point 198m south of the proposed junction. Regarding the southbound SSD, it's recognised that the new signal junction from the by-Pass will have an effect on speeds. A drawing showing achievable SSD's around the left-hand curve should be provided for HCC to review. Given the existing speed limit on Peak Lane, the 'x' distance required is 4.5m.

The proposed new pedestrian crossing has been located 50m south of the new access in order to accommodate the required pedestrian visibility splays. This proposal requires new carriageway to be constructed and, as a result of the limited through lanes, these have been artificially reduced to 3m. The lane widths should be confirmed at the existing crossing point within the 30mph speed limit for comparison.

Shared use facilities are proposed in drawing A-02-015-SC Rev E. The proposals need to show the Shared Use facility with at least 2m separation from adjoining carriageway (or 1.5m if speed limit was reduced to 50). New standards call for grade separation or signal control on a busy national speed limit road such as Peak Lane therefore the complete provision, including any pedestrian refuge islands, would need to be approved via a Departure from Standard (DfS) process.

The Road Safety Audit 1 (RSA1) identified a number of safety issues, which should be resolved. However, the brief did not include the Site Layout in Drawing A-02-015-SL Rev E. Whilst this is mainly Section 38, future audits will need to include amendments to Oakcroft Lane (including turning head) covered by the S278 works.

### **Internal Layout**

The highway authority would like to make the following comments regarding the proposed internal layout of the site.

Multiple residential areas and turning head areas have widths of less than 4.6m. These should have a width of between 4.8m and 5.5m. Sections of the spine road also appear to be less than 5.5m in width and this should have a width of between 5.5m and 7.0m. The footway widths should be a minimum of 2m, however the turning head at the southern edge of the site has a 1m strip of footway.

Three main sections of straight carriageway have been shown to exceed 70m. For internal roads of this nature traffic calming may be required to reduce speeds.

No visibility splays have been shown regarding the internal road layout of the site and these should be included.

Swept paths should be provided for a super large refuse, a fire tender, a family car, a single decker bus and a pantechnicon. vehicles to demonstrate that the internal layout is acceptable. Vehicle visitor parking spaces have been shown as having a width of 2m. These should have a minimum width of 2.4m.

Parking has not been fully assessed as this is a function of Gosport Borough Council as Local Parking Authority, however it is noted that the visitor parking spaces have a width of 2m and this should be a minimum of 2.4m.

Street lighting columns have not been shown in the drawings of the site and should be included. Some dwellings also appear to be less than 1m from the adoptable highway which should not be the case.

The location of driveways must not conflict with road geometry but the plans show driveways on corners which should be reviewed.

No pedestrian crossing points are shown and these are required throughout the development. The location of manhole covers should also be shown.

Gradients of the internals of the proposed site should be included. Also, Ordinary Watercourse Consent is required for alterations to an existing watercourse.

### **Trip Generation**

Following an independent interrogation of the TRICs database, the highway authority can confirm that the proposed vehicular trip rates are considered

robust. The two-way AM peak vehicular trips of 138 and the two-way PM peak vehicular trips of 129 are agreed.

### **Trip Distribution**

The trip distribution associated with the site has been derived by using the 2011 Census 'location of usual residence and place of work' data for the E02004739: Fareham 013 Mid-Layer output area. This methodology is considered appropriate.

It was agreed in pre-application discussions that Oakcroft Lane should be considered in the trip distribution from the site. This has now been done and 50% of vehicles anticipated to be connecting with the A27 travelling west have been re-assigned onto Oakcroft Lane travelling west to connect to Titchfield Road.

The majority of trips associated with the site are anticipated to turn at the proposed access road/ Peak Lane junction, travelling north on Peak Lane towards the Peak Lane/Rowan Way/Longfield Avenue roundabout. This is anticipated to account for 57% of development traffic. This is considered to represent the likely distribution of development traffic as this provides the most direct route to the A27.

The trip distribution is expected to change should the proposed Stubbington Bypass be implemented. With the bypass in place it is forecast that the 19% of development traffic that would travel west on the A27 would instead connect directly to the bypass, turning left at the Peak Lane/Stubbington Bypass junction, with the remaining 37% continuing to the Peak Lane/Rowan Way/Longfield Avenue roundabout. 33% would then continue straight onto the A27 with 4% turning right onto Longfield Avenue.

### **Junction Capacity Assessment**

The modelling for the junction capacity assessment has been reviewed and the highway authority would like to make the following comments. As Stubbington bypass is committed the scenarios without the bypass haven't been reviewed.

#### A27/Peak Lane/Catisfield Road model

The model needs to include the Catisfield Road arm which is also signalised and forms part of the same junction.

A number of inter-green times need to be changed to reflect the on-street values. This is as follows:

- A to B, A to C
- B to A
- C to A
- D to A, D to E
- E to D

Stubbington bypass/Peak Lane model

The model reflects the Stubbington bypass proposed junction layout. However, the development proposes to change the Peak Lane south approach to the junction to accommodate a right turn lane into Oakcroft Lane. As stated above the Peak Lane/ bypass junction should not be amended. However, if this proposal continues to be pursued, the change should be reflected in the Linsig model. If it is not pursued and the proposals amended to remove the impact on the bypass junction, then detailed comments on the Stubbington bypass/Peak Lane modelling as currently submitted will be provided.

Site Access / Peak Lane

Right turning traffic from Peak Lane North into the site is likely to block back on to the through approach if the right turn vehicles are unable to find gaps in the on-coming traffic. Therefore, modelling parameter 'C-B traffic blocks C-A traffic' should be used with the correct blocking queue length provided.

Peak Lane / Rowan Way / Longfield Avenue Roundabout

Peak Lane South entry lane width and Rowan way effective flare length should be reviewed and amended to better reflect the roundabout layout. The junction should be modelled using lane simulation mode due to unequal lane usage at the Peak Lane South and Rowan Way approaches. The flow entry should be amended for the 2018 AM peak model to match the RTA (Appendix M).

Ranvilles / A27

The central kerbed reserve width of major arm should be checked and updated if required. Flare length for Ranvilles Lane should be manually entered as 0 due to no right turns allowed.

May's Lane / Titchfield Road / B3334 Gosport Road (with Stubbington bypass - compact design)

Clarification is required on whether the pedestrian crossing on B3334 Gosport Road is included for the reconfigured junction and model should be amended accordingly.

Stubbington Green / Stubbington Lane / B3334 Gosport Road (with Stubbington bypass - compact design)

Clarification is required on whether the pedestrian crossing on Gosport Road North is included for the reconfigured junction and the model should be amended accordingly if required.

The operation of the junctions in question as a result of the proposed development will be reviewed when acceptable modelling is submitted.

**Travel Plan**

The applicant has suggested that a bond value would be agreed through the Section 106 process and it is anticipated that this would be a proportion of the total value of the works. This is not the case. The TP bond should of equal value to the whole Travel Plan budget. The full TP bond or surety should be in place prior to occupation.

The monitoring schedule has changed. The previous iteration of the travel plan states surveys to be conducted annually for the full five years of monitoring. This travel plan indicates surveys at the end of years one, three and five. This is adequate, however, the HA will require for the TPC to submit monitoring reports annually, even for years where full surveys are not conducted. During these years snapshot surveys and other important updates should be included within these reports i.e. actions completed throughout the year.

The Travel Plan should be amended and resubmitted to reflect the above comments.

### **Recommendation**

As set out above, the highway authority has registered an objection to the proposed Local Plan policy for allocating development at this location which remains in place. In addition, there are a number of areas where further information is required before the highway authority can provide a complete recommendation as set out in this response and summarised as follows:

- Upgrades to bus stops to be explored.
- Mitigation to improve the Peak Lane/Rowan Way/Longfield Avenue junction should be explored.
- Amendments to the site access arrangement as advised.
- Amendments to the internal layout as advised.
- Junction modelling should be amended.
- Clarification required regarding Travel Plan.

I look forward to receiving further information in due course. In the meantime, if you are minded to determine the application then please contact Fraser Spinney to provide formal highway reasons for refusal.

Yours faithfully,

Ben Clifton  
Team Leader - Highways Development Planning