



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)

Enquiries to	Fraser Spinney	My reference	6/3/10/231
Direct Line	01962 845103	Your reference	P/20/0522/FP
Date	26th November 2020	Email	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 following comments relate to the additional information that was supplied on 13<sup>th</sup> November 2020.

**Policy**

In the previous application response, it was reaffirmed that a local plan policy objection had been raised relating to this development in the South of Fareham Strategic Growth Area (SGA) within in the emerging Fareham Local Plan. HCC's objection was against development in this area due to the negative impact on the operation and function of the approved bypass.

This policy has subsequently been removed from the emerging Local Plan, however HCC remain concerned regarding development in the vicinity of the approved Stubbington bypass.

**Pedestrian Network**

It has been 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.

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

Should it be required following full occupation of the site, a contribution of £5,000 will be required towards the large stretches of Bells Lane that are currently unrestricted and raise parking issues local to the schools. This would cover the TRO cost and should be secured via a Section 106 agreement.

### **Public transport**

Due to the distance from the site to the nearest bus stops a contribution of £10,500 contribution is required for public transport improvements to make bus travel a more attractive option for residents of the development. Should the development be approved, this contribution will be secured via the Section 106 Agreement.

### **Highway Safety**

Previously highway safety concerns were raised at the Peak Lane/Rowan Way/Longfield Avenue roundabout. However, it is acknowledged that once the Stubbington bypass is in place existing trips through this junction are expected to reduce. Mitigation based on safety and operation of this junction remains sought and as set out within in the junction capacity assessment section of this response.

### **Site Access**

The suitability of a 2.4m X distance at the site access has been considered and this is now accepted. The approach Stopping Sight Distances (SSD) have not been provided in either direction from 1.5 x SSD and will be required at the Section 278 preliminary design checking stage.

The site access bellmouth junction swept path analysis indicates that conflicts are possible between vehicles. Whilst the principle of the access is accepted, this should be addressed prior to submission of the Section 278 preliminary design stage.

HCC had also previously confirmed that a Departure from Standard application would also be required for the footway/cycleway due to the lack of separation between the footway/cycleway and adjoining carriageway. To address this the access arrangements have been revised and are now supported 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 width of the pedestrian refuge exceeds minimum HCC standards but, the adjacent lane widths are insufficient for anticipated speeds and should be a minimum of 4m.

### **Internal Layout**

The issues relating to the internal layout have not been addressed and these are reiterated below.

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 Fareham 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.

The Highway Authority understand that it is not currently proposed for the internal roads to be offered for adoption. The above matters however should still be addressed by the applicant. Should the applicant propose to offer the internal roads for adoption, which is encouraged, these elements will need to

be resolved prior to submission of a Section 38 design check and the Highway Authority would welcome early dialogue on this element.

Also, Ordinary Watercourse Consent will be required for alterations to an existing watercourse

### **Junction Capacity Assessment**

The modelling for the junction capacity assessment has been reviewed and the Highway Authority would like to make the following comments. This response focuses on the scenario 'with Stubbington bypass'.

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

The suggested amendments have been made to the modelling for the A27/Peak Lane/Catisfield Road junction and the modelling is now an accurate reflection of conditions.

The impact of the proposals on this junction are considered acceptable and mitigation at this junction is not considered necessary.

#### Stubbington bypass/Peak Lane model

The proposed changes to the junction layout that the applicant has proposed have now been applied to the model for this junction. The model is accurate of the proposed changes and the Stubbington bypass/Peak Lane junction.

The modelling results show that in the worst-case future year scenario, which includes the proposed development, the junction works within capacity.

Whilst the development is shown to have a negligible impact upon the operation of Stubbington bypass itself once completed, it does introduce additional queuing and demand- particularly on the Peak Lane arm of the junction.

The above scenarios are acceptable based on Stubbington Bypass being implemented, and therefore in order to mitigate the impact of the development it is considered necessary for a proportionate contribution of £500,000 towards provision of the Bypass scheme and the supporting infrastructure including works to minimise traffic flow and improve pedestrian and cycle facilities within Stubbington Village to be provided. This is considered a fair and reasonable approach to ensure the necessary infrastructure is provided upon which the post development scenario has been tested.

#### Site Access/Peak Lane

The modelling for the site access/Peak Lane junction has been amended and is now acceptable. This junction works well within capacity in all scenarios.

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

The applicant has proposed an amendment to the Peak Lane/Rowan Way/Longfield Avenue roundabout. This involves amendments to the lane markings to allow both lanes to cater for the straight on manoeuvre in order to increase capacity. The applicant has proposed this mitigation is secured via a Section 106 contribution.

The principle of the mitigation is agreed and improves capacity at the roundabout.

Currently, the exit arm on Peak Lane North operates as one lane exit approximately 6m in width (10m if the hatched surface is included). The applicant has proposed that the Peak Lane North exit is reconfigured as 2 lanes by means of changes to lane markings and proposing signage. However, the following concerns have been raised with regards to the mitigation:

- A proposed plan of the mitigation has not been provided; therefore, it is unclear the extent of the merge on Peak Lane north exit and changes within the circulatory of the roundabout;
- The exit lane reduces to 5m in width, within 15m from the exit of the roundabout. DMRB standards suggest at least 30m – 50m merge which cannot be obtained within the existing Right of Way;
- The central median is currently raised and unclear the effect on modelling results with regards to the proposed mitigation;
- Deflection of lanes in and around the roundabout and the merge with slip lane from Rowan way may have to be considered;
- A road safety audit may be required for the proposed mitigation.

Whilst the principle of a financial contribution to mitigate the development related impact upon this junction is accepted, in the absence of a drawing setting out the proposed scheme and the above concerns, the Highway Authority consider it necessary to monitor the operation of the junction following implementation of Stubbington bypass and develop options to improve capacity and safety at the junction at this time. A contribution of £50,000 towards capacity and safety improvements at this junction is therefore considered fair and reasonable.

#### Ranvilles/A27

The modelling submitted for the Ranvilles Lane/A27 junction is accepted and mitigation at this junction is not required.

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

The modelling supplied for the May's Lane/Titchfield Road/B3334 Gosport Road roundabout is consistent with that in the Stubbington bypass TA. Therefore, this is accepted. No mitigation is required at this junction.

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

The modelling submitted for the Stubbington Green/Stubbington Lane/B3334 Gosport Road roundabout is consistent with that in the Stubbington bypass TA and is therefore accepted. This shows that the development does not have a

significant impact on the roundabout and therefore mitigation is not required at this junction.

#### Financial Contribution Requirements

A summary of the required financial contribution requirements are set out below;

- £500,000 towards provision of Stubbington Bypass and supporting infrastructure works including measures to minimise traffic and encourage sustainable modes within Stubbington Village.
- £50,000 towards improvements at the Peak Lane/Rowan Way/Longfield Avenue roundabout.
- £10,500 towards bus infrastructure improvements.
- £5,000 towards TRO provision.

An overall contribution sum of £565,500 is therefore required in order to mitigate the site specific impact of the development proposals. This requirement is in line with CIL tests and is considered fair and suitable mitigation for the development proposals.

#### **Travel Plan**

The issues raised regarding the Travel Plan in the previous highways response have not been addressed. Amendments to the Framework Travel Plan should be made and agreed prior to the signing of the Section 106.

#### **Recommendation**

As set out above, the highway authority raises no objection to the application subject to a legal agreement to secure the following:

- Financial contribution of £565,500 as set out above.
- Approval of Framework Travel Plan prior to signing of Section 106 and approval of Full Travel Plan with associated approval and monitoring fees, and surety to be secured in the Section 106 agreement.

I trust the above is clear. Please do not hesitate to contact Fraser Spinney should you wish to discuss anything further.

Yours faithfully,

Gemma McCart  
Team Leader - Highways Development Planning