

Fareham Borough Council  
Civic Offices  
Civic Way  
Fareham  
PO16 7AZ

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

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

*Enquiries To* **Matt Lewis**

*My reference* **030097**

*Direct Line* **0370 779 3589**

*Your reference* **P/20/1168/OA**

*Date* **17 December 2020**

*Email* **farehamdc@hants.gov.uk**

Dear Mr Wright,

### **Land to the south of Funtley Road, Funtley**

**Outline application to provide up to 125 one, two, three and four-bedroom dwellings including 6 Self or Custom build plots, Community Building or Local Shop (Use Class E & F.2) with associated infrastructure, new community park, landscaping and access, following demolition of existing buildings.**

These comments are in response to planning application P/20/1168/OA. The applicant seeks permission for up to 125 dwellings with community and local facilities. Extant permission for up to 55 dwellings has been granted under planning application P/18/0067/OA.

#### *Site Accessibility*

The Transport Assessment (TA) lays out walking distances to education, employment, retail, and health facilities. These have been checked and confirmed to be actual walking distances and not "as the crow flies" distances and are therefore acceptable. It is noted that whilst a significant number of services lie beyond the 2km walking distance recommended by CIHT, there are some facilities from each category within this distance.

Pedestrian facilities along Funtley Road are currently secured to be improved (construction has started, albeit not yet completed) by planning permission P/17/1135/OA for 27 dwellings north of Funtley Road. This application proposes to tie in with the existing pedestrian network and provide crossing points to the northern side of Funtley Road, which has existing pedestrian facilities providing onward connections towards the facilities at Knowle village.

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

Notwithstanding this, due to the increased levels of pedestrian footfall on the existing network, an NMU audit should be conducted and submitted detailing the acceptability of routes to local amenities and education facilities which are not provided within the development. Particular note should be drawn to the route to Henry Cort Community College as this secondary education facility is at the maximum acceptable walking distance when measured against CIHT recommendations if taking the shortest distance available (that being over the M27 footbridge and along the PRow to the west).

The number 20 bus route previously used to serve Fareham then Funtley and then onto Knowle village via Mayles Lane, which is a private road not within the Highway Authority's control. However, there is a railway bridge over Mayles Lane which has recently had a 7.5t weight restriction added and therefore the bus can no longer use this road and instead is redirected to Knowle via Wickham Road. The weight limit was implemented to prevent HGV's using the bridge.

Hampshire County Council has investigated securing a bus only exemption for the bridge so that the number 20 bus can revert back to the previous route. The Land Trust who own the section of road have confirmed that a fee of £5,500 per annum is required to access this section of road. It is considered important that the availability of this bus route via the site is secured in perpetuity. The applicant should liaise with Hampshire County Council's Passenger Transport Group, Land Trust and service provider to ensure bus provision is reinstated.

#### *Road Safety Review*

The applicant has provided some collision data in relation to the site. However, the data has been obtained from CrashMap as oppose to Hampshire Constabulary. Data is required to be obtained from Hampshire Constabulary as this is the most accurate, up to date and presented in the correct narrative.

It is also noted that the study area is not clearly defined, and a brief independent review identified a number of accidents in the most recent 5-year period occurring at the River Lane / Titchfield Lane junction, which have been omitted in the TA, despite the TA stating that Titchfield Lane was included in the study area. The potential impact on safety at the signalised shuttle working over the rail line to the east of the site has also not been assessed.

The TA also states that updated information has been obtained, however Appendix B only presents data from Oct 2012 - Sep 2017, which is not the most recent 5-year period available.

#### *Existing Traffic Conditions*

A traffic survey was carried out on 21st-27th October 2016, which is beyond the required 3 years accepted by the Highway Authority. It is also noted that this was during autumn half-term and therefore may not be wholly representative of the usual traffic flows.

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

Notwithstanding this, the Highway Authority has compared the flows with those more recently recorded by the Welborne development and concluded that the proposed figures are not dissimilar. As such the proposed methodology to uplift the previous data with TEMPro is accepted in this instance.

It is also noted that the submitted speed surveys are over 5 years old, and these should be updated. In terms of conducting speed surveys, the Highway Authority does not have any additional restrictions to these being carried out due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

### *Site Access*

The proposed access design is as that submitted and approved in principle under planning application P/18/0067/OA for 55 dwellings. All pedestrian crossing points and the works associated with the footpath / cycle link over the M27 will also be completed, however it is noted that not all works are currently complete. These comments will therefore relate to the proposed intensification of the site access junction resulting from increase from 55 units to up to 125 units.

The PICADY summaries show an increase in the RFC but do not result in any capacity issue for the site access. It is noted that the visibility splays have been increased compared to the approved permission (P/18/0067/OA) despite speed data not being updated. These visibility splays should be confirmed as acceptable with more recent speed surveys.

As the site access will see an increase in private car use, additional tracking drawings demonstrating that cars can carry out right / left turns into the site with a car waiting at the give way line to turn right out of the site is required.

### *Internal Arrangements*

It is noted that internal layout and parking details will be provided at the reserved matters stage. As such, the Highway Authority will only be providing high level comments for consideration. It is however requested that the applicant provides an indication as to whether it is currently intended to offer the internal roads for adoption. Early engagement with the Highway Authority regarding this matter is encouraged prior to submission of any subsequent reserved matters application, to ensure that the internal layout is suitable for adoption.

The parking standards for the site are laid down by Fareham Borough Council (FBC) as the local parking authority, in accordance with their Residential Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as adopted in November 2009.

It should be noted that high levels of tandem parking could result in an increased use of on-street parking causing restrictions for other highway users. As such this should be kept to a minimum.

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

The indicative internal layout on the masterplan shows a few occurrences where SSD's / visibility splays will not be achievable due to proposed buildings. For a 20mph design speed, 25m is requirement and should be demonstrated on future submissions.

### *Trip Generation and Distribution*

The proposed trip rates are as per the approved planning application P/18/0067/OA and are accepted. Distribution has been derived from Journey to Work Census data, as per the extant permission. This method is acceptable; however the analysis does not assume any traffic from the site will travel east towards the A32 Wickham Road to access Eastleigh and Winchester and should be amended. Furthermore, the assessment does not include consideration of improvements to M27 Junction 10 to an all moves junction associated with the Welborne development. This should be considered.

### *Junction Modelling*

The scope of the junctions requiring assessment will be confirmed once site traffic distribution is agreed.

Modelling has been carried out for the site access (which has been reviewed above), River Lane / Titchfield Road priority junction and Kiln Road / Park Lane signalised crossroads. It is noted that the signalised shuttle working over the rail line on Funtley Road to the east of the site has not been modelled; this is required as part of this application.

While further work on traffic distribution and committed development is required, an initial review of the modelling submitted has been carried out, as below.

The submitted modelling shows River Lane / Titchfield Road priority junction to be within acceptable limits in both the 2020 and 2025 scenarios, with or without the development. The TA has failed to analyse this junction in terms of safety.

In regard to the Kiln Road / Park Lane signalised crossroads, it is noted that this development is forecast to have a significant impact on the junction. The 2025 results indicate that the site will have the greatest impact on the Kiln Road arm, increasing the queue length by 37 PCU's, an increase of over 88%.

In order to mitigate this, the TA has looked at the modelling and mitigation package submitted in relation to the development at Welborne. However, the analysis has been wholly based on the March 2019 TA, which is not the latest data available, nor the correct mitigation approved at the October 2019 planning committee. As such the summarisation that the proposed Welborne mitigation package will not improve the junction is ill-founded and no weight is given to the subsequent analysis and proposed turning ban. It is also noted that the effect of the proposed turning ban has not been extended to the wider network.

The TA and modelling should be updated to review the approved Welborne modelling

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

and mitigation package as submitted in the July 2019 TA. Any proposed mitigation should also take into account the full implications of the Welborne proposals. The modelling should also assess the impact of the development before and after the installation of the proposed improvement to an all-moves junction at Junction 10 of the M27, as this will likely impact the proposed distribution.

### *Travel Plan*

Although the Travel Plan is generally of a high standard, it does not meet the minimum standards required by HCC to be accepted. A recommended list of improvements are listed below:

- Baseline mode-share data should be provided to inform the targets in Section 5. This must be valid, site-specific data and can be sourced from either TRICS or Census 2011 (MSOA level)
- Although the measures suggested are effective, a non-exhaustive list of additional measures HCC would expect for a site of this description include:
  - Liaison with local schools to organise activities such as walking to school events
  - Cycle provision should be provided in secure, covered locations. This is not specified in Section 7.7
- The existing monitoring strategy is not clear. HCC would expect a commitment for annual monitoring to be conducted, with reports to be submitted to HCC within 3 months of completion
- The action plan is currently incomplete. It should be noted that a cost estimate must be provided at this stage for all measures which do not form part of the site's infrastructure and regardless of whether the developer will fund them directly. This cost estimate will be used to inform the value of the cash deposit secured through the Section 106 agreement.
- A section should be included in the travel plan to explain enforcement. For example, descriptions of the S106 agreement and a commitment to pay HCC's monitoring / approval fees.

### *Travel to Schools*

This development would be served by Orchard Lea Infant and Junior for primary education, and Henry Cort Community College for secondary education. Both schools are noted as being within an acceptable walking distance.

There is an identified need for a TRO in the form of double yellow lines to prevent parents parking where the coaches need to wait at Henry Cort. With the Orchard Schools, they are on a bus route (Red Barn Lane) and cars often parked in inappropriate places. Although the site is within walking distance, it is expected that a proportion of parents would drive to the schools and add to the existing parking issues.

A previous contribution has been secured through the Section 106 for the extant planning permission (P/18/0067/OA), but due to the increase in housing numbers and HCC's revised structure of pricing, this figure will be required to be adjusted to reflect the true

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

cost of delivering meaningful travel planning with the catchment schools.

The requirement of School Travel Plan contributions is to take developer contributions for housing developments of 100 houses or more for the development of STP's for the catchment primary and secondary schools, and associated capital and revenue costs to implement the STP in an effective and meaningful way.

Developments of this scale have the potential to generate significant new / additional school journeys and there will be an impact on the local schools if the chosen mode of travel by families is the car.

Whilst the development must provide adequate infrastructure to promote non-car modes of travel, it is likely that for various reasons, some families will opt for the car, especially where there is little or no engagement, promotion, education and enforcement of the school travel plan.

When looking to encourage positive travel behaviours, it is vital that these messages are introduced early. This in turn supports the wider travel plan for the development site in achieving its targets to reduce car travel and maintain high highway safety standards.

So that the STP can be a meaningful and useful document for both the school, its community and the development, and can be delivered, a resource budget is required for measures such as road safety training (e.g. Balanceability training) and travel to school maps to assist those traveling to the catchment school from the development, for the duration of the build-out phases. Subject to the existing facilities, funding may also be required for infrastructure such as cycle/scooter storage, footpath links, access points and so on.

For this development, a contribution of £42,000 is required based on the following and should be paid prior to commencement. This is based on the following costs:

Primary STP	£7,000
Secondary STP	£10,000
Monitoring fee p.a. (six years for primary and four years for secondary)	£1,000
Resources budget (primary)	£5,000
Resources budget (secondary)	£10,000

### *Summary*

The extant permission for 55 dwellings (P/18/0067/OA) has secured the following highway obligations under a signed S106 agreement in August 2020:

- a) To secure provision of a pedestrian and cycle public right of way through the site from Funtley Road (north) to Thames Drive (south); associated works to

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



- upgrade the bridge over the M27 motorway (including structural survey) and commuted sum for future maintenance;
- b) To secure a financial contribution towards the production of school travel plans in the area (£15,000) [to be increased to £42,000 in line with the above comments];
  - c) To secure a financial contribution toward the revision of the existing traffic regulation order (TRO) to allow the speed limit restrictions on Funtley Road to be amended (£5,000);
  - d) To secure submission and implementation of a travel plan;

It is considered that these commitments will still be required as a minimum, in addition to any other commitments agreed to mitigate the proposed increase to 125 dwellings.

### *Recommendation*

Additional information is required in order to support the application:

- Provision of an NMU audit to off-site facilities and exploration into required improvements;
- Securing bus provision to the site through redirecting the Number 20 bus route to pass the site;
- Updated PIA data to include a clearly defined study area, the signalised shuttle system over the rail bridge, and priority junction of River Lane / Titchfield Road, with data to be up to date and obtained from Hampshire Constabulary;
- Inclusion of signalised shuttle working over rail bridge to the east of the site on Funtley Road;
- Modelling of Kiln Road / Park Lane signalised crossroads to be updated to include most up to date data and approved design under the Welborne application;
- Distributions and modelling to be updated in line with including the all-moves Junction 10 approved with the Welborne development; and,
- Travel Plans updated and submitted for approval to the Highway Authority.

Should the local planning authority wish to determine the application prior to the TA being amended, the Highway Authority should be contacted for reasons for refusal.

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

Yours sincerely,

Gemma McCart

Development Planning Team Leader

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