

From: Alborough, Ray

Sent: 02 April 2020 09:51

To: Haywood, Daphney

Subject: RE: APP/20/00160 Site Address: Land adjacent Woodcroft Primary School, Woodcroft Lane, Waterloo, PO8 9QD

Daphney,

It is thank you and I trust you and your family are free from Covid 19.

HCC at one time had a Policy advising a maximum cul de sac length of 200m. More recently it was changed to up to 50 houses can be served by a cul de sac. Now we rely on Manual for Streets.

In this case whilst the development is less than 50 units it is an extension of an existing fairly long cul de sac already which may be reduced when the Woodcroft Farm development is complete.

In para 6.7 MfS advises

“6.7 Emergency vehicles

6.7.1 The requirements for emergency vehicles are generally dictated by the fire service requirements. Providing access for large fire appliances (including the need to be able to work around them where appropriate) will cater for police vehicles and ambulances.

6.7.2 The Building Regulation requirement B5 (2000)¹⁰ concerns ‘Access and Facilities for the Fire Service’. Section 17, ‘Vehicle Access’, includes the following advice on access from the highway: • there should be a minimum carriageway width of 3.7 m between kerbs; • there should be vehicle access for a pump appliance within 45 m of single family houses; • there should be vehicle access for a pump appliance within 45 m of every dwelling entrance for flats/maisonettes; • a vehicle access route may be a road or other route; and • fire service vehicles should not have to reverse more than 20 m.

6.7.3 The Association of Chief Fire Officers has expanded upon and clarified these requirements as follows: • a 3.7 m carriageway (kerb to kerb) is required for operating space at the scene of a fire. Simply to reach a fire, the access route could be reduced to 2.75 m over short distances, provided the pump appliance can get to within 45 m of dwelling entrances; • if an authority or developer wishes to reduce the running carriageway width to below 3.7 m, they should consult the local Fire Safety Officer; • the length of cul-de-sacs or the number of dwellings have been used by local authorities as criteria for limiting the size of a development served by a single access route. Authorities have often argued that the larger the site, the more likely it is that a single access could be blocked for whatever reason. The fire services adopt a less numbers-driven approach and consider each application based on a risk assessment for the site, and response time requirements. Since the introduction of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004,¹¹ all regions have had to produce an Integrated Management Plan setting out response time targets (Wales: Risk Reduction Plans¹²). These targets depend on the time required to get fire appliances to a particular area, together with the ease of movement within it. It is therefore possible that a layout acceptable to the Fire and Rescue Service (FRS) in one area, might be objected to in a more remote location; • parked cars can have a significant influence on response times. Developments should have adequate provision for parking to reduce its impact on response times; and • residential sprinkler systems are highly regarded by the FRS and their presence allows a longer response time to be used. A site layout which has been rejected on the grounds of accessibility for fire appliances may become acceptable if its buildings are equipped with these systems.”

I therefore conclude that HFRS are satisfied with the proposed development without the secondary access as its non-provision is unlikely to impact their response times.

Ray. Alborough MCIHT

Senior Engineer

Highway Development Agreements and Planning
Hampshire County Council

2nd Floor, Elizabeth II Court West
The Castle, Winchester, SO23 8UJ

Tel: 01962 847316

E-mail: ray.alborough@hants.gov.uk

Web: <https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers>

[Copyright](#) Hampshire County Council 2004 [Disclaimer](#) [Privacy Statement](#)