

Michelle Houghton

From: Daphney Haywood
Sent: 11 September 2013 14:22
To: bst shared
Subject: FW: Residential Development Station Road13/00639 additional Devpt Eng comments for meridio and web

Charles

Please see below for further highway comments on the revised layout and the sustainable transport issue.

Regarding the layout, there may be some minor issues with the proximity of parking to plots, but a numbered plan may resolve this, other wise in the main the issues have been addressed, and I recommend that you now submit this formally - if possible by noon tomorrow so that I can ensure the necessary consultation/notification is carried out.

In any event I will forward contact details before I go tomorrow.

regards

Daphney haywood
Havant BC

From: Peter Marshall
Sent: 11 September 2013 13:40
To: David Eaves
Subject: Residential Development Station Road13/00639

The layout is acceptable in principle but I would suggest that any future detailed planning application should include overlays demonstrating that emergency and servicing vehicles can manoeuvre around the tight bends within the layout. The position and the number of parking spaces is acceptable.
I have already made comments with regard to the offsite highways works that are required to make this application sustainable.

Peter J Marshall BSc MCHIT

The developer called me yesterday concerning the suggested solutions to the restricted road width and lack of footway pass the Public House, I've explained that these works would require the s278 and that they would need to provide a safety audit before planning is submitted as there is a slight bend in the road as it narrows, each solution they have put forward requires the construction of a pinch point at the bend, and therefore provide the footway to one side of the road which would be the best that can be obtained. Due to the curve of the carriageway I have suggested before they progress too far they provide some forward visibility splays to show that approaching vehicles will be able to see any vehicles in the opposite direction. They were hoping to get this sent though in the next couple of days.

If they can show that suitable visibility is available with pinch points and the footway is provided then my original reason to refuse the site as non sustainable in transport terms as pedestrians would not be able to access the local services/amenities will no longer stand assuming the work they are already proposing providing the footway to the bus stop and crossing point is still included. All this work would need to be undertaken by s278.

The other s106 schemes which are within 400m of the site are attached, these will need to be considered with the s278 requirements and CIL.

Tracey

Tracey Ford

