

HAVANT BOROUGH
COUNCIL

28 AUG 2012

RECEIVED

Havant Borough Council
Civic Offices
Civic Centre Road
HAVANT
Hampshire
PO9 2AX



Hampshire
County Council

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

Enquiries to	Steve Jenkins	My reference	SJJ/6/3/13/78
Direct Line	01962 846819	Your reference	APP/12/00338
Date	23 August 2012	Email	stephen.jenkins@hants.gov.uk

For the attention of Stephen Cantwell

Dear Sir

APP/12/00338 Dunsbury Hill Farm – Hybrid planning application comprising a part outline application for employment uses and a hotel and part detailed application for a new link road with bus gate to Woolston Road

I refer to my letter dated 26th June 2012 where I provided comments on the Transport Assessment and off site impact arising from the planning application. I am now able to provide full comments on the proposed access arrangements and link road. In addition I can update you on several issues raised in my earlier letter. Two issues are being dealt with jointly by the County Council and the applicant. A summary of issues is tabulated below and where the responsibility for action lies.

Issue	Action	Responsibility
Review access roundabout and link road	HCC response within this letter, applicant to address points raised. Amended drawings required	Applicant
CBBS	Applicant / HCC to agree a priced strategy to deliver CBBS. HCC to draft subsidy / revenue strategy.	HCC
Pedestrian / Cycle access from West	Links to Waterlooville not provided and applicant should provide a revised pedestrian / cycle strategy	Applicant
Traffic modelling	Assumes CBBS will serve the development. Unless an agreement is entered into relating to provision of CBBS then modelling assumptions will be incorrect and development impact underestimated. CBBS to be secured	Applicant

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

Traffic modelling	A3(M) J3 must be tested with committed improvement scheme from Waterloooville MDA, details have been provided to applicant	Applicant
Traffic modelling	The VISSIM modelling (which has been used to assess the local network in more detail) still distributes the development traffic 85% via J3 and 15% via J3. This is contrary to the SRTM output and is considered to be unrealistic	Applicant
Asda roundabout	Separate joint study to design a scheme which overcomes the queuing forecast to occur due to the proposed development due in late August	HCC/Applicant
Travel Plan	Certainty over Travel Planning measures to be introduced / responsibility for delivering them required. HCC's costs of approving / monitoring the Travel Plan also required	Applicant

I hope to report back to you on the HCC elements listed above within the next 3 weeks. The main purpose of this letter is to provide you with advice over the proposed highway access works (the proposed Hulbert Road Roundabout) and the proposed on site link road

Hulbert Road access roundabout

A 48m ICD roundabout is proposed approximately 250m south of A3(M) junction 3, this will be the all purpose vehicular access to the site. The location has been chosen for a number of reasons and constraints including a surrounding SINC, ground levels and the geometric difficulty of adding a further arm to Junction 3. I am aware that there is local support for a direct arm to Junction 3 and I agree that it does appear sensible at first glance. However due to the above environmental and technical issues it is not simple to achieve such a connection. Any such connection would require the closing of the Hulbert Road arm as two arms could not be provided in such close proximity. Such an option would still involve the need for a major road link back across the site to reconnect Hulbert Road to Junction 3, in effect re-providing what is proposed in the application minus the Hulbert Road roundabout. Unfortunately whilst there maybe support for an alternative access option the application must be assessed as submitted and I have carried out a thorough review of the submitted roundabout design and although there are a number of departures from standards within the design, the proposal as shown on drawing 5099849/TP/GA/101 Rev B is considered acceptable. I have provided more detailed comments leading to this conclusion below.

Hulbert Road Traffic speeds

The existing speed limit for Hulbert Road is 60mph, however, speed checks have been carried out and show that the 85th percentile speed is 43mph in both the north and south directions. This is important information and has been used in justification of some elements of the highway design.

Hulbert Road Accident history

Personal Injury Accident data has been provided for this scheme which shows that there are no significant patterns of accidents within the scheme location. However immediately north of the scheme at the A3(M) roundabout the County Council are implementing a scheme to reduce rear end shunts by

implementing a longer section of High Friction Surfacing and vegetation clearance. It is recommended that the applicant consider complementing these measures at Section 278 stage.

Horizontal alignment

Drawing number 101 covers the Hulbert Road Roundabout and roads leading to it. The following comments cover some of the approaches.

Drawing 101 Eastern Arm

The approach to the roundabout is on a continuous right hand bend. On exit from the Hulbert Roundabout consideration shall be given to the forward visibility due to the fact that it is on a tight bend and embankment. It is envisaged that a vehicle restraint system will be in place and this may hinder visibility to the low target height throughout this area. Furthermore, with the introduction of the dedicated left turn lane visibility for both lanes of merging traffic shall be considered both horizontally and vertically. This must be considered further at the Section 278 stage.

Drawing 101 Northern Arm

This alignment predominantly uses the existing alignment of Hulbert Road and removes the existing lay-by to enable the roundabout junction to be provided. The visibility requirements have been reduced on this section of carriageway from 215m to 160m which is one step below the 'desirable minimum'. Due to the fact that vehicles will be on a slight incline on approach to the roundabout this is not foreseen as a safety issue and therefore this alignment is acceptable and has been detailed within a Departure from Standard (DfS) submission which the Chief Engineer has approved. A 'No Right Turn' sign shall be considered on the northern approach to prevent vehicles from turning right into the parking/rest area to the west of the scheme.

The dedicated left turn lane does not conform to the standards as set out in The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges - TD 51/03. The nonconformities are that the entrance and exit lanes from the dedicated left turn lane are quite short for the speed of the road as well as the internal radius proposed within the design. The applicant has applied for a DfS to allow this and this has been accepted.

On approach to the A3(M) roundabout the applicant is proposing a sight stopping distance of 90m which is considerably lower than the requirement of 215m, however, these factors are covered by departure from standard applications which have been approved. At the Section 278 stage the applicant shall consider the signing strategy within the vicinity as it would be anticipated that large Advanced Direction Sign (ADS) will be present as well as warning signs regarding the approaching roundabout, these need to be positioned as not to hinder the sight stopping distance, however must not be placed in such a fashion as to not be visible to drivers. With regards to the roundabout visibility splays need to be provided to comply with the requirements set out in TD 16/07.

Drawing 101 Departures from Standard

There are a number of departures associated with this proposed scheme, which have all been approved by the Council's Chief Engineer. However

visibilities shown on the drawings do not reflect those which are approved within the departures, or the visibility lines attached in labels. Therefore, the visibilities shall be re-drawn to reflect the approved Departures from Standard.

Link road

The proposed link road has been considered in detail and is largely acceptable. The key outstanding issues are related to the bus gate, structures and pedestrian facilities. The following comments cover each section in detail.

Drawing 102

This section covers the access road between Hotel roundabout and chainage 260. This section incorporates a bridge over the Hermitage Stream and consideration should be given to the length of parapet and safety fence required. The realignment of the stream needs to be considered so not to cause scour on the bridge, this can be done at the post planning stage.

Drawing 103

This section covers the access road between Hotel roundabout and chainage 290. The access locations have not been defined and are subject to change once the development plots have been planned. Visibility from the proposed junctions will need to be provided to Manual for Streets requirements. The footbridges and headwalls for the swales will need to be considered in detail at that stage.

With regards to the Hotel roundabout visibility of 45m is adequate when undertaken using Manual for Streets calculations. However the two entrances to the roundabout on both north and south shall be constructed to a minimum length of 45m to assure that the required visibility is provided. Furthermore drainage shall be considered at detailed design stage.

The need for pedestrian refuges on the link road as raised in my earlier letter have still not been added to drawing 103/Rev B. I still require this omission to be amended. Similarly the pedestrian crossing facilities on hotel roundabout splitter islands have not been added to drawing 103/Rev B. I still require this omission to be amended.

Bus lay-bys should be made usable for buses of 12m in length. These should be a minimum of 2.5m in width and total length of 16m. Furthermore, the lay-bys design shall enable shelters to be provided and the shelters shall be of a high quality 'BRT' type specification.

Drawing 104

This section covers the remainder of the access road up to the Woolston Road roundabout. It includes the proposed rising bollard.

The rising bollards that enable the bus gate to be provided should be located a minimum of 25m from the roundabout 'Give Way' to allow for a bus to exit / enter the roundabout without encroaching on the bollard or the roundabout. Due to this the central island will need to be extended 5m beyond the bollard, thus the central island should be a minimum of 30m in length. Furthermore

consideration should be given to preventing vehicles from mounting the footway and bypassing the bollard.

The bus gate is situated approximately 200m from the nearest turning point on the western side, therefore any vehicle passing this turning will not be able to turn around when confronted by the bollard thus needing to reverse a considerable distance. Therefore it is necessary for a turning head to be provided for an appropriately sized vehicle. Consideration should be given to amending the geometry of the last access road to the west of the bus gate, this should be changed to effectively make the bus link the side road. This could be achieved through a combination of measures such as road markings, kerb line changes and narrowing the road width at the entry to the bus link. These measures will help to dissuade unauthorised drivers from entering the bus link.

The location of the CCTV cameras should be shown, it is suggested that these be placed on the nearside verges facing oncoming vehicles. The locations of the power supply pillars to allow for ease of maintenance that will not obstruct the carriageway whilst being undertaken should be shown. An area of hard standing will be required for maintenance vehicles for the bus gate. Preferred location would be to the west of the bus gate. Appropriate signage and road marking should be considered to highlight the bus gate, with the possibility of red coloured surfacing.

Vertical Alignment

There has been a limited amount of vertical alignment detail provided and the alignment does not conform to full standards. However applications for the departures from standards have been submitted to cover these aspects and all been approved. The applicant will need to consider the driveability of the vertical alignment on the southern approach to Hulbert Roundabout due to the undulating characteristic of the alignment and consider the eastern approach to the Hulbert Roundabout due to the steep incline. Some vehicles will need to stop on this incline and undertake a hill start which may not be ideal for some drivers. Therefore the applicant shall consider reducing the incline where possible as part of the Section 278 process.

Drainage Proposals

The detailed drainage proposals will be assessed at the detailed Section 278 / 38 submission stage. However the applicant shall provide all correspondence with the Environment Agency regarding the diversion works to Hermitage Stream, including flood risk analysis, all discharge consents that are required and the water quality report within a future submission.

Street Lighting Proposals

Lighting will be provided to the Highway Authority's specification and approval at the detailed design stage. The lighting strategy set out within the Lighting report is a suitable base for the detailed design. Maintenance numbers of all existing street lighting furniture, including illuminated signs and bollards shall be provided at the detail Section 278 stage.

Structures

The proposed link road includes new structures. I have provided detailed specific comments directly to the applicant consulting engineer in a formal design check report and these points must be addressed before I can support this element of the proposal.

Ecology

The construction of the proposed new link road would result in the loss of approximately 0.2ha of habitat from within Neville's Park Wood Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Paragraph 15.108 of the Environmental Statement (ES) states that the underlying pasture within the affected area of ancient woodland is species poor and that the ecological interest is limited to the mature oak trees, approximately 14 of which would need to be removed to create the proposed road. However, consideration should also be given to the interest that has developed within the irreplaceable woodland soils which will be lost. I understand that the County Council's Ecology consultation response to the planning application has highlighted this point along with other concerns over the extent of the earthworks, consideration of alternative locations / designs, the bat survey, dormouse survey, reptile survey, vegetation clearance being timed to take place outside of the bird breeding season. I have nothing further to add and trust that the applicant will be addressing these points directly.

Summary

In summary the proposed Hulbert Road Access Roundabout and on site link road are considered acceptable subject to the following revisions being made:

- Visibility splays on all drawings to match approved Departures
- Pedestrian crossing facilities on the Hotel roundabout splitter islands being added to drawing 103/Rev B.
- Pedestrian refuges on the link road being added as raised in my earlier letter on drawing 103/Rev B.
- Bus lay-bys should be made usable for buses of 12m in length and should be a minimum of 2.5m in width and total length of 16m.
- The bus lay-bys shall be annotated to include a high quality 'BRT' type specification shelter.

On completion of these amendments and resolution of the matters included in the table on page 1 of this letter I will be able to provide a formal and positive recommendation to this planning application.

Yours faithfully


Steve Jenkins

Team Leader - Highways Development Planning

cc: Highways Agency, Federated House, London Road, Dorking – Neil Andrew
cc: HBC, Transport, FAO – Peter Marshall
cc: HBC, Planning Policy, FAO – Lucy Howard