

Eastleigh Borough Council  
Eastleigh House  
Upper Market Street  
Eastleigh  
SO50 9YN

*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

*Enquiries To* Matt Grantham

*My reference* 031037

*Direct Line*

*Your reference* F/20/89488

*Date* 31 March 2021

*Email* eastleighdc@hants.gov.uk

Dear Mrs Martin,

## **LAND AT SATCHELL LANE, HAMBLE-LE-RICE,**

### **Residential development of 61 no. dwellings, with associated public open space, landscaping and amenity areas with access off Satchell Lane.**

In regard to application F/20/89488, an **objection** is made to the proposals on the grounds of:

1. Highway safety due to the lack of appropriate footway to the north and west of the site; and
2. Due to the cumulative impact of traffic flows on Hamble Lane that this development will further contribute to.

#### **ACCESS:**

The principal of direct access into site has previously been deemed acceptable in principle as part of planning permission O/17/80319, which was granted at appeal App/W1715/W/18/3194846 by the governments planning inspector on 20 December 2018.

This access provided both vehicle and pedestrian access into the site, and is replicated in both location and design principles for this application (see Drawing 17-004-035 Rev D -Appendix C of the submitted Transport Assessment).

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

However, the developer should be made aware that whilst this design had been agreed in principle for the purposes of the planning appeal, it had not passed through the formal S278 process, and as such this will be required prior to any access works being undertaken.

This will require additional information such as formal engineering drawings to be submitted, and due to the relatively significant embankment works required to achieve adequate visibility it is strongly suggested that early engagement with the S278 team is undertaken, as this process may require updates to the design which could affect the proposed layout.

Land ownership issues (to be verified) have also been raised by members of the public which could prevent the implementation of elements of the proposed access and footway works, and as such conditions should be in place (outlined below) stipulating that no works can start on site until the S278 is agreed and constructed.

Details of the S278 process can be found via the following link:

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

#### **PEDESTRIAN LINKS:**

As mentioned above, and as outlined in the applicants Transport Assessment, the site has previously been granted permission at appeal by the government inspector. One of the reasons for objection from HCC as Local Highway Authority was in regard to the inadequate pedestrian provision, relating to the lack of footway / safe walking route north and west from the site on Satchell Lane.

HCC / EBC provided evidence on this matter to the Inquiry and this was one of the Inspectors main considerations. The Inspector was however satisfied that there were suitable and safe walking routes available to users of the site and allowed the Appeal, finding: "42. Overall, there is no policy requirement that a specific walking route should be acceptable, especially when other routes and transport modes exist. Although I disagree with the appellants concerning the safety of the northern route for pedestrians, the appeal site is sustainable in locational terms having regard to the proximity of and accessibility to local services and facilities. It complies with policy LPR 100.T."

Whilst the inspectors opinion is respectfully taken into consideration, it does however remain the opinion of HCC as Local Highway Authority that the provision of footway links to the north and west of the site remain imperative for the realistic safe and sustainable (in line with the aims of the NPPF) travel of pedestrians from the site.

Whilst foot and (to an extent) cycle links are available on an elongated route to the south, then heading west and finally north, this route would be approximately 3.2km if utilised to access (for example) the local secondary school. Whilst this distance 'may' be deemed an acceptable distance by some, simple common sense would suggest that

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

teenagers accessing the school would most likely choose the shortest option (north and west) along Satchell Lane at approximately 1.3km distance.

Even in full knowledge of the associated safety issues, it may be unrealistic to believe the majority of children (and in reality adults) would choose a route over 2.5 times the distance of the shortest option.

Satchell Lane along this section of the route is essentially a country road in terms of facilities, with narrow lanes; no street lighting; winding in nature with limited visibility; and has a lack of refuge spaces for pedestrians to step into, compounded by steep side banks with a high level of vegetation that prevents utilisation if needing to get out of the way of a vehicle. The route is simply not promotable as a Safer Route to School (or other local facilities such as the Doctors Surgery) due to the identified road safety implications for pedestrians.

In terms of mitigation that could be forthcoming, it is unlikely that any footway could be provided along the route. Widening of the highway to accommodate such a facility would involve removal of vast stretches of habitat to the side of the road which is unlikely to be agreeable, and a route behind the landscaping would potentially be unsafe for other reasons such as the lack of visual security with users hidden behind trees and bushes.

As such, HCC as Local Highway Authority would be unable to support the application for these reasons. Undoubtedly once residents arrive, there would be calls to improve the route, and as mentioned, this is very unlikely to be achievable and highway safety issues would likely result.

#### **INTERNAL SITE LAYOUT:**

It is understood that a mix of S38 adopted areas and un-adopted areas are proposed for the roads and footways of the site, and whilst HCC would not necessarily object to the proposals for the unadopted areas it would be advisable that the developer ensures that the roads and footways are designed to minimum industry standards and / or Hampshire County Council's best practice as set out in <https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards> and onwards, that an appropriate Private Management Plan is put in place to deal with any future issues.

In regard to areas of the site where roads and footways are to be adopted, it should be noted that these 'planning application' consultee comments have been made utilising the plans submitted. Should adoption be required, the S38 process will still need to be undertaken in addition to any planning approval that may be granted by the Local Planning Authority, and the details of this process can be found via the following link - <https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards>.

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

This process will require additional information to that submitted to date, and require formal engineering drawings for assessment which may result in updates to the layout being required. As such, it is recommended that the developer engage with the S38 team at their earliest convenience.

For both S38 adopted areas as well as areas not proposed to be adopted, developers should also be made aware of the Advanced Payment Code (APC) that will be required by the Highway Authority. Details of this can be found via the following link - <http://documents.hants.gov.uk/transport/APCProcess-Guidancedocumentforwebsitev22018-04-02.pdf>

Having reviewed plans however, the following comments are made:

1. No dedicated turning head is provided for the rear parking area associated with plots 6 to 10, with reliance on an adequate aisle width for manoeuvres to be made. Whilst this is acceptable for private use vehicles, it does mean that a relatively long refuse vehicle reverse will be required to collect the associated bins with rear access. For this reason, it would be recommended that a bin collection point is provided for ease of service. The EBC Direct Services team may wish to comment on the details of this;
2. A narrow step out footway is provided for 3 of the 4 area of parallel parking bays, and this will need to be widened to conform to S38 requirements;
3. Where parking bays are located adjacent to vertical obstructions or landscaping, an additional step-out strip of 0.3m per affected side is required to ease user access. This appear to have been taken into consideration across the site which is welcomed;
4. Additional elements such as street lighting and tactile crossing point provision will need to be provided as part of the S278 process;
5. Forward visibility requirements for adoptable areas (S38) are set against a minimum design speed of 20mph, requiring a minimum of 25.0m of unobstructed forward visibility. It is noted that the applicants have reduced this standard in places, and as such they should engage with the S38 team as early as possible to discuss potential Departures from Standard, or preferably conform to the requirements through design updates. This should also include height requirements for any frontal landscaping, which should be out of visibility splays due to issues with ensuring maximum heights are retained when they may be within private areas. If revised plans can be submitted, they can be assessed accordingly;
6. Whilst the majority of the development is fully served with footway provision, there are areas that have minimal footways requiring a step out into the road almost immediately from the dwelling. Whilst speeds and visibility may accommodate this, it is likely that the S38 process will require specific comment of this within the Road safety

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

Audit to be submitted as part of the process. Again, early engagement with the S38 team is recommended to ensure updates to plans are not required, or a fully functioning footway provision is investigated and added to revised plans for review accordingly;

7. Vehicle tracking diagrams have been provided for refuse, fire and private car vehicles, and are in the main acceptable. There are certain areas of the site that are tighter than others, and could become blocked with obstructive parking, however as outlined below, TRO funding is requested to deal with this.

It should however be noted by the developer that the refuse vehicle movement in and out of the site access will need to form part of the S278 requirements.

8. In terms of parking, the quantum of vehicle spaces proposed has not been assessed, given this is a function of EBC as Local Parking Authority. It is however requested that the Case Officer ensures the parking standards are adhered to, as any shortfall is likely to result in obstructive parking both on the highway and on footways.

Parking layout has however been assessed, and is generally accepted bar the comment above concerning the step out area of 3 of the 4 parallel parking bay areas, and the requirements for visibility not being obstructed by landscaping. Bays associated with plot 58 do appear to be visually obstructed by formal parallel parking bays opposite however, and this should be reviewed

### **TRIP GENERATION:**

As part of the planning submission, the applicants have submitted a Transport Assessment which outlines the anticipated level of vehicle trips to be generated by the site, and also reviews two highway junctions, being the site access onto Satchell Lane via modelling software, and the uplift in vehicle flows associated with the area surrounding the junction of Satchell Lane / Hamble Lane and the adjacent Hamble Lane / Hound Road roundabout.

This work demonstrated that:

**A: Anticipated vehicle trips are shown to be:**

- 31 two way vehicle movements in the am peak (7 in / 25 out with rounding); and
- 33 two way vehicle movements in the pm peak (24 in / 9 out).

**B: Site access / Satchell Lane junction:**

Junction modelling has been undertaken for the proposed site access, and this demonstrates that given the flow of vehicles in and out of site, queues are very unlikely, and any delay will be minimal. The junction will work well within capacity.

**C: Satchell Lane / Hamble Lane and Hamble Lane / Hound Road impact:**

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

The applicants have also reviewed the potential impact on existing traffic flows within the local vicinity of the site, in terms of a percentage uplift anticipated to existing vehicle flows. This demonstrates how as a stand alone development, impact would be anticipated to be low.

Details provided show:

Satchell Lane:

- AM peak vehicle flows are anticipated to increase by 9.67% over existing
- PM peak vehicle flows are anticipated to increase by 1.45% over existing

Hamble Lane South:

- AM peak vehicle flows are anticipated to increase by 0.18% over existing
- PM peak vehicle flows are anticipated to increase by 0.13% over existing

Hamble Lane North:

- AM peak vehicle flows are anticipated to increase by 0.72% over existing
- PM peak vehicle flows are anticipated to increase by 1.27% over existing

Hound Road:

- AM peak vehicle flows are anticipated to increase by 0.50% over existing
- PM peak vehicle flows are anticipated to increase by 0.98% over existing

However, at a recent appeal dismissed by the Governments Planning Inspector - (Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/W/20/3255559 - O/18/84191 GE Aviation, Kings Avenue, Hamble-Le-Rice, SO31 4NF) the current issues of traffic were discussed and at point 52 of the decision notice.

Here, it outlined the 'March 2019 HCC report to the Executive Member for Environment and Transport, which states that until improvements to the northern section of Hamble Lane have been implemented it is considered inappropriate from a traffic perspective for further development to be allocated or permitted along Hamble Lane'.

At point 45, the inspector further outlines that 'There is no definition of 'severe' in the NPPF or elsewhere in policy. I consider that individual impacts at the Tesco Roundabout and Portsmouth Road junctions would be severe, particularly when compared to the current baseline and considering the cumulative impact of background growth elsewhere. Hamble Lane is already congested and the development would result in increased queuing. The appellant and HCC concur in their agreed statement on transport matters that the impact would not be severe subject to the agreed package of measures'.

Whilst the proposed development at Satchell Lane is smaller in scale than the GE Aviation site, and so impacts will be lower, in consideration of cumulative impacts, it is clear that congestion issues are already experienced on Hamble Lane.

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

As the inspector intimates, and the HCC report suggests, no further development should take place on Hamble Lane, until such times as the Hamble Lane Corridor Study is complete; the package of measures are fully identified, tested and found to be feasible; and funding sources for the implementation of such works have been identified.

Until such time, any additional development that directly feeds onto Hamble Lane (as is the case with this application) should not proceed or there is a high risk of a significant impact resulting due to cumulative affects.

In addition, if developers wish to continue with the application despite the issues as outlined above, due to the issues on Hamble Lane, it would be requested that formal transport modelling be provided in addition to that already received for:

- Hamble lane / Satchell Lane junction at three peak periods being 0800-0900 / 1430-1530 / 1700-1800; and

- Hamble Lane / Hound Road roundabout at three peak periods being 0800-0900 / 1430-1530 / 1700-1800.

#### **DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS:**

As outlined above, any development feeding onto Hamble Lane will undoubtedly have an impact on an already congested road. This will require mitigation measures to the local highway junctions, as well as a requirement to update local highway infrastructure such as bus stops. For this reason, highway developer contributions are requested, which when utilising the HCC Highways Contribution Policy in the first instance (a replication of the methodology behind the approved application, equates to £293,395 for the specific development quantum by bed type.

This would in the first instance be allocated to the following highway schemes, though this may be change in the interim period of the S106 being signed - should permission be granted.

- Hamble Lane corridor improvements;
- Bus subsidisation for existing services in the vicinity of the site;
- Bus infrastructure improvements; and
- To improve pedestrian and cycle links in the local area.

An additional contribution of £6,000 should also be secured towards necessary site junction and on-site Traffic Regulation Orders.

Whilst an objection is made to the proposals at this point, should the Case Officer be minded to approve the application, it would be requested that the following conditions

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

be applied:

## **CONDITIONS:**

### **1. ACCESS CONSTRUCTION PROVISION**

No development shall start on site until the access, including the footway and/or verge crossing shall be constructed and agreed lines of sight are provided in accordance with the approved plans. The lines of sight splays shall be kept free of any obstruction exceeding a height to be agreed during the S278 process above the adjacent carriageway and shall be subsequently maintained so thereafter.

Reason - To provide satisfactory access and in the interests of highway safety.

### **2. CONSTRUCTION METHOD STATEMENT REQUIRED**

No development shall start on site until a construction method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority, which shall include:

- (a) A programme of and phasing of demolition (if any) and construction work;
- (b) The provision of long term facilities for contractor parking;
- (c) The arrangements for deliveries associated with all construction works;
- (d) Methods and phasing of construction works;
- (e) Access and egress for plant and machinery;
- (f) Protection of pedestrian routes during construction;
- (g) Location of temporary site buildings, compounds, construction material, and plant storage areas;
- (h) Methodology for preventing dirt from the site reaching the highway, and should this fail, details of how this will be rectified - i.e utilisation of mechanical road sweepers; and
- (i) Demolition and construction work shall only take place in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason - In order that the Planning Authority can properly consider the effect of the works on the amenity of the locality.

### **PARKING PROVISION**

Before use of the development is commenced provision for parking shall have been made within the site in accordance with the approved plans and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason - To ensure adequate on-site car parking provision for the approved development.

Yours sincerely,

Matt Grantham

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