

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

Hampshire 2050
The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UL

Telephone 0300 555 1375
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

<i>Enquiries to</i>	Zara Rogers	<i>My reference</i>	055529
<i>Direct Line</i>	N/A	<i>Your reference</i>	O/24/98619
<i>Date</i>	25 February 2025	<i>Email</i>	eastleighdc@hants.gov.uk

For attention of Mrs Martin

Dear Sirs

Re: O/24/98619 At Land South of Mortimers Lane, Fair Oak

Outline application with all matters reserved (apart from access) for the construction of up to 245 dwellings (Use Class C3) and up to 350sqm multi-functional building (Use Class E - commercial, business or service or Use Class F2 - Community), with associated open space and play area, landscaping, SuDS, infrastructure, mobility hub and vehicular access off Mortimers Lane

Thank you for the consultation for the above application. The application seeks to gain outline planning permission for a residential development consisting of 245 dwellings and a multifunctional hub, with a new access of Mortimers Lane. It is noted that HCC have previously engaged with the applicant on this site via HCC pre-application service.

In terms of this application, the applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (reference 24_8230679_AJ_Transport_Assessment) and associated plan and drawings that looks to embellish on the advice given during pre-app. Upon review, the Highway Authority would like to make the following comments.

Existing situation:

The site is situated on land south of Mortimers Lane, on the eastern edge of Fair Oak. The existing site consists of green fields with an existing gated access onto Mortimers Lane. Mortimers Lane is subject to a 30mph speed limit up to 100m east of the junction of Mortimers Lane and Pembers Farm Avenue, and with the remainder being a derestricted national speed limit.

Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Site Accessibility:

The Transport Assessment sets out that the majority of the facilities and amenities located in Fair Oak are located within two kilometres from the centre of the site. This consists of the local school, shops, banks and food outlets. It is noted that this is outside of the recommended distance set out by Active Travel England.

Furthermore, Fair Oak Infant School is likely to be slightly over the CIHT recommended preferred maximum walking distance of 2km from the southeastern extent of the site. Most destinations are over 20 minutes' walk from the site and the distance to local facilities is likely to encourage short trips by private car rather than active travel. The distance to amenities is on the cusp of what the LHA consider acceptable for a site of this scale and provision of high-quality active travel links will be essential for the LHA to consider the proposed development sustainably located.

WCHAR (Walking, Cycling and Horse Ridding Assessment)

A WCHAR assessment has been undertaken, reviewing the quality of the routes via sustainable modes to several destination listed above. The following routes have been assessed.

- Route 1 – west to the bus stops on Mortimers Lane;
- Route 2 – west to Fair Oak village centre;
- Route 3 – to Fair Oak Infant and Junior School, Wyvern College, Wyvern Day Nursery and Gym (via Mortiers Lane, residential streets or Knowle Park);
- Route 4 – south to Knowle Park;
- Route 5 – south to Knowle Lane employment area;
- Route 6 – west to Stokewood Surgery and Kings School; and
- Route 7 - north towards Crowdhill and Colden Common.
- Route 8 - south to Hedge End railway station, Chalcroft Business Park;
- Route 9 – west to Eastleigh Town centre.

The WHCAR has identified several deficiencies within these routes and has produced a table for user opportunities highlighting where improvement to these routes should be considered. Whilst the Highway Authority agree with the “green” improvements in principle, a concept masterplan plan to highlight where these deficiencies are within the network, with an associated drawing of each improvement, should be submitted for review to be secured within any future S106 for the applicant to implement via S278.

Bus services:

The closest existing bus stop is located on Mortimers Lane, approximately 730m to the west of the site access. This is served by bus numbers 69 and 649. Bus service 69 provides an hourly service between Winchester and Fareham,

including peak times. Furthermore, additional bus services are available from “the Square” in the centre of Fair Oak (c.1.6km from the centre of the site), which provides an additional service between Eastleigh and Southampton.

As part of the development proposals, the applicant is proposing to introduce a new pair (eastbound and westbound) of bus stops, approximately 400m from the centre of the application site (c.180m from site access), located between Mortimers Lane junction with Knowle Lane and the Pembers Hill residential scheme site access. HCC support the introduction of an additional stop, with further comments on the proposals in the below sections. This additional proposed bus stop is envisaged to be an additional stop on the normal service, providing a bus service to the site within an acceptable distance

Rail:

Both Eastleigh and Hedge End station are within 6km of the application site, which have frequent trains to a range of destinations including, Southampton and London Waterloo.

Multi-use Mobility Hub:

The proposals include a multi-functional hub which will comprise up to 350m², and is proposed to be an ancillary use to the main residential development. The transport assessment highlights that the exact use is still under consideration, but could include vehicle charging points, ATM, or other facilities. However, the TA further explains that the primary use is to serve the residents of the development and to reduce the reliance on private car. While the LHA welcome the principle of this, future details at this stage would be beneficial to give an idea of the potential for this to reduce trips by private car. Details of operators/ongoing maintenance etc should also be considered

PIA (personal injury Accident) Data:

PIA data has been provided as agreed during pre-app. This is therefore acceptable to the Highway Authority. There are no patterns of accidents that require mitigation.

Proposed Development:

The proposed development seeks outline planning permission for up to 245 dwellings, with a new access of Mortimer Lane.

Vehicular Access:

Access to the site is proposed to take the form of a new priority junction, with a ghost island right turn lane. Visibility splays have been provided, with these in accordance with the 85th percentile of measured speeds. It should be noted that during pre-app with the LHA, a departure from standard was agreed in principle to provide a reduced visibility X distance of 2.4m, with the right-hand emerging

visibility achievable to the nearside kerb line and the left hand spay achievable to the centre line. This was deemed as being acceptable due to the proposed splitter island to the west of the access, which would prevent any overtaking manoeuvres along this stretch. The proposed splitter island to the west of the proposed access seems to be positioned in the right turn lane and may need amending to prevent vehicle conflict; this can be addressed during S278 detailed design should the site come forward

Furthermore, the proposals also look to relocate the existing gateway feature and 30mph speed limit signage to the east of the new junction. Whilst there are no objections in principle to this, this is subject to a TRO (traffic regulation order) approval. The applicant is advised that the statutory TRO process can be time-consuming. To begin this process, the applicant should contact Hampshire County Council's Traffic Management team at traffic.management@hants.gov.uk, at the earliest opportunity.

Swept path analysis has been undertaken for a range of vehicle manoeuvres entering and existing the site. These appear acceptable to the Highway Authority.

Whilst an RSA has been undertaken for the proposed access, it should be noted that it is not the responsibility of the safety auditor to mention the maintenance routine of the Highway Authority. The designer appears to have agreed that the visibility splays should be clear via the maintenance routine; however, the access splays will be under the responsibility of the developer from the start of works until adoption. Removal of vegetation may be required to facilitate the visibility splay at the access. This can be addressed during S278 detailed design should the site come forward.

Pedestrian and Cycle Access:

Pedestrian and Cycle Access will be delivered to the site through the provision of 2.0m wide footway either side of the access, connecting to the 1.8m footway delivered by the Mortimer Farm application. A crossing point has been provided at this access to facilitate this east-west connection. However, visibility splays at this crossing point have only been shown for one direction; visibility splays for pedestrians should be provided in all directions, in accordance with HCC TG3 guidance.

Offsite Highway Works:

Several off-site highway works have been put forward as part of these proposals which include:

- Cycle improvements and a new bus stops on Mortimers Lane
- Shared use facility along Botley Road
- Cycling markings Knowle Lane

Upon review, the Highway Authority would like to make the following comments. However, as a general comment, no RSA has been undertaken for these improvements; this is required.

Cycle Improvement and Bus Stop on Mortimers Lane:

These proposals include the introduction of a 3m shared use path from the application site, tying into the HCC shared use scheme along Mortimers Lane. The proposals also look at including two new bus stops, including bus shelters, on both sides of Mortimers Lane, along with litter bins and cycle Sheffield stands. However, upon review, whilst HCC support the proposals in principle, additional consideration to the design is required now as set out below.

It should be noted that given the proximity of trees to the new proposed 3m shared use path, specialised materials (permeable surface course and binder) may be required, and if so, this would require the approval by HCC asset management team. Furthermore, any removal of highway trees will incur a CAVAT fee.

It is advised that the applicants consider the depth of the ditch and the existing lamp column and the potential for pedestrians to fall into the ditch, on the northern side of the proposals. Furthermore, the northern footway is being proposed at 1.9m which is below the standard width of an HCC adoptable footway and therefore increasing this to 2m should be explored.

Botley Road Shared use:

The proposal includes changes to the operation of the Botley Road/ Eastleigh Road / Stubbington Way junction, with the introduction of a shared use path on the western side of the carriageway. A short section of shared use is also proposed on the Stubbington Way arm. Whilst the Highway Authority welcome these proposals as it increases the opportunity to travel via sustainable modes, the following comments are made regarding the design.

Limited dimension details have been provided for the Botley Road shared use facility, and therefore the dimensions/geometry should be provided (both for carriageway width and shared use path). This should highlight where it complies, or does not comply, with HCC technical guidance and justification / mitigation measures should be provided where a departure from standard is required. It is noted that there are multiple pinch points along the Botley Road southern section of the proposed shared use facilities and anything less than the standards set out within TG10 will require a Departure from Standards (DfS). Furthermore, it is not clear how the widening works will interact with the current street furniture and retaining features and this should be clarified. Whilst the designer has identified several existing items of street furniture for removal (pedestrian guardrail), all street furniture, signs etc. should be considered for removal/ relocation to facilitate the shared use facility.

Furthermore, at the junction of Botley Road/ Eastleigh Road / Stubbington Way, although the intervisibility at this junction for both the existing and HCC proposed scheme falls outside the highway boundary, the proposals include further changes to the intervisibility at this junction; this may require a DfS.

In terms of the changes to both the operation and layout of the junction, this has been reviewed by HCC ITS team. It should be noted that as part of this review, three separate layouts have been compared to each other in terms of modelling and feasibility. These include:

- HCC proposed junction layout (removing the Winchester Road north centre island to increase right turn storage)
- Applicant layout proposal (as above plus removal of Botley Road and Stubbington Way centre islands to facilitate off road pedestrian/cycle route plus HCC proposed changes)
- ITS amended Applicant layout proposal (as above but reassignment of Botley Road northbound ahead traffic to nearside lane)

The traffic flows used throughout the assessment for each have been taken from the Transport Assessment.

In terms of the Applicant proposed junction layout, the following comments are made:

- There is no waiting space for vehicles who are gap seeking, turning right into Stubbington Way. As a result, Botley Road northbound traffic is blocked.
- The removal of the island and realignment of Botley Road North Bound causes a direct conflict with vehicles waiting to turn right into Eastleigh Road. As a result, vehicles heading North Bound will need to veer around the waiting vehicles to avoid collision. This manoeuvre complete at higher speeds would increase risk significantly.
- As a result of vehicles veering around waiting vehicles, it imposes risk on vehicles turning left into Eastleigh Road.
- Signal Heads on Stubbington Way Island will be lost as a result of the proposal to remove the refuge island. An offside closely associated secondary will be lost for Stubbington Way. There is an existing visibility issue to the nearside primary on Stubbington Way due to overhanging vegetation. Consideration of where to relocate this signal head will be required.
- The secondary signal head will be lost for the Eastleigh Road approach. Consideration of where to relocate this signal head will be required, most likely to one of the signal poles on Stubbington Way.
- The secondary signal head will be lost for the Botley Road right turn into Eastleigh Road as a result of the proposed removal of the refuge island.
- The offside primary signal head will be lost for Botley Road northbound as a result of the proposed removal of the refuge island. Consideration of where to relocate this signal head will be required

In terms of modelling and capacity through this junction, a comparison between the HCC proposed scheme and the applicant scheme has been undertaken.

The table below indicates the Practical Reserve Capacity (PRC), Degree of Saturation and Total Delay for the HCC proposed junction. 'Current' refers to predicted traffic flows with the HCC Fair Oak NMU scheme, 'Future + Committed' includes predicted traffic flows in the future, and committed developments in the area. Whilst the final scenario 'Future + Committed + Development' also includes the proposed development to land south of Mortimers Lane.

HCC Proposed Junction Layout	Traffic flow scenarios					
	Current		Future + Committed		Future + Committed + Development	
	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
PRC (%)	8.2	8.5	-5.1	-4.1	-9.6	-10.1
Degree of Sat (%)	83.2	83.0	94.6	93.7	98.6	99.1
Total Delay (pcuHr)	20.54	22.02	33.49	33.15	44.81	46.74

The table below indicates the Practical Reserve Capacity (PRC), Degree of Saturation and Total Delay for the applicant's proposed junction amendments.

Applicant Proposed Layout	Future + Committed + Development	
	AM	PM
PRC (%)	-32.3	-45.1
Degree of Sat (%)	119.1	130.6
Total Delay (pcuHr)	127.1	181.56

As seen by the tables above, the applicant's scheme in terms of the PRC (Practical Reserve Capacity) indicates a negative value of -32.3% in the AM peak and -45.1%, because of oversaturated lanes on Eastleigh Road and Botley Road northbound. This therefore means queues would not clear in one cycle during peak times at the junction, with significant delays in both AM and PM peaks. This proposed scheme therefore has an unacceptable impact.

Subsequently, HCC have taken the proposed junction design (that is, the applicant's scheme) and have made small changes to it. This now avoids the conflict between Botley Road NB and Botley Road SB right turn. On the northbound approach, the ahead traffic has been reassigned to use the nearside lane together with left turning traffic and the offside lane is designated for right turners only. The model has been tested with the 'Future + Committed + Development' traffic flows only. The approaches experiencing the biggest delays include Botley Road northbound (AM Peak 67 seconds & PM peak 51 seconds) and Eastleigh Road (AM Peak & PM peak 33 seconds). This is an improvement on the scenario recommended by the applicant.

ITS amended S278 Mortimers Lane proposed layout	Future + Committed + Development	
	AM	PM
PRC (%)	-25.5	-22.8
Degree of Sat (%)	112.9	110.5
Total Delay (pcuHr)	106.11	115.56

Ultimately, further amendments and discussions are required regarding the design of this junction (and shared use path) before it can be considered acceptable.

Knowle Lane:

The proposals include the provision of cycle markings along the northern section by the junction on Mortimers Lane as well as the Southern section by Botley Road. Upon review the following comments are made.

Through pre-app discussions it was understood that a share-use path along Knowle Lane to Deer Park would be explored, but this has not been taken forward. Instead on road cycle marking are being proposed. Clarity and justification over why these have been provided over amending the existing footway route to a shared-use facilities should be explained. The WCHAR suggest that this is down to Third Party Land Ownership, but this should be presented to the Highway Authority to review as there appears to be adequate highway land available to implement a shared use route. Additionally, it is recommended that LNT1/20 and HCC TG10 guidance is reviewed as these cycle markings do not appear to adhere to this guidance and therefore may not be supported (possibly subject to RSA comments). *“Cyclists must be physically separated and protected from high volumes motor traffic, both at junction and on stretches of road between them”*. Further/ alternative mitigation in this area should be explored.

Trip Generation:

The TA indicated that during pre-app discussions it was agreed that trip generation could either be based on the TRICS database or a survey of the recently constructed development at Pembers Farm Avenue.

As such, the TA has presented data regarding the traffic generation and resultant trip rates from the latter turning count surveys, which would result in 142 AM peak two-way vehicular movement and 105 PM peak two-way vehicular movement. It is noted that the data obtained from the Pembers Hill turning Counts results in a lower forecast trip generation compared to the TRICS trip rate, however this is acceptable.

Trip Distribution:

Distribution has been calculated by the trip purpose. This is acceptable to the Highway Authority. However, for clarity, the overall development trip distribution

should be clearly presented for review; this is currently titled 'Total Dev Trips – AM/PM TRICs', however, appears to be based on the Pembers Hill traffic survey trip rates (not TRICs). Clarification should be provided. Furthermore, these stick diagrams appear to have some missing information through junctions J7 and J9, with 30 trips inexplicably lost. The distribution should be checked and amended, with modelling inputs and percentage impact of development traffic updated if necessary; it may be that Junction 7 requires modelling.

Finally, there seem to be some discrepancies between the AM and PM peak; for example, in the AM peak 30 trips route south through J6 and in the PM peak, only 4 trips route north.

Assignment:

The trip assignment method has not been stated and this should be clarified.

Modelling:

The following scenarios have been used for modelling which include:

- Base Year.
- Future Year + Committed Development Flows.
- Future Year + Committed Development + Development Flows.

TEMPro has been used to grow the baseline traffic with committed developments added separately. This is acceptable to the Highway Authority. However, as above it is not clear whether the trips are associated with the TRICS database or Pembers Hill traffic surveys have been used within the modelling; this should be clarified.

The following junctions have been modelled, with the study area agreed during pre-app. It was suggested that only junctions that are subject to an increase in traffic by 5% due to the development should be modelled. Therefore, the following junctions have been assessed:

- Site Access / Mortimers Lane (new junction);
- Mortimers Lane/ B3354 Winchester Road priority junction;
- B3354 Winchester Road/ B3037 Eastleigh Road/ Botley Road/ Stubbington Way traffic signal-controlled junction;
- Mortimers Lane/ Knowle Lane priority junction;
- Mortimers Lane/ Pembers Farm Avenue priority junction.

The results indicate that the Mortimer's Lane/Winchester Road junction would operate within capacity, currently and in the future year. This finding is considered questionable for two reasons. Firstly, the modelling results for the Pembers Hill application (O/15/77190) show this junction to operate over practical capacity (RFC of 0.85) in the base year (2018) and significantly over capacity in the future year with development. There is a similar situation in the assessment carried out for the One Horton Heath application, with the development well over capacity in the base (2020) and future years. The model

set up has not been reviewed in detail, however, this discrepancy appears to be due to significantly lower surveyed flows. The HA is aware of ongoing works on Mortimers Lane, with signalised one way working, that may have resulted in throttling of traffic, or redistribution, temporarily reducing traffic flows through this junction. As such, the based flows presented are not agreed, and this junction should be resurveyed, ensuring free flow traffic conditions on Mortimers Lane at that time.

Secondly, the traffic CCTV data, shows this junction queuing. While this may, in part, be due to downstream queuing blocking back through this junction, calibration with queue length data should be considered in any revised assessment.

The other junctions including the site access, Mortimers Lane / Knowle Lane, Mortimers Lane/ Pember Farm Avenue junction all operate within capacity within the future years assessment.

Comments regarding the operation of B3354 Winchester Road/ B3037 Eastleigh Road/ Botley Road/ Stubbington Way traffic signal-controlled junction are mentioned above. But in summary, the proposed junction arrangement, with this development, tips the operation of this junction over capacity, with significant increases in queue lengths due to development trips. Careful consideration of improvements at this junction will be required.

Travel Plan:

This Travel Plan has been assessed using Hampshire County Council's (HCC's) evaluation criteria for the assessment of travel plans – "A guide to development related travel plans".

Section 1

Title page

This section should contain the following:

- Date of Submission
- Planning reference

Introduction

This section should contain the following:

- Known applications in the vicinity, likely to impact this proposal
- Purpose of the travel plan

Section 2

This section should contain the following:

Site Audit Existing

- Footways and cycleways, including:
- Walking Isochrone Map

Section 3

This section does not require any further amendments.

Section 4

This section does not require any further amendments.

Section 5

This section should contain the following:

Measures

There are some additional measures which should be considered for inclusion within this FTP. Some of these measures may be applicable only to residents or employees, or to both groups

Walking

- Improvements to (and maintenance of) the walking network and signage
- Coordinate with schools to organise walking to school events

Cycling

- Sustainable travel voucher
- Formation of a Bicycle Users Group (BUG)
- Bike maintenance events e.g. Bike Dr, minimum annually

Public Transport

- Sustainable travel voucher
- Collaboration with local public transport providers to improve services, negotiate discounts and trial initiatives

Marketing and Promotion

- Hold events
- Introduction of a personalised journey planning scheme

Management / TPC role

- A commitment to establish a Steering Group

The travel plan should include a estimated total cost of the TPC based on the time spent on travel plan per week, the number of weeks per year to be working on the travel plan and the measures / actions accolated to the TPC.

Section 6

This section should contain the following:

Monitoring

- Monitoring timetable as laid out below:

	Baseline (Year 1)	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Level of report	To be submitted one year after occupation. This will include the baseline survey results found in the updated Full Travel Plan and a monitoring report.	Monitoring Report	Full Surveys - Monitoring Report	Monitoring Report	Full Surveys - Monitoring Report

- Snapshot surveys to be conducted for years where a full survey will not be carried out.
- Recognition that HCC requires a 35% response rate for questionnaire surveys.
- Measures to ensure that this response rate is met, e.g., a voucher for supermarket or online retailer.
- Alternative method of survey if 35% response rate not achieved, e.g., ATCs/TRICS.
- Keep records of participation in sustainable travel scheme and incentives

The travel plan is missing a number of important sections without which it cannot be approved. These have been outlined below.

Guidance

The travel plan should include a list and description of the national and local policy documents that are relevant to the site. These may include, but are not limited to:

National

- National Planning Policy Framework (2021)
- Planning Practice Guidance 'Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements' (2014)
- CIHT's 'Guidelines Planning for Walking' (2015)
- CIHT's 'Buses in Urban Developments' (2018)
- DfT's Manual for Streets (2007)
- LTN 1/20 Cycle infrastructure design

Regional

- Hampshire's Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 (2013)
- Hampshire County Council's 'A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans' (2019)

Local (where applicable)

- LPA Parking SPD
- LPA Clean Air Policy
- LPA Local Plan
- LPA Electric Vehicle SPD
- Neighbourhood Plans

Site Audit Proposal

The travel plan should include the details of the proposed development.

- Site quantum
- Site boundary
- Class use
- Plan
- Car parking, including:
- LPA/LHA SPD guidelines (including electric vehicles)

- Quantum
 - Location
 - Type
- Cycling parking, including:
 - LPA/SPD guidelines
 - Quantum
 - Location
 - Type
- Internal highway design, including:
 - Roads
 - Footways
 - Cycleways
 - Guidelines used to inform them
- Accesses, if they're changing, including:
 - The impact on sustainable travel
- Transport contributions affecting the site (where applicable)

Delivery and Enforcement

The needs to be a section relevant to enforcement should include the following detail:

- Paragraph explaining the role of the Section 106 agreement including the value of the Travel Plan Cash Deposit (where applicable)
- Commitment to pay HCC's monitoring and approval fees
- Commitment to provide a Travel Plan Cash Deposit of equal value to travel plan measures
- Sanctions in the event of non-compliance

Conclusion

A final paragraph should conclude the travel plan summarising the key points from each section.

The FTP will require further amendments as set out above before it can be considered acceptable for submission in conjunction with the proposed site.

Recommendations:

Further information as mentioned above is required before the Highway Authority can provide a formal recommendation.

Yours faithfully,

Zara Rogers

Transport Planner - Highway Development Planning
Hampshire 2050