From: Highways Consult  
Sent: 16 February 2018 13:22  
To: Rob Sims  
Subject: RE: Consultation for 17/02723/FUL - Land To East Of Pamber Heath Road  
Pamber Heath Road Pamber Heath Hampshire  

Rob,

Please find attached highway comments.

For Highways Development Management  
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Application No. 17/02723/FUL

Location
Land To East Of Pamber Heath Road, Pamber Heath Road, Pamber Heath, Hampshire.

Proposal
Erection of 12 no. dwellings (Rural Exception Scheme) with associated access, car parking and landscaping.

DATE: 16 Feb.18
Highways Officer: AM

With respect to the above the Highways Development Management Team (HDMT) wishes to make the following highway observations.

---

**Recommendation**

i. With reference to BDBC Local Plan Policy CN9 (Transport), the Applicant’s proposals have been considered by the below Assessment.

ii. Taking this Assessment into account, and in particular the absence of a satisfactory Transport Statement, suitable vehicle swept path analysis and appropriate refuse and recycling collection points, etc., the HDMT is unable to conclude that these development proposals would comply with Policy CN9 of the Local Plan.

iii. Consequently, the HDMT is unable to make a favourable recommendation at this stage.

iv. Therefore, the Applicant is requested to provide an updated comprehensive robust Transport Statement and amended plans which satisfactorily address the concerns raised by the below Assessment.

---

**Assessment**

Integrate into the existing network

1. Vehicular and pedestrian access to the proposed development is via an existing access from Pamber Heath Road which will be realigned to accommodate traffic flows into the site. From inspection of the Visibility Splay Road Access drawing (Dwg. No. ADC1740-DR-001 Rev. P2, Nov.’17) the proposed access road into the development is 5.5m wide with 6m kerb radii and 2m footways adjoining with the existing footways.

2. The Transport Statement states that Pamber Heath Road is approximately 6.3m wide with footways measuring 1.6m wide on the eastern side of the carriageway and 1.2m on the western side of the carriageway. However it would appear that the existing carriageway is approximately 5.8m wide at the proposed access. The western side of Pamber Heath Road does not have a continuous footway but consists of several vehicle crossovers and grass verges adjacent to the highway and the existing footway on the eastern side of Pamber Heath Road is approximately 1.4m wide.

3. The Transport Statement details that an Automatic Traffic Counter (ATC) was placed at the proposed access to record the speeds of traffic in both directions. However the ATC was only in operation for 48 hours and the survey took place over a weekend. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) states that ATC’s should be installed for a one or two week period in order to identify normal traffic patterns.
4. The results of the speed survey were used to determine sight stopping distance and appropriate visibility splays for the proposed access. Due to the short survey duration period, the HDMT cannot be confident that the results of the speed survey undertaken is a true reflection of normal traffic patterns on Pamber Heath Road. Therefore the HDMT requests that the ATC be carried out again for a longer duration (minimum 1 week).

5. The 85%ile speeds can then be calculated and appropriate visibility splays determined. The visibility splays should also be illustrated to the channel line and not offset 1m from the kerb line as illustrated on drawing ADC1740-DR-001 Rev. P2.

6. Notwithstanding the proposed 2m footways to tie into the existing footway along the eastern side of Pamber Heath Road, drawing ADC1740-DR-001 Rev. P2 does not illustrate any pedestrian crossings, including tactile paving and dropped kerbs. The proposed plan should be amended to incorporate this.

7. For the avoidance of doubt, the proposed access from Pamber Heath Road and any associated highway works, will have to be implemented under a Section 278 / Minor Works Agreement with HCC (refer to the link below).

Hampshire County Council - Standards for developers and engineers
https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards

8. Therefore, it is essential that the Applicant liaises with HCC as soon as possible in order to determine HCC’s design requirements for the access (see HCC’s ‘Section 278 Guidance for Developers’).

Proposed vehicular/non-vehicular access

9. An initial inspection of the proposed internal movement network illustrates that stretches of shared surfaces are proposed. The Applicant needs to demonstrate how this network will be retained free of obstructions (especially indiscriminate on-street parking) to provide safe and convenient access for all users, in particular refuse vehicle manoeuvres indicated by the Applicant’s swept path drawing, whilst also providing unhindered access for service and emergency vehicles at all times, in a manner that minimises any required reversing distances.

10. The Proposed Site Layout illustrates that there is no safe off-road continuous route for residents of Plot 2 to access their car parking space or refuse facilities. It appears that there is no direct route from the entrance of the dwelling for residents to access facilities at the rear of their property and will therefore be required to walk along the shared surface near the entrance to the development. The HDMT regards this to be unsafe and requests an amended plan to be submitted illustrating a footpath adjacent to the property which can be used.

11. The Proposed Site Layout illustrates that there is no direct route from the front of Plot 7 to access their bin and cycle storage facilities at the rear of the dwelling without having to carry cycles/bins through the dwelling. This is unacceptable and an amended plan needs to be submitted.

12. The Proposed Site Layout illustrates hedging and landscaping around the disabled parking bay, ensuring that a user will only be able to access the space via the shared surface. An amended plan needs to illustrate a safe means of access to this bay.
Vehicle swept paths

13. The HDMT notes that the proposed turning head is within the proposed parking court provided for Plots 1, 2 and 12. This is not deemed an appropriate location for a turning head due to potential conflict with parking vehicles. The Swept Path Analysis drawing also illustrates the refuse vehicles starting position to be inaccurate based on the predicted swept path it would make upon entering the access road. The swept path analysis indicates that the refuse vehicle will overrun landscaped areas in order to turn and also passes flush to vehicle parking bays. The swept path analysis does not provide a margin for the width of wing mirrors or potential for vehicles to overhang parking bays.

14. The swept path analysis of the access (Dwg. No. ADC 1740-DR-051 Rev. P2) illustrates that there is insufficient space for a vehicle to pass the refuse vehicle when it is entering/exiting the site. The access needs to be realigned to accommodate both vehicles.

15. An amended refuse swept path analysis drawing must be provided in paper and electronic format (suitable for viewing in Autocad 2018) which includes continuous tracking of a refuse vehicle entering the site from Pamber Heath Road, turning safely within the site and exiting the site onto Pamber Heath Road, ensuring that the vehicle does not encroach footways, adjacent parking bays, landscaping, etc.

16. The Applicant is also requested to submit a car swept path analysis drawing which includes vehicle tracking of a typical large family sized car entering and exiting the parking bays within the parking court (Plots 1, 2 and 12) to ensure there is sufficient space to safely manoeuvre into the parking bays without encroaching footways, adjacent parking bays, landscaping, etc.

Parking

17. The Proposed Site Layout drawing illustrates a total of 25 parking bays within the development, with 5 bays offered as unallocated parking bays. This complies with the LPA’s standards for the housing mix specified, with 20% spaces being unallocated.

18. Perpendicular parking bays adjacent to footpaths and footways should be increased to 5.5m in length to avoid vehicles overhanging and obstructing pedestrian movement. Perpendicular parking bays in car ports should be increased to at least 5m to avoid overhanging the parking bay and interfering with vehicle maneuvering and turning space.

Appropriate waste and recycling storage areas

19. The Proposed Site Plan does not illustrate bin collection zones. A plan should be submitted demonstrating bin collection facilities in accordance with Appendix 6 of the Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document ‘Storage and Collection of Waste and Recycling’ where refuse and recycling collection points must be provided within the curtilage of the site and must not hinder vehicular nor pedestrian access/egress to dwellings or visibility sightlines.

I hope that the above is of assistance.

For Highways Development Management
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council