# **Clare Spiller**

From: Clare Spiller

**Sent:** 25 October 2022 11:05

To: James Gilfillan

Cc: Simon Mcfarlane - AJC Group; Giles Moir

Subject: Orchard Gate, Dibden Purlieu

Attachments: FW: 5577: Dibden Purlieu - Detail Application

#### **Dear James**

Please see attached in the email attachment the Highways Consultants comments to Hampshire CC highways comments.

I also attach a couple of CGI images which can be found in the link below:

## https://www.dropbox.com/t/mnRHn82KjptqJ0vx

In response to your request for an extension of time, we are not against an EOT but we would like to have a face to face meeting with yourself to discuss your thoughts on this proposal and any outstanding issues there might be. It would also be useful to discuss timeframes with you in respect of the need to carry out over winter groundwater monitoring.

Kind regards

Clare Spiller Senior Planner Chapman Lily Planning Limited



M: 07387 419793

T: Wareham, Dorset Office: 01929 553818

E: clare.spiller@clplanning.co.uk W:http://www.clplanning.co.uk

Unit 5 Designer House, Sandford Lane, Wareham, BH20 4DY

Follow us on Twitter: @cl\_planning, and Facebook: chapmanlilyplanning

To receive our newsletter containing updates on planning matters please email <a href="mailto:co.uk">co.uk</a> requesting to be added to the mailing list

This email transmission is strictly confidential and intended solely for the person or organisation to whom it is addressed. It may contain confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify Chapman Lily Planning Ltd as soon as possible via <a href="mailto:contact@clplanning.co.uk">contact@clplanning.co.uk</a> and delete it.

## **Clare Spiller**

From:

Debby Wise <debbywise@bellamyroberts.co.uk>

Sent:

18 October 2022 17:28

To:

Simon Mcfarlane - AJC Group

Subject:

FW: 5577: Dibden Purlieu - Detail Application

Attachments:

5577-001 Rev E.pdf

Dear Simon

Please find amended email as discussed earlier.

Orchard Gate, Noads Way, Dibden Purlieu Planning Application 22/10813

HCC Reference: 046924

I am in receipt of the County Highway Authority's consultation response of the 4<sup>th</sup> October and write to provide you with my comments and use the headings within the HCC letter.

### Walking

The isochrones appended to the Transport Statement accurately reflect the distances to the nearby facilities and I provide below the distances from the site to those facilities listed by the Authority.

Junior and Infant School 554m Secondary School 612m Forestside Surgery 737m Local shopping facilities 570m Family Church Waterside 752m

### Cycling

No comment.

#### Bus

No comment.

## **WCHAR**

This is an assessment of the existing pedestrian and cycle routes taken from the site to various destinations, such as the nearby schools and local shops. Bearing in mind the modest scale of the development proposed, and such an exercise is not mandatory, I believe the request is not essential in this instance and would be an unnecessary additional cost to the application.

#### **Accident History**

The Authority has requested that accident data should be obtained from Hampshire Constabulary, albeit the CrashMap data provided within the TS provides the same data as one would obtain from Hampshire Constabulary.

Whilst the Hampshire Constabulary information can be obtained, the expected turnaround of receiving the data is 3 months, which is clearly outside the planning process timeframe. I would therefore suggest that the Highway Authority has the relevant data, although it comes from a different source.

The Council has accepted CrashMap data previously and should do so again, bearing in mind both sets of data are the same.

## Visibility Splays

The plan 5577/001 Rev. D illustrates the visibility at the access of 2.4m x 43m in each direction, which was prepared before the speed surveys were undertaken and submitted within the Addendum Transport Statement. The speed survey was undertaken between 15<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> July 2022 as stated, and recorded 85<sup>th</sup>%ile speeds of:

31.4 mph northeast bound

31.1 mph southwest bound

The splays have been calculated as being 41.4m and 40.7m correctly. The period of the survey was dry and therefore there is no need to adjust the speeds.

The stopping sight distance calculated within TG3 of the Council's guidance was produced for the 'y' dimensions. However, the calculations add a distance of 2.4m to the 'y' distance for bonnet length. Such a requirement is not in accordance with MfS. The bonnet length should be added for the stopping sight distance (SSD), and I refer to Section 7.5 of MfS. Such a requirement is for vehicles travelling along the road and not stationery at the T-junction or access.

Section 7.7 of MfS refers to the 'y' dimension which is the distance a vehicle wishing to exit a junction or access which is required to see oncoming traffic. There is no requirement to add 2.4m to such a distance.

The vehicle travelling along the road (SSD) requires the extra 2.4m bonnet length, however, this visibility is taken at least 1.5m from the kerbside edge for the vehicle travelling along the major road and should not be applied to the 'y' dimension.

Paragraph 7.7.10 clearly states that the 'y' distance should be based on values for SSD, it does not say that the 'y' distance should be based on the values for SSD plus 2.4m bonnet length. That requirement clearly is for the traffic travelling along the major road, reference paragraph 7.6.4. This mis-reading of MfS is a common mistake.

However, notwithstanding the above point, I attach the revised access drawing illustrating the 'y' dimension of 46m in each direction rather than the required 43m, which is commensurate with the recorded speeds. (See plan 5577/001 Rev. E attached.)

## Internal Layout

An RSA at this stage is unnecessary. An RSA can be undertaken at the S38 stage. With regard to the tracking of the refuse vehicle shown at Appendix 6 of the Transport Statement, there is ample space within the layout for such a vehicle to manoeuvre safely within the site.

The on-street parking shown on the plan is for visitors who are unlikely to be parked during the collection of the refuse. Notwithstanding this, the carriageway is 5.5m wide which is ample width for a car and HGV to pass one another. Reference Figure 7.1 MfS.

# Arboriculture and Ecology

I refer the Authority to the Arboriculture report prepared by Treeworks Environmental Practice of June 2022.

#### **Parking**

No comment.

#### Traffic Impact

The trip rates have been established through the correct procedure set out within the TRICS database. The guidance notes within TRICS states that preconceived views on trip rates should not be made. The Highway Authority suggest the trip rate is lower than expected which goes against the user guide for TRICS.

I therefore trust the above is of assistance and should you require clarification on any matter please do not hesitate to give me a call.

Kind Regards

Ian Roberts MCIHT Partner

## **Bellamy Roberts**

Highway Transportation and Infrastructure Consultants

Clover House, Western Lane, Odiham, Hampshire, RG29 1TU

Tel: 01256 703355 Mobile: 07778 299608

Contact Email: ianroberts@bellamyroberts.co.uk General Email: info@bellamyroberts.co.uk Web site: www.bellamyroberts.co.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email









This email and the information it contains is confidential and may contain copyright material. The information is intended only for the use of the person or person's to whom it is addressed. Any unauthorised use, disclosure or copying of this email or any information it contains is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, and receive it by mistake, please notify the sender immediately. Please also destroy any hard copies and delete the message from your computer. Thank you for your cooperation.

