

New Forest District Council  
Appletree Court  
LYNDHURST  
Hampshire  
SO43 7PA

Hampshire 2050  
The Castle  
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD

Telephone: 0300 555 1375  
Fax: 01962 847055

[www.hants.gov.uk](http://www.hants.gov.uk)

Enquiries To Anna Li

My reference 051584

Direct Line 01962 847438

Your reference 22/11424

Date 6 February 2024

Email Hampshire.Highways.New  
ForestDC@hants.gov.uk

Dear Mr. Thain,

**SS6 Land EAST OF LOWER PENNINGTON LANE, PENNINGTON, LYMINGTON  
SO41 8AN**

**Erection of up to 82 No. Dwellings, including Access, Highways Works, Public  
Open Space (POS), Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG),  
Landscaping and Drainage Attenuation (Outline Application with details of  
Access and Layout only)**

Further to the initial highway response dated 26th April 2023, the applicant has now submitted further information in a revised Transport Assessment (Ref: 6181 dated September 2023). Highway comments to this further information are set out below. The previous highway response should be read in conjunction with this response. The applicant has very recently submitted further technical work associated with mitigation designs in a Technical Note (TN05-6181). This has not been considered within the response below and will be reviewed and comments provided in due course.

**Walking and Cycling**

In the previous highway response, the HA requested the applicant to carry out a Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Assessment & Review (WCHAR) to routes between the site and local amenities including schools, shops, bus stops and town centre. In

Director of Hampshire 2050  
Gary Westbrook

response to this request, the applicant has now submitted a WCHAR (Ref: 6181 dated September 2023).

The study area of the WCHAR focused on Ridgeway Lane, Lower Pennington Lane and Pennington Cross roundabout. The WCHAR identified a number of existing issues with the walking infrastructure on the routes from the site to local key amenities and the applicant has subsequently proposed the following schemes (in *Italic* font) to improve sustainable mode facilities. Having reviewed the design of the proposed schemes, the HA raises the following comments which are shown under each the proposed schemes:

On Ridgeway Lane:

1. *Provision of a 2.0m wide pedestrian route connecting the site to Forest Gate Gardens to the north; Provision of a new pedestrian crossing on Ridgeway Lane, connecting Forest Gate Gardens to the proposed footway/cycleway running through Woodside Park.*

The Applicant has changed this path from a 3m-shared-use path to a 2m-pedestrian path which will not be used for cycling. The previous misaligned crossing has been rectified in the re-submission, as such, it is considered acceptable in principle at this stage. The proposed scheme would however have impact on trees, the hedgerow, and the open ditch, as such would require further attention during the detail design stage.

2. *Provision of a new footway/cycle way running between ‘Brocklands Cottage’ and ‘The Buccaneer’, and a new pedestrian crossing on Ridgeway Lane to link with the proposed footway/cycleway running through Woodside Park;*

The HA is concerned about visibility around the bend of the proposed path crossing the property frontage, and delivery of this scheme, due to the potential impact to utilities, driveway gates of the private property. The applicant therefore should submit further details to show what the potential impact would be or to provide alternative design solution.

Director of Hampshire 2050  
Gary Westbrook

- 3. Provision of a 3m wide shared footway and cycleway running through Woodside Park up to Rookes Lane with an upgraded pedestrian crossing across Rookes Lane connecting to the existing footway on the northern side of the road;*

As raised in highways' previous response, the Town Council stated that the agreement of provision of the proposed new paths linking to Forest Gate Gardens and within Woodside Park pedestrian does not extend to allowing cycleways. The applicant therefore needs to confirm whether these paths are to be used by foot only, or as a shared use path, allowing use by cycles. Visibility splays (43m) at the crossing of Rookes Lane shown on the plan 2020-6181-118 are calculated based on 30mph posted speed limit. The visibility should be based on measured 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds derived from speed surveys. The applicant should demonstrate visibility splays at this crossing are achievable for the measured speeds and within the highway boundary or land controlled by the applicant. It is noted that the estimated required visibility for 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of 30mph is outside the highway boundary; it is therefore unlikely suitable visibility will be achievable. The applicant should consider how acceptable crossing provision is achieved in line with measured speeds and may wish to consider relocating this crossing point.

- 4. Provision of footways along the site's eastern vehicle access which would connect to a new section of footway on the eastern side of Ridgeway Lane proposed as part of the Poles Lane reconfiguration.*

Whilst the alignment of the footway is considered acceptable in principle at this stage, it's essential to ensure adequate visibility from the crossing landings is provided, particularly the eastern landing when looking north, due to the presence of a mature hedgerow. Depending on visibility requirements, the exact position of the crossing may need adjustment during the detail design stage.

#### On Lower Pennington Lane

- 5. Provision of a new footway along Lower Pennington Lane between Footpath 83 and Fox Pond Lane. Improvements (resurface and widening) to the existing footpath*

Director of Hampshire 2050  
Gary Westbrook

*adjacent to the property Sunnybank, cutting across the corner of the junction of Lower Pennington Lane/Fox Pond Lane;*

The HA is concerned about the construction / delivery of these proposals due to potential difficulty imposed by the adjacent trees and ditches. The applicant therefore should submit further details to show what the potential impact would be or to provide alternative design solution.

*6. Provide a connection between the site and the northwest section of the existing Footpath 83.*

The HA previously requested a connection between the Site and the northwestern section of the footpath 83 to be provided as well as improvements including upgrading the surface and width to this section of the footpath. The revised masterplan Drawing 2020-6181-101 Rev A has shown this connection but not the improvements. The HA requests the footpath improvements (including the existing bridge) to be provided via payment of a financial contribution to HCC's Countryside Service team and should be secured via S106. The value of this contribution should be discussed and agreed with HCC's Countryside Services team.

### Other requirements

In addition to the above comments, the applicant has updated and reviewed Personal Injury Accident Data (PIAs) in the WCHAR. It identified that there have been relatively high percentage of recorded accidents involving cyclists at the roundabout of Milford Road/North Street/Ridgeway Lane. Furthermore, the WCHAR also identified that tactile paving is missing at the pedestrian crossing near the junction of Milford Road/South Street. Therefore, walking and cycling improvements at this roundabout are required.

The HA previously requested a financial contribution of £58,080 from the applicant towards improvement at this roundabout, including walking and cycling facilities. The applicant has not confirmed if they accept this requirement; confirmation should be provided and the contribution secured within the S106 Agreement should the site come forward. It is understood there is a local desire for a signalised crossing to be provided at the existing uncontrolled crossing on Milford Road near South Street. This suggestion would be reviewed as part of the roundabout improvement works, however,

*Director of Hampshire 2050*  
**Gary Westbrook**

while the above contribution is required, provision specifically of this signalised crossing is not considered necessary to make this application acceptable.

### **Site Vehicular Accesses**

In the previous response, the HA raised concerns with regard to the site accesses and requested the applicant reviewed the designs and address the following concerns.

1. Review the stagger distance between the eastern access and Poles Lane, and submit a Departure from Standard (DfS) application.
2. Review the vehicle tracking speeds used in vehicle swept path analysis.
3. Review the speed data used to obtain visibility splays and justify the speed surveys or carry out additional surveys.
4. Provision of an Arboricultural Assessment.
5. Ensure all land required for visibility should be within highway land or be available for dedication to the highway authority.
6. Review the safety risk associated with the deeper sections of open ditches near the western access.

To address the first concern the applicant has submitted a Departure from Standard (DfS) application, including drawings 2020-6181-102, 2020-6181-104, 2020-6181-105,106,107, 108,109,110,111,112, and 2020-6181-113. The DfS application was discussed by the Departure Panel, including HCC's Chief Engineer, and it was concluded that the vehicle turning movement as presented will be in conflict with the crossing point on the opposite side of Ridgeway Lane. However, the panel agreed to the proposal in principle, subject to the introduction of an additional 500mm buffer on the critical tracked vehicle (outside of the vehicle envelope/overhangs including wing mirrors) at the proposed crossing point. The applicant has submitted an amended design and updated tracking drawings demonstrating this issue has been addressed.

The applicant has shown the vehicle tracking speeds used in vehicle swept path analysis on all the submitted drawings. As such, the second concern has been satisfactorily addressed at this stage.

The applicant has submitted justifications for the location of the speed surveys on Ridgeway Lane. The HA has reviewed the justifications as well as other supporting information and consider the surveyed speeds, which are used to obtain visibility splays

*Director of Hampshire 2050*  
**Gary Westbrook**

at the site accesses, are appropriate. The access arrangement has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and issues raised have been addressed. The HA therefore accepts the design of the site accesses as shown in principle on drawings 2020-6181-102 RevA and 2020-6181-103 RevA. Should planning permission be granted and the site progress, the applicant will be required to complete the S278 Agreement process to work on the highway. As part of this process a detailed design check will be carried out, including a requirement for further speed surveys and, depending upon the resulting visibility requirements, minor amendments to the designs may be required. However, the HA is content that if any minor amendments are required, these will be achievable within either existing highway or the developer controlled land available. It is noteworthy that a detailed design (Stage 2) Road Safety Audit will be carried out as part of the S278 process, as well as a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit upon opening of the works.

It is also worth noting that, whilst the design of the accesses is acceptable in principle in highway terms, the proposed access works would result in the loss of some trees/hedges. The loss of vegetation may be a concern for the Local Planning Authority. There are also ditches adjacent to the carriageway; as a note to the applicant, any works affecting the ditch will require Ordinary Watercourse Consent (OWC) prior to works commencing.

### **Local Widening**

The applicant has accepted most suggestions of local widening and resurfacing of Lower Pennington Lane and Ridgeway Lane and these improvements are shown on the drawings 2020-6181-131, and 2020-6181-132. The HA is discussing these areas with the applicant to find the most suitable approach.

### **Internal Site Layout**

In the previous response, the HA required the angle of new car park entrance to be modified. The applicant has submitted the revised the design which is considered acceptable in principle at this stage. It is noted that no footway link between the Oakhaven Hospice car park to the new footway along the western access, this needs to be provided and shown on the plan.

### **Construction Traffic Management**

*Director of Hampshire 2050*  
**Gary Westbrook**

No information has been submitted regarding construction traffic management. The HA requires additional details to be provided regarding the construction methodology and traffic management for the construction site accesses, off-site highway works, including any road closures/ diversion and the duration of the works. This is likely to require temporary traffic management, causing inconvenience to the locals, prior to the opening of the access and full link road. The impact of road closure/ diversion will also affect the decision if occupations will be acceptable prior to the completion of the site access works.

### **Amended Residential Travel Plan**

Following the HA's initial response, an updated Full Travel Plan has been submitted to address the issues raised. The updated Travel Plan is considered acceptable at this stage. The provision of a full Travel Plan, bond and associated fees should be secured within a Section 106 legal agreement if the application is granted planning permission.

### **Recommendation**

There are a number of areas where further information is required as set out in this response before the Highway Authority can provide a recommendation. Until the additional information is provided, the Highway Authority will not be in a position to agree the proposals.

I look forward to receiving further information in due course, at which point I will be able to provide an update on the position. In the meantime, if you are minded to determine the application, please contact the Highway Authority for highway reasons for refusal.

I trust the above is clear. Please do not hesitate to contact Anna Li should you wish to discuss anything further.

Yours sincerely,

Gemma McCart  
Strategic Transport Manager

*Director of Hampshire 2050*  
**Gary Westbrook**