

Havant Borough Council
Civic Offices
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

Hampshire 2050
The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD

Telephone: 0300 555 1375
Fax: 01962 847055

www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries To Holly Drury
Direct Line 0370 779 5232
Date 12 October 2023

My reference 050513 (6/3/13/176)
Your reference APP/23/00488
Email havantdc@hants.gov.uk

Dear Ms Miszewska,

Land East Of, College Road, Purbrook, Waterlooville

Application for mixed use residential development comprising 628 dwellings, community centre, allotments, public open space including play areas, new junction to College Road, related internal access road, footways and cycleways, pumping station and drainage basins

Thank you for your consultation on the above full planning application. To support this planning application the applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (hereafter, TA) along with a Travel Plan and associated drawings which the Highway Authority have reviewed and have the following comments to make.

The response to the Planning Authority shall be provided in two phases due to the significant size of the application. This response therefore covers the review of the strategic outline matters including a review of the TA, Travel Plan, EIA Assessment and general accessibility comments which relate to the layout.

An additional response relating to the details regarding the internal layout shall follow in due course.

Proposed Development

The development is for a total of 628 dwellings and a community centre. The location of the community centre is not clear on the plans provided and should be clearly marked.

Policy Status

The policy position set out considers the key policy documents except for two core

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

documents which should be set out to ensure the planning policy position in relation to this particular site is clear. Those documents missing are the following:

- Havant Borough Councils Housing Delivery Position Statement
- Policy H40 of the Havant Withdrawn Local Plan setting out the requirements for compliance for the Housing Delivery Position Statement.
- The Inspector's Interim Findings Report

The Policy section of the TA covers elements of guidance rather than just policy which is agreeable. It should also consider the shift in guidance away from the predict and provide approach and reflect the guidance on the decide and provide approach in order to move away from providing for existing travel patterns and seeking to shape and influence the transport needs for the future such as the 'TRICs Decide and Provide Guidance'. The Highway Authority seek to ensure that highway infrastructure for the car modes are not overprovided at the detriment of provision for walking, cycling and public transport. This point is reflected within the response from Active Travel England.

Pre-Application Advice

The most recent formal pre-application advice from the Highway Authority was provided on the 31st October 2022 and is appended to the TA as Appendix B. There remained a number of matters outstanding to be addressed within the application.

Site History

The site has been subject to a number of planning applications in relation to the development. To date the Highway Authority have not reached a position to make a positive recommendation of the applications to the Planning Authority. It is noted that this is new application and considerations of the comments made previously have been noted by the consultants and designers.

The site was identified within the now withdrawn Havant Local Plan with a number of highway related requirements. These included:

- Providing a high degree of permeability through an extensive network of walking and cycling routes across the site, this should include an on-site multi-user route running east to west linking to Havant Footpath 26c and Havant Bridgeway 28 (Scratchface Lane).
- Provides pedestrian and cycle routes that are integrated throughout the development and provides connectivity between this site and HSDC South Downs Site (Policy KP8);
- Provides a safe and suitable access to the residential element of the development site under Policy KP8 through an access road into this site where possible.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

- Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.

Site Location

The site is located to the east of College Road and west of the A3(M). The site bounds the Southdowns College development site and is subject to a number of existing PRoW connections including footpath 26c running through the northern part of the site and Bridleway 28 running along the northern and western boundary of the site. It is noted that there are a number of development constraints across the site.

To the north of the development is South Downs College which is subject to a current planning application ref APP/22/00439.

The site topography is also noted to be challenging and shall be considered in detail when reviewing the proposed internal layout.

Environmental Impact Assessment

The EIA assessment work parameters are generally agreed however it should be noted that the IEA Guidelines do not apply to the requirements for assessment of the Highway with regards to the Transport Assessment work requirements or the definition of severity. Severity impacts in relation to the highway impacts are assessed as per the NPPF requirements paragraph 111.

Reference is made in paragraph 5.2.16 to only some impacts of the traffic increases being assessed within Chapter 5 of the EIA and other related impacts being assessed elsewhere. The Highway Authority would welcome signposting to the other relevant impacts of the traffic growth as a result of the development within the EIA.

It is considered within the EIA that there are ample opportunities to travel via sustainable modes and that this is discussed further within the TA and TP. The Highway Authority at this time do not agree that the baseline conditions provide sufficient infrastructure for walking and cycling from this development site. The existing site is greenfield with no current access requirements beyond recreational access to the public rights of way network. The existing infrastructure is therefore naturally lacking and not to the current expected level of service to support the development proposal. This will be addressed further within this response.

Sensitive receptors have been identified within section 5.3.13. This refers to specific junctions as high however the links themselves should also be considered regarding the impact on severance.

An assumption is made regarding wider model shift as a result of the connection provided within the site between College Road and Scratchface Lane. The principle of this is agreeable however this is dependent on the level of service that is provided, and this is discussed further within the response.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Section 5.4.6 suggests that provision of the new site access junction would not have any harm with regards to delay as the junction operates within capacity. However, whilst it may operate within modelling parameters, implementation of the new junction would still impact delay on the link as vehicles are required to stop on a currently unimpeded route and this should be considered within the EIA to determine whether that delay is suitably mitigated through the wider benefits the access arrangement can offer.

Section 5.4.9 relates to the A3(M) Purbrook Way roundabout junctions and discussions held at the pre-app stage. The Highway Authority agree that previously proposed mitigation was unsatisfactory in relation to providing a capacity improvement to the Purbrook Way corridor. This did not reflect the opinion of National Highways where the improvement was more significant on the slip road. Reference was made to a need to improve the existing Purbrook Way corridor, increasing the level of service or providing the missing section on the northern section of Purbrook Way to achieve wider model shift and create capacity to accommodate connections to the strategic network for this development. The EIA refers to provision of tactile paving at the B&Q access. Improvements to this crossing point have been secured through the Lidl application and this has maximised the deliverable crossing improvements at this access point given a number of constraints on the access itself. Therefore, the applicant should seek to identify alternative improvements. Joint engagement with National Highways and the County Council would be welcomed.

The EIA section 5.5.10 refers to the impact of the development and construction traffic being mitigated through the provision of the proposed offsite works at the junction access and additional crossing provision. Whilst the principle of this is agreeable the timing of the proposed works will be critical to ensure that the impacts of the development are mitigated at the appropriate time. The EIA should also set out what measures within the CTMP will be utilised to minimise the impact of the construction traffic which is not insignificant as set out within the report. A framework CTMP would be beneficial given the scale of the site and the nature of the application being full.

Section 5.5.13 relates to the Crookhorn Lane/Portsdown Hill junction being mitigated through provision of a contribution. It is premature at this stage to agree this matter and is one for joint consideration within PCC as Highway Authority however give the reliance of the site on pedestrian and cycle connectivity and for the impacts to be mitigated, s106 contributions which don't bind the deliverability of the scheme in a timely manner to support the development may not be agreeable.

The EIA at section 5.5.17 identifies that trips north of the site to Purbrook Way are likely to be high given the location of the secondary school and College itself. It refers to the implemented improvements at the College Road/Purbrook Way junction providing suitable mitigation however does not reference the identified scheme from the Southdown's College site and the benefits of contributions towards this scheme to mitigate the impacts of the additional traffic generation and severance issues as a result

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

of the proposed development. This should be further considered by the applicant given that severance effects the links themselves rather than solely specific junctions.

Paragraph 5.5.18 should be updated as appropriate given the comments on this location and the approval of the Lidl application.

At present given the EIA specific comments and wider commentary in relation to the TA and TP the Highway Authority are unable to agree to the conclusions of the EIA assessment work in relation to the transport impacts.

Sustainable Access

Walking and Cycling:

A site accessibility assessment has been undertaken within the TA which identifies that most core services and supporting provision for residential development sits outside the recommended distances. The TA considers the walking parameters against criteria which is not agreed with the Highway Authority to be the most appropriate. Active Travel England have released requirements for a development and the suitable accessibility of a site which sits alongside the 20 minute neighbourhood parameters. The applicant should consider the site accessibility against these criteria using the ATE toolkit as a starting point and identify specific measures which can be implemented to address the barriers for the uptake of more sustainable transport modes. This should consider the requirements set out in the emerging LTP4 and the adopted TG10 guidance. This guidance also makes reference to the use of the tools set out in LTN1/20 and Healthy Streets to ensure the barriers to traveling on foot or by bike are truly addressed. At this time the Highway Authority do not consider that the site is within an accessible area and would have an over reliance on the private car.

Previously the application included provision of local amenities within the site, which impacts the sustainability of the development. .

It is noted within the EIA Chapter 5 that the development will generate a significant number of pedestrian movements. The Highway Authority note that the existing provision on College Road itself and the surrounding area is currently lacking. The applicant should be mindful that College Road as it currently stands has no street function and the provision for pedestrians and cyclists is limited in its level of service due to demand for current use of the route. College Road does however have potential for remodelling alongside this development to create a high standard street function which caters for all users.

Reference is made within the TA to the creation of a shared cycle/footway along the eastern side of College Road along the site frontage. Reference is also made to this being a stepped cycle track facility. No drawing is provided of the proposed scheme and should be set out for consideration. The Highway Authority have a feasibility proposal for the northern section of College Road as produced by the South Downs College application. This scheme is not secured and nor will it be delivered wholly from the South Downs College site. Consideration must be given to a holistic and complete

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

approach to how delivery of the required sustainable travel infrastructure can be delivered on College Road to link to the existing facilities and proposed improvement works at Portsdown Hill Road/Crookhorn Lane junction.

Proposals are also made within the TA to provide tactile paving at the B&Q approach to the A3(M)/Purbrook Way roundabout. The approach to this roundabout is subject to improvements as a result of the Lidl application. The TA refers to this making no offsite improvements however it has made both a financial contribution and improvement works to this approach arm of the junction to both increase capacity and improve the pedestrian/cycle crossing infrastructure.

Reference provision of a refuge crossing on College Road is made within the TA however again no drawing is provided and should be included for consideration. The WCHAR suggests that this could be delivered by contribution due to the 3rd party land issues. Given that PCC will be party to any S106 this is not agreed as any land issues can be dealt with at this time. The land issues referred to also impact the proposed access arrangement and should be dealt with collectively. In the absence of this crossing the site would not be able to demonstrate that it is well integrated and accessible.

Another mitigation proposal to encourage sustainable travel is the provision of secure, covered and accessible cycle parking. However, this cannot be identified with no details of this being provided. Reference further with the TA relies on Sheffield stands for public cycle parking. Provision of electric vehicle charging points on plots also does not aid in reducing the reliance of the private car, whilst noting it may seek to reduce other environmental impacts, the approach itself does not encourage sustainable travel choices and model shift.

Generally, there is little consideration throughout the assessment of the topography of the site or the surrounding area and this should be considered through the cycling level of service tool within LTN1/20 and consideration of the routes against a Healthy Streets audit.

The travel plan is referred to as a mitigation measure and it is considered key alongside timely sustainable infrastructure to support the development. Further comments on the travel plan are provided later within this response. It should be noted that the travel plan when moving away from a predict and provide approach needs to tie the aspired travel demand reductions with the infrastructure provision to achieve model shift, monitor the impact and provide travel planning measures to ensure the assumed targets are met. The Highway Authority seek further engagement on this matter as the application progresses.

The LCWIP for Havant has been reviewed within the TA. The incorrect version of the LCWIP plan has been used within the documentation and should be amended to reflect the adopted version, in particular within the Travel Plan as this will support the site moving forward. None of the LCWIP routes themselves run along College Road but

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

College Road has been identified as a result of development to provide a key route to be identified within future LCWIP updates. The route 275 and 361 are key to integrating this development as well as route 277 which has not been identified within the TA.

The identification of a route through the LCWIP however does not sit alongside a funding stream for delivery of the number of identified improvements within the document. The applicant should consider how improvements to these routes can be contributed towards by this development to ease the reliance on the private car and reduce the impact of the vehicular trips associated with the site.

Consideration of works across the boundary within the Portsmouth area to link the Hampshire and Portsmouth LCWIP routes are also supported for consideration by the applicant to integrate the Crookhorn Lane route via Gillman Lane to the infrastructure provided by the Forty Acre site and towards Portsmouth. Joint discussions with Portsmouth City Council would be welcomed on this point and this matter was raised within the Pre-Application engagement.

During the pre-application discussions and as part of the WCHAR discussion the need for wayfinding was discussed in detail. This however has not been addressed in the WCHAR nor has it been highlighted as a measure for improvement within the TA. The Highway Authority would expect the routes to school and Crookhorn centre to be provided with suitable wayfinding to direct new residents via the most direct, convenient and accessible route.

The WCHAR has considered the routes to school and whilst identified potential improvements to the crossing on Crookhorn Lane near the junction of Mercury Place it has not committed to delivering these improvements or providing wayfinding as requested at the pre-application stage. Generally, the WCHAR identifies a number of improvements to the key routes agreed for assessment however there is no commitment for delivery of these works to support the development. There has also been no assessment undertaken in accordance with TG10 and the routes should be considered alongside utilising where appropriate the Healthy Streets and LTN1/20 assessment tools. The Highway Authority provided a clear steer of infrastructure provision requirements within the Pre-App advice provided and there is no narrative in the WCHAR or the TA that reflects appropriate consideration of these requirements.

Public Rights of Way (PRoW):

The public rights of way surrounding this site provide opportunity to create direct and inclusive links for people to walk and cycle. This has been broadly identified however there are no proposed improvements to these routes set out within the TA.

Bridleway 28 is currently unlit and the connection from the bridge into the site could benefit from improvement. For the route to be an all year-round sustainable walking and cycling route and to achieve meaningful modal shift the route would need to be lit.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

This link has the ability to reduce travel time and distance to Havant town centre and Havant rail station considerably from approximately 2.8 miles to 1.8 miles.

Bridleway 28 also continues north on College Road and runs parallel with Purbrook Way. This is a well-used route for the schools and college and public rights of way should be consulted on whether improvements to this route could be supported by the development.

Footpath 26c also has the ability to create an additional route for pedestrians and cyclists to reach College Road north of the South Downs College. An indicative access is shown to the back of the college within the site layout, and it is not clear if this is provided currently. This should be confirmed. Whilst a direct connection is welcomed for reducing journey times there would also appear to be an opportunity to improve the connectivity of this link to allow for cyclists. This should be considered by the applicant to improve permeability across the site and create a beneficial sustainable car free link to the college site.

Buses:

Bus service information has been provided within the TA, the Stat 7 route doesn't run past these stops outside the specific college service which is listed as SD7. The nearest stop to that frequent service to Portsmouth is on Crookhorn Lane and the assessment should consider this. The distance is approximately 1km from the centre of the site. This reduces the attractiveness of the route to application site with the increased walking distance and should be appropriately reflected. The stops at this location are simple flag stops with no waiting facilities and therefore does not support the longer journey times. Improvements to the existing stops which will be utilised by the development should be considered by the applicant.

The EIA and TA make reference to provision of new high quality bus shelters as part of the S278 works however no drawing has been provided to include this element. Details of these improvements will be required along with confirmation from the bus operators that the additional stops would be utilised. It should be noted however that not all the high frequency routes operate from College Road itself with the Star 7 route being via Crookhorn Lane. Whilst improvements to the stops are welcomed confirmation on what service provision will be included on College Road as a result of the development should be provided by the bus operators.

The internal layout does not appear to be suitable to accommodate a bus into the site. The Highway Authority requested discussions were held with the bus operators for any initial ability to accommodate better bus permeability. The site should not preclude the ability for such services to enter the site in the future and the internal layout should be amended to accommodate bus infiltration. The parameters for this would need to be discussed with the bus operators alongside the Highway Authority to set the design requirements.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

More broadly the applicant should consider how the site can support the SEHRT priorities by providing for buses appropriately within the access or improvement works and facilitating efficient routing.

Rail:

The TA sets out the nearest railway station being 2.9km at Bedhampton. The TA sets out that there are regular services to London, Littlehampton and Portsmouth however the level of service is not frequent. Reference is also made to a 20 space cycle parking provision but no assessment on its current level of use or availability. The journey to Havant Station should also be considered as this operates a much high level of service to the routes set out within the TA.

Personal Injury Accidents (PIA)

The TA has considered the accident data across the agreed network; however the Highway Authority do not agree with the conclusions drawn. There is an emerging accident cluster at the College Road/Purbrook Way signals which requires further review and consideration. The signals have been in place for some time and therefore continued accidents at this junction are a concern. The applicant should consider this against the risk of exacerbating issues as a result of the proposed development.

In addition, there would appear to be a pedal cycle accident issue emerging at the Asda Roundabout again this will potentially be exacerbated by the development and should be considered in more detail as part of the application.

Site Access

The site access is shown in drawing 147.0008.0005 Revision P01.

The junction form was previously considered the most appropriate given the evidence base provided within application APP/19/01101. Given the passage of time and the move toward a more sustainable transport led approach the Highway Authority wish to confirm that the junction form remains the most appropriate given the forecast traffic flows.

Connectivity is shown across what is Portsmouth City Council owned land. Confirmation is sought that this is agreed with the Portsmouth City Council estates team and that the land will be available to be dedicated as Highway to Hampshire County Council in order to ensure the connection in perpetuity.

The landing area on the western side of College Road is insufficient to allow efficient turning and landing for cyclists and should be reconsidered on how this movement can be eased. The details around the cycle provision shown on College Road are unclear. A 3m shared use path is shown at the junction and widening to 4.16m further south. The site redline should provide additional land needed to widen the path to provide segregated cycle infrastructure/stepped cycle tracks and the design should show how it

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

would integrate to the wider identified improvement scheme and continue the level of service provided.

The crossings within the signal junction are not compliant with LTN1/20 guidance in that they do not separate pedestrians and cyclists. The junction should be amended to accord with the latest design guidance.

The proposed access should be shown on a drawing alongside the proposed access arrangements for the Southdowns College site and the future arrangement for the reallocation of road space north of the site. The access arrangements and walking and cycling improvements need to be considered holistically by the applicant to ensure a comprehensive scheme.

It is unclear if the 30mph limit is to be extended through the junction and to what extent this should cover College Road. This will feed into the future design and aspirations for the route to make it more cycle friendly. The scheme design should support a reduction in the speed limit of College Road/Crookhorn Lane.

Reference is made to an emergency access within the TA however this isn't shown on the masterplan drawings or the site access plan 147.0008.0005 Rev P01 and it is unclear where this location is, clarity is sought on this point.

Given at this time the junction layout requires further work the tracking drawings have not been considered in detail.

Notwithstanding the above consideration required to the junction form the ITS team have made detailed comments which have been appended to this response (Appendix 1) and should be considered within the design iterations. Comments have also been provided in relation to the engineering design of the scheme and these have been included in Appendix 2.

Construction Access:

Construction access is referred to within the EIA to be built first and on College Road itself. Whilst it is agreed that the majority of matters in relation to construction access can be conditioned to be dealt with via a CTMP the location of the proposed construction access and form given the extensive build period should be agreed at this stage. Further information on the access location and form should therefore be provided along with achievable TG3 compliant visibility splays. A framework CTMP map be most efficient at setting out the construction management expectations for the site.

90 HGV movements are anticipated per a day during peak construction at a time when 130 dwellings will also be occupied. It is unclear in the EIA how this has been calculated and why given the size of the site the level of HGV movements would reduce when occupations exceed 130 dwellings. Further clarity is sought.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

The EIA Chapter 5 suggests that the above noted increase in relation to construction traffic movements would not meet a significant impact however the details behind this assumption have not been provided. The EIA chapter should set out the current HGV and vehicle movements on College Road and Purbrook Way to evidence the conclusion drawn. Given the proximity to South Downs College it is likely that the route will be more sensitive to HGV increases.

Internal Road Network

A direct shared use path provision has been shown from the proposed main site access linking to the Scratchface Lane although where it meets at Scratchface Lane it does sit north of the desire line, owing to 3rd party land constraints. Notwithstanding that point the infrastructure as shown is supported and improves on previous layouts, however it should be in the form of a separate footway and cycle track as set out in LTN1/20.

The Highway Authority would also appreciate confirmation on whether discussions on the land ownership with National Highways have progressed. The internal site layout design should enable a direct link to this point even if the connection cannot be secured at this time. Amendments to the internal layout should be made to ensure cycle access across the area of public open space via a 4m shared use path. Suitable segregation should be provided and integration to the currently proposed facility on the northern boundary of the site.

The western boundary that faces Scratchface Lane is designed so it is not overlooked by the internal layout which decreases the attractiveness of the route, especially during the hours of darkness. Given the key strategic nature of the route and its potential use the internal layout should offer a less secluded arrangement to this key piece of infrastructure and integrate the link into the site as much as the land redline allows.

The connection to South Downs College is shown to be in the northern part of the Campdown site linking to the eastern boundary of the Southdowns College application. This does not connect to the agreed connection point within the South Downs College layout and should be provided to the southern boundary of the South Downs College site. Engagement with the South Downs College applicant should be had to ensure a suitable coherent connection point is made in this location.

Footpath 26 running through the site links to the back of the South Downs College campus. This appears to be an additional connection point and the Highway Authority seek confirmation that this is agreed with the college. In addition, clarity is sought in whether additional rights can be provided to this footpath for cyclists to provide direct connections to the college for both people walking and cycling.

Stage One Road Safety Audit (RSA1)

A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit will need to be provided for all offsite amendments to the highway and the proposed internal layout, this must be provided for consideration at the planning stage.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Trip Generation

It is noted that the proposed 200m² community facility has been considered as an ancillary use to the development and given its proposed use would not generate a significant amount of peak hour traffic therefore for the purpose of modelling this is agreed. However, for other matters relating to car parking and the trip generation for all modes throughout the day the use should be appropriately considered.

Vehicular trip rates have been provided along with an assessment of active travel modes. Vehicular trip rates were agreed previously at 0.534 in the AM peak and 0.589 in the PM peak. A new assessment has been provided. The revised rates set out in the TA for vehicular traffic are 0.486 in the AM peak and 0.522 in the PM peak. Across the quantum of development this creates an assumed reduction in vehicular trips compared to the previously agreed rate of 30 in the AM peak and 42 in the PM peak. It is noted that the revised survey data includes a survey undertaken during the period of the Covid Pandemic in September 2021 and this should be removed as travel patterns cannot be confirmed to be representative of usual travel behaviour. The remaining additional survey data would have been available at the time of the previous analysis, and it is likely that the broadening of the search criteria to include larger population categories has resulted in these additional sites within the selection. Confirmation is sought on why this is felt to now be appropriate given no significant development within this radius which would result in an increase in population of an additional 100,000 residents.

The Highway Authority consider that the previous rates should be used in the absence of a clear justification for the revised analysis.

The TA places some weight on the reduction in trip generation as a result of the revised analysis and reduction in dwelling numbers. It seeks to demonstrate a reduction in the impact of the development as a result, however no planning approval was granted or agreement from the Highway Authority on the suitability of the proposal therefore this should not be taken into account.

Active travel mode trip rates have also been presented in the TA. Notwithstanding the above comments on the vehicular traffic, the trip rates presented demonstrate a significant number of walking, cycling and active travel mode trips across the day. These trips however will not materialise in the absence of the supporting infrastructure. The TA also doesn't set out aspirational changes to these model splits or opportunities for model shift from the private car. This should be considered in accordance with TG10 to ensure meaningful infrastructure to support the development to reduce the reliance on the private car can be delivered. The multi model trip rates from the previously agreed assessment should be provided in the absence of agreement to the alternatives. These trip rates should be utilised as the base assumptions for model shift targets within the Travel Plan and for assessment against a mitigation strategy that aims to fulfil the travel plan targets and adopts appropriate measures for additional infrastructure requirements to support sustainable modes if the base package of

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

mitigation and supporting travel plan measures is not sufficient to reach the required reduction in private car use. The conclusion drawn within the TA that the generated walking/cycling and public transport trips can be absorbed by the existing and proposed infrastructure (which remains unclear). No existing pedestrian or cycle counts have been provided to quantify the existing use and therefore design parameters for appropriate consideration. These should be obtained for both Purbrook Way and the College Road/Crookhorn Lane corridors.

Traffic Distribution/Assignment

The distribution proposed is as previously agreed. The diagrams provided however have been titled incorrectly and therefore should be re-provided so that the growth assumed on the network can be confirmed as assigned correctly.

Active Travel Modes and Public Transport Distribution

The applicant has sought to go some way to consider the active travel mode from the site. However, it has based the assessment on peak hour traffic. When considering active travel modes this should be done using daily totals. Considering peak hour only assumes a broad assumption that a shift to active travel for commuter based peak hour trips is the primary focus. In order to achieve active travel reductions consideration needs to be given to all trips made from the site and where these can meaningfully be shifted to alternatives to the private car. Significant impacts can be achieved by reducing driven trips to trip generators other than commuting. Whilst commuting trips should be considered this should not be in isolation.

The bus service assessment is incorrect as already identified and should be amended accordingly.

The walking assessment assumes the South Downs College site will implement fully the identified improvement scheme which is incorrect.

Within this section of the TA a stepped cycle route is referenced. The proposed improvements to College Road from this site remain unclear. The suitability of Scratchface Lane also remains unclear at this time in the absence of a lighting strategy for the route.

Traffic Surveys

Traffic surveys have been undertaken for the following junctions in February 2022 and these are agreed to be acceptable.

- Crookhorn Lane/Portsdown Hill Road junction
- Bedhampton Hill/Portsdown Hill Road/Bedhampton Hill Road roundabout
- College Road/Purbrook Way signalised junction
- Stakes Hill Road/Stakes Road/Purbrook Way/Crookhorn Lane roundabout

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

- A3(M) Purbrook Way dumbbell roundabouts

Additional surveys were also undertaken in June 2022 to obtain queue length data in order to validate the modelling work. This is agreed subject to the general traffic patterns and movements at each survey location being broadly similar. This should be analysed and confirmed.

Committed Development and Background Growth

TEMPRO has been utilised and agreed appropriate. However, it is unclear why a forecast year for the A3(M) has been set at only 2025. This is against National Highways guidance and is not supported by Hampshire County Council as Highway Authority given the size of the development and the main impacts being on the local highway network. A forecast year of 2033 should be utilised for all assessments.

Regarding committed development the following sites have been listed:

- Forty Acre Farm (App/18/00450)
- South Downs College Residential Development (App/22/00439)
- Lidl Purbrook Way (APP/20/01221)
- South Downs College Parking Reduction (APP/22/00576)

The Hulbert Road site (APP/20/00441) and this should be included. It is also unclear within the TA how Waterlooville MDA has been accounted for. Further information on how these sites have been accounted for and applied to the network should be provided for clarity, especially given that for the South Downs College Parking Reduction application the highway authority is not agreed to the assessment or assumed reduction in vehicular trips.

Junction Assessments

The following scope of assessment has been agreed with the applicant:

- Site Access
- College Road/Purbrook Way
- Stakes Road Roundabout
- A3(M) Junction dumbbell roundabouts
- Asda Roundabout
- Crookhorn Lane/Portsdown Hill Road

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

As the trip generation, committed development parameters and clarity on the distribution diagrams is not yet agreed the conclusion of the modelling assessment work cannot be undertaken.

Site Access:

Narrative on the site access has been provided further within this response, at this time it would not be beneficial to comment further on the modelling outputs.

College Road/Purbrook Way Junction:

Comments to the modelling were made at the pre-application stage, confirmation is required that these have been applied to the revised modelling and the model files should be submitted to the Highway Authority for review.

Stakes Hill Road Roundabout:

The Highway Authority request a copy of the modelling file for review. The impact of the development in this location requires further consideration. The assumption that a solution exists that can accommodate the development traffic is also not supported through modelling the existing junction. The Highway Authority are seeking an update to the additional design work for the roundabout and welcome further discussion with the applicant on whether the junction can accommodate the additional demand appropriately.

A3(M) Purbrook Way Roundabouts:

The mitigation proposals have been discussed above in relation to the EIA assessment work and sustainable travel access to the site and are considered insufficient. The proposed development exacerbates matters on the Purbrook Way (EB) approach to the junction in the AM peak on both roundabouts increasing the queue length significantly based on the initial assessment. Once outstanding matters have been agreed the modelling should be revisited, however given the current evidence base it is considered likely that mitigation to offset the additional demand here will be required.

Reference is made that the Lidl application are not bound to any mitigation for the impacts to the B&Q roundabout junction, but this is not correct. A mitigation package has been secured along with S278 works to improve the operation of the access.

Crookhorn Lane/Portsdown Hill Road Junction:

The Crookhorn Lane/Portsdown Hill Road junction falls within the Portsmouth City Council highway jurisdiction. However, the impacts of the junction are realised within the Hampshire network as a result of the queue on Crookhorn Lane and the scheme impacts the connectivity between the Portsmouth and Havant LCWIP identified routes and schemes.

Modelling review will therefore be undertaken by Portsmouth City Council and comments from Hampshire relate purely to the design provision.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

It should be noted that the crossing provision proposed for cyclists does not meet current LTN1/20 standards in that it does not segregate pedestrians and cyclists. Hampshire County Council as Highway Authority have identified College Road/Crookhorn Lane between Portsdown Hill Road and Purbrook Way as a key opportunity for road space reassignment to provide segregated provision for all users and the principles of such a scheme for the northern section have been provided for the Southdowns College application. This has been shared with the applicant and Portsmouth City Council. Hampshire are also aware that the Portsmouth LCWIP identifies Gilman Road as a key low vehicle flow cycle route (access is restricted for vehicles) which has onward connectivity to the secured scheme for the Forty Acres development on Havant Road and at the Rusty Cutter Roundabout. Hampshire as Highway Authority welcome engagement on the connectivity of this missing section of cycle infrastructure within the Portsmouth area to connect the Hampshire LCWIP routes.

Asda Roundabout:

The Highway Authority request the modelling files for this junction once agreement to the input values has been agreed. It is unclear how the modelling can demonstrate an improvement to the Purbrook Way (EB) approach with the increase in development traffic.

Travel Plan

The travel plan provided requires further work to support the sustainability of the site support the application in offsetting private car use both by reducing that generated from the site and offsetting existing trips to accommodate the car dependent travel. The travel plan needs to be supported by a infrastructure strategy and allow for appropriate review to facilitate the site in achieving its model shift aspirations if it is to offset its location limitations. Comments on the travel plan as drafted have been provided in appendix 3 of this response however further engagement on the travel plan should be had once the potential for offsite improvements are understood and therefore meaningful monitoring and measures can be set out to move this site away from a predict and provide approach that has been adopted for previous applications.

Recommendation

The Highway Authority require additional information on the outline matters. A further response shall be provided on the internal layout matters shortly. In the meantime, the Highway Authority welcome engagement on the site to reduce the outstanding matters of concern.

Yours faithfully,

Gemma
Transport
Hampshire 2050

Team

Leader

–

Highways

Development

McCart
Planning

Appendix 1 – ITS Technical Comments

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Date: 22/08/2023
Prepared by Graham Lee,
Approved by Jonathan Mundy

The following documents/ reversions have been considered:

- 147.0008TA1 Transport Assessment – June 2023
 - Appendix D – Drawing 147.0008.0005 P01
 - Appendix E – Drawing 147.0008.0006 P01
 - Appendix P – Drawing 147.0008.003 A
- College Road - Site Access HCC Comments.lsg3x (Modelling)

Note: Drawing 147.0008.0004 Rev C formed the basis of the previous ITS comments, an updated version of this drawing has not been included within the latest package.

College Road/Site Access junction - Residual ITS comments

1. A maintenance hard standing is required and has not been included on drawing 147.0008.0005 rev P01
2. Advance cycle stop lines have not been included on drawing 147.0008.0005 rev P01, this requirement may be superseded (see comment 1 in the Design/ Layout section below).
3. Tracking for a 16.5m articulated vehicle has been requested.
4. Forward visibility splays and intervisibility have not been demonstrated on any of the submitted drawings.
5. No utility information has been shown on drawing 147.0008.0005 rev P01 or any other drawings.

College Road/Site Access junction - Design/ Layout comments

1. Suggest a wider discussion about the application of LTN 1/20 is undertaken. This will drive the type of crossings required with the potential for segregated facilities and the need of the advance cycle stop lines and/or Low-Level Cycle

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Signals (LLCS). The crossings will be considered in more detail below; The comments are made in lieu of the wider ped/ cycle strategy discussions.

2. The flows presented in the TA and LinSig modeling are exceptionally low, it would seem a simple priority junction could handle the flows and would be preferable, reducing the maintenance burden on the Authority a traffic signal junction represents. Subject to meeting the County Council's PmV² threshold a 'mid-block' sparrow type crossing over College Road could be considered to provide priority to pedestrian/cyclists and perhaps an uncontrolled facility over the site access road.
3. The previous ITS comments requested an uncontrolled crossing over College Road however a signal-controlled crossing has been provided. The crossing has been designed 'in line' with a center splitter island and red tactiles although, has been run in two separate phases which run separately. This is not permitted and would be unsafe as pedestrians may assume they can continue to cross whilst the conflicting phase is at green to traffic. The island would need to be at least 5m wide to accommodate this arrangement. Also, Phase A and H run together which would be a conflict. There are a couple of options, the most preferable of which will depend on some of the other issues raised and the wider ped/ cycle strategy discussions. These options may include:
 - a. Making the crossing a single phase (pedestrian would cross in one movement), in this case the tactile paving within the island should be completely removed;
 - b. As previously requested, making the crossing uncontrolled and utilize buff tactile paving which could then be upgraded in the future (if necessary);
 - c. Provided a 5m+ island or stagger the crossing; or
 - d. In line with the principles outlined in LT1/20, provide a segregated ped/cycle crossing (a sparrow type crossing).
4. The junction would appear to be much larger than is necessary, it would seem possible to reduce the College Road left turn radius and/or provide a compound curve, just wide enough to accommodate a 16.5m arc. The College Road approach stop lines can then be pulled in towards the junction. This may also provide an opportunity to make the access road Toucan a single phase (so pedestrians crossing in one movement with an 'all red' to traffic).

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

5. The tails on the tactile paving should always be oriented to the right of the crossing, which they are not either side of the access road.
6. The tactile paving should extend all the way to the back of the footway/cycleways.
7. A 3m constant width has been provided for the central splitter island within the access road. This has resulted in a convoluted layout. There is concern that debris may collect in the offside area which is unlikely to be tracked over often (or at all). This debris would pose a hazard to cyclists. Suggest 3m is treated as a minimum and the island size increased asymmetrically to conform with the vehicle tracking. Alternatively the island could be rotated to an angle similar to the side road approach, which would also ease the right turn movement from College Road. It may be more appropriate to omit the island and have pedestrian crossing in a single phase with an 'all red' to traffic.
8. The 'linetype scale' on the drawing 147.0008.0005 rev P01 is incorrect such that the road markings lines are displaying incorrectly.
9. The right turn is separately signaled. Could this be a RTIGA and operate under a giveaway arrangement? Vehicle speeds should be considered.
10. A simple drop kerb crossing is provided on Atlantis Avenue, suggest this is a full width drop kerb crossing with buff tactile. It is noted that the northern footway on Atlantis Avenue route is not suitable for cyclists however, they would likely be accessing the short section of cycleway directly from the carriageway so the southern drop kerb should be wide enough. Perhaps some on road cycle markings may also be beneficial.
11. The Atlantis Avenue northern tactile paving lands within an existing side road access. The crossing may need to move further to the north.
12. The masterplan includes residential access and visitors parking near the signal junctions. The friction these accesses may create is undesirable and may cause detection issues. A section circa 40m from the stop line should be safeguarded. This length should also include a centre white line marking.
13. How much of the access road is to be adopted? A section of at least 40m is recommended or an agreement entered into to ensure the authority can access and maintain the traffic signal equipment and detection. Regardless the agreement should ensure that a minimum length of the site access road is fully constructed at the junction opening to enable the signals to operate correctly. Is

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

a refuse vehicle required to access the 3.7m side road on the access road approach?

14. There is concern westbound traffic could strike the central pedestrian splitter island. The end of this island should be 1.5m from the running lane and difference white lined and hatched.
15. The traffic signal poles are very close the end of the island on the access road central splitter island. Enough room for guard railing should be provided (if required) and it should be possible to set up an 'A' frame ladder against the pole without the foot of the ladder being in the carriageway. Suggest that poles are located a minimum of 1.5m for the kerbed edge of the island.
16. Please consider where the controller and hard standing will go before redline boundaries/ masterplan/ earthworks are fixed. This may also impact the location of the vehicle maintenance bay.
17. A 3m shared cycleway/ footway has been provided however, no offset from the kerb is included. TG10 para 5.3.2 includes a desirable minimum separation of 1.0m between the kerb and the cycle track for a 40mph road.
18. Lane markings should be at least 300mm from the edge of islands.
19. Islands should be extended back so that the start of the corner radius intersects the stop line. This can help to highlight the stop line in low light or poor weather conditions.
20. There is a kink in the alignment of the westbound running lane/ eastbound right turn lane adjacent to the eastbound right turn lane stop line.
21. The southbound College Road approach nearside kerbline and shared footway/cycleway crosses into 3rd party land (part of the college?). Please confirm this land is available.
22. If the right turn into from College Road is to be separately signaled (as currently modelled), then an offside traffic island would be required to house the offside (right turn arrow) traffic signal. This is not required if an RTIGA is used.

College Road/Site Access junction - Modelling Comments

1. Lane widths included in the LinSig models RR67 calculation do not match those on the drawing.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

2. Typo in the LinSig model scenario 1 name.
3. The LinSig model does not appear to include properly calculated intergreens. These should be measured in line with Chapter 6 of TSRGD and an additional 2 seconds added when leaving a high-speed phase (High speed in this context is anything likely to have an 85%ile speed over 35mph). This is standard practice when using MOVA which will likely be the primary method of control. The leaving pedestrian crossing intergreen should be calculated with a pedestrian walk speed of 1.2m/s plus 2 second starting amber.
4. All intergreens must be entered not just those that appear in the current stage sequence.

Portsdown Hill Road/ Crookhorn Lane junction – General Comments

Note: This junction lies on the border between Highway Authorities. The junction would be run and maintained by Portsmouth City Council although the Crookhorn Lane arm is within HCC area. Comments made here are limited and in lieu of the Portsmouth City Council's complete junction review.

1. The cycle provision should form part of a wider walking cycling strategy and the use of segregated facilities (in accordance with LTN1/20 should be considered).
2. The Crookhorn Lane crossing has been designed 'in line' with a centre splitter island and red tactiles although it has been run in two separate phases which run separately. This is not permitted and would be unsafe as pedestrians may assume they can continue to cross whilst the conflicting phase is at green to traffic. In order to accommodate this arrangement, the island would need to be 5m+ wide. The crossing should be made into a single phase (so pedestrians cross in one go) and the tactile paving removed. The island can also be reduced in size, or removed, to reduce the crossing distance. It would also be worth dropping the footway to carriageway level and providing a kerb on the inside of the island.
3. The crossing could be pulled into the junction pulling the stop line in further towards the centre of the junction, reducing intergreens and providing more space around the pedestrian/ cycle crossings.
4. The tail of the tactile paving should always be the right and both tails on the Portsdown Hill Road arm should be 3m deep.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

5. The notes pointing to the corduroy paving on the Crookhorn Road approach indicate that it is the end of the cycleway and yet the cycleway continues both sides?

It would seem logical to link the northern section of the Portsdown Hill Road crossing directly to the eastern shared cycle/ footway.

Appendix 2 – Engineering Comments

Offsite Works - Proposed signalised junction and associated mitigation infrastructure:

1. For new signalised junctions, the designer shall refer to advice in TG4-1, HCC.
<https://documents.hants.gov.uk/transport/TG4-1-TrafficSignalJunctions.pdf>
 - a. Example layout:
<https://documents.hants.gov.uk/transport/traffic-signals/ExampleofaPreliminaryDesignTrafficSignalDrawinga1.pdf>
2. Junction Intersection: The designer shall confirm the intersection angle as per (7.1) CD123, DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges). *NB: Intersection angles of less than 70 degrees can cause problems with driver comprehension of the junction, intervisibility, tight turning manoeuvres and turning speeds.*
3. At new signal junctions, the intersection angle shall satisfy one of the following:
 - a. 90 degrees; or
 - b. A minimum of 70 degrees.
4. There are currently no visibility splays shown on drawings for consideration. In the first instance, visibility shall be available to each primary signal head in accordance with (7.2) CD123, DMRB. This can be relaxed if measured 85%ile speeds are 64kph and below.
5. Visibility corresponding to measured speeds – as per TG3 - shall be provided.
 - a. (5.1.3) HCC (Hampshire County Council), TG4-1. *Stopping Sight Distances (SSD) - Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD109 SSDs shall apply on all approaches to traffic signals and pedestrian controlled crossings where the 85th percentile speed is over 64kph. The Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 6 SSD requirements shall apply where the 85th percentile speed is 64kph or less. The SSDs are to be annotated on all arms of the signal junction to the nearside primary signal on that approach.*

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

- b. Proposed 20mph design speeds for new residential road approaches to signals could be acceptable, subject to consultation with HCCs ITS (Intelligent Transport Systems) Group.
- 6. Junction intervisibility zone:
 - a. (7.4) CD123, DMRB: *An intervisibility zone shall be provided that incorporates an area that extends across the full carriageway width of each arm from a distance of 2.5 metres back from each stop line.*
 - b. (7.5.1) CD123, DMRB: *Where a staggered pedestrian crossing is provided, the section of the crossing immediately adjacent to the junction should be included in the junction intervisibility zone.*
- 7. Speed measurements (TG3):
 - a. For improvements to existing roads, the Design Speed shall be the 85th percentile speed derived from the measured speeds:
 - b. Speed measurements shall be taken in accordance with CA 185 using spot speeds measurements as opposed to the Journey Speed.
- 8. Traffic signal installations (CA185, DMRB):
 - a. (2.2) When design parameters for traffic signal installations are to be determined based on speed measurement, spot speed measurements of all motor vehicle types shall be used.
 - b. (2.2.1) Spot speed measurements on the approach to proposed, upgraded and existing traffic signal installations should be taken between 150 and 200 metres back from the existing/proposed stop line but as close to 160 metres as practicable.
 - c. (2.2.2) Spot speed measurements on the approach to proposed, upgraded and existing traffic signal installations should be taken where there are no parked vehicles within 100 metres of the measurement point.
- 9. There appears to be scope on the south-western approach arm to move the stop line forward, without conflicting with the right turning vehicle swept paths exiting the development.
 - a. The right turn storage lane appears to narrow slightly over its length, so the designer will need to ensure there is sufficient space to avoid conflict with vehicles travelling straight through the junction.
- 10. Has the staggered pedestrian/cycle crossing been agreed with ITS?

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

- a. Could this be replaced with a single crossing, and could this provide better efficiency?
11. The existing speed limit is 40mph and therefore a horizontal separation is required between the footway/cycleway.
- a. (Table 6-1) LTN 1/20 recommends a desirable and absolute minimum of 1.0m and 0.5m, respectively.
12. It appears that the existing nearside kerb alignment, on the western side of College Rd, will be change as a result of the proposed staggered access for the College application. And this could impact the alignment at the northern end of the proposed signalised junction.
13. Sequence of the works could affect both prospective developments.

Appendix 3 – Travel Plan Comments

Introduction

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". Whilst the quality of this FTP (Full Travel Plan) is good, it still requires some amendments before it can be approved.

Title page and version control

- Needs no amendment

Background/ introduction and aims

- Section 1 needs no amendment

Guidance

- Section 2 needs no amendment

Existing site conditions / site audit

Section 3 should include the following details:

- Site quantum
- Footways and cycleways, including:
 - Walking Isochrone Map
 - Cycling Isochrone Map

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

- Nearest (or relevant) train stations, including:
 - Timetable

Site Audit – proposed layout

Section 4 should include the following details:

- Site quantum
- Further details of the proposed infrastructure improvements mentioned in the travel plan are required to ensure that they will support the measures outlined in Section 6 of the plan.

Measures – Section 6

There are a few additional measures which should be considered for inclusion within this FTP.

Cycling

- In paragraph 6.13 a cycle voucher to the value of £50 is offered. As the travel plan proposes infrastructure improvements to improve the cycle network it is recommended that the value of the voucher be increased to £75.
- Secure, well lit, covered cycle storage with pumps

Public Transport

- In paragraph 6.16 a travel voucher to the value of £50 is offered. Having checked the current offers from Stagecoach a limit of £50 would only provide travel for a week. It is recommended that the travel offer be increased to a maximum of £100 which would be redeemable upon the production of evidence of purchase.
- Collaboration with local public transport providers to improve services, negotiate discounts and trial initiatives

Marketing and Promotion

- Provision of information to all occupants, residents, visitors and staff on how to access the site by means other than the car through a variety of methods, including
 - Notice boards – at para 6.3.9 the travel plan states that no noticeboards will be put in place, but no reason is given for this. Clarification is required as to why.
 - Hold events – para 6.2.1 of the travel plan states that “Given the scale of the development proposed and experience in acting as TPCs, it is not

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

proposed to organise a dedicated event at this site. Instead, the TPC will review the opportunity to support and promote other local events which may encourage sustainable travel”. Clarification of this statement is required.

Management / TPC role – Section 7

The following information should be provided to HCC Travel Plan Assessment and Monitoring Team at least 3 months before 1st occupation:

- Name (cannot be generic, such as a consultancy name)
- Job title
- Organisation
- Contact details, including:
 - Email address
 - Work address
 - Phone number
 - Website (where applicable)

Monitoring

Section 7.7 should include the following details:

There are currently no measures in place to encourage residents to complete a questionnaire survey. Entry into a prize draw could be offered to those who complete a survey, although it should be noted that the prize should **not** be travel-related (e.g., bus tickets, cycle vouchers, etc).

The example survey form that is attached should include additional questions relating to

- What would encourage residents to use more sustainable modes of transport?
- What would prevent them from using these alternative modes of transport?

Action plan

The action plan states that the baseline survey will take place at 80% occupation but the travel plan states that this will take place at either 5% occupation in para 7.8 and at 50% occupation in para 7.9. Clarification on the timing of the baseline survey is required.

Delivery and Enforcement

Section 7.1 should include the following detail:

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

- Paragraph explaining the role of the Section 106 agreement. **Please note that it is not acceptable for the travel plan to be secured by a planning condition.**
- 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 section 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.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook