



Hampshire
County Council

Head of Development Planning

Havant Borough Council
Civic Offices
Civic Centre Road
HAVANT
Hampshire County Council
PO9 2AX

Hampshire 2050

The Castle

Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UL

Telephone 0300 555 1375

Fax 01962 847055

www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries to

Chris Hirst

My reference

6-3-13-187

Direct Line

0370 779 0563

Your reference

APP/21/01451

Date

14th December 2023

Email

Chris.Hirst@hants.gov.uk

For the attention of Arleta Miszewska

Dear Madam,

Reserved Matters application for the scale and appearance of the development, the landscaping of the site and the layout of buildings pursuant to Planning Permission ref. APP/17/00863 (B) (Outline Application (All Matters Reserved except means of access) for the demolition of 1983 office building and associated brick and glass corridor link and development of up to 70 residential units, associated landscaping, parking and infrastructure works). Request to Discharge Condition 17 of Planning Permission APP/17/00863 (B) as amended by APP/21/01292 (Design Code) and Condition 26 of Permission APP/17/00863 (B) (viability assessment). | Southleigh Park House, Eastleigh Road, Havant, PO9 2PE.

Thank you for reconsulting the Highway Authority on the above planning application.

Further to the Highway Authority's response dated 8th November 2023, the applicant has produced a Response Note (RN) to address the comments raised. Subsequent discussions have taken place with the applicant, resulting in the provision of additional site layout plans. This response takes account of all of the updated information provided since the Highway Authority's previous response.

Site Access

The applicant has confirmed that the ramps provided in between each site access and the shared space areas of the site will be removed. The Highway Authority are therefore satisfied that there are no additional implications on the previously approved access works.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Internal Site Layout

Within the Highway Authority's previous response, a number of points were raised regarding the internal layout, which are set out below. It should be noted that this does not include pedestrian and cycle improvements which are covered under a separate sub heading of this response.

- Plot 29 fronts directly onto the carriageway, with a narrow margin separating the property from the road. A condition is required to ensure that a levels difference is provided between the margin and the road.
- Removal of permeable crate parking surface type to be replaced with a compact material which does not spread debris onto the road.
- The crossfall drawings should show the crossfall or camber from kerb to kerb.
- Parking within end bays in some of the parking courts is constrained, particularly for Plot 22. Additional aisle width should be provided to assist with manoeuvring.
- Removal of triple tandem parking spaces.
- Confirmation regarding the maintenance requirements for the substation.
- Provision of hardstanding to the back of parking laybys.

The points listed are addressed below.

Plot 29 is a FOG with a dropped kerb across its frontage which provides access to the garages. It is unclear from the surfaces drawing whether the area outside the front door to the building will be separated from the carriageway via a full height kerb and boundary treatment to prevent pedestrians from walking straight into the carriageway, but the Highway Authority is satisfied that these matters can be secured via planning condition.

The applicant is not proposing to amend the surfacing in some of the car parking areas to remove the Golpa gravel; however, changes have been made to the pedestrian and cycle infrastructure which provides alternative, off carriageway provision away from any potential loose material. Whilst the Highway Authority still considers loose material on the carriageway to be a safety risk, it is acknowledged that alternative pedestrian and cycle provision is now available and therefore offers a safe place to walk and cycle if this were to occur.

Additional crossfall drawings have now been provided which have been reviewed and indicate minimum level change. A condition will be sought for the applicant to provide the final level details across the site.

The RN indicates that revised tracking has been undertaken for vehicles manoeuvring in and out of the parking space for Plot 22, although this has not been provided/appended to the document. However, it is noted that additional aisle width has been provided to aid with manoeuvring in this location. Furthermore, the Highway Authority requires a planning condition which

secures a safety margin for cyclists within the parking court to indicate to drivers that cyclists may access the parking court whilst they are manoeuvring. For these reasons, the parking court in this area is considered acceptable.

The Highway Authority previously requested the removal of triple tandem parking spaces from Plots 1 and 2. The RN misconstrues the Highway Authority's concerns by referring to general overspill car parking within the site, despite the stated over provision in car parking spaces. The concerns around on street parking arises from the triple tandem spaces not being fully utilised by the occupants of each property because of the need to move the cars depending on where they have been parked. As a result, it may be more convenient for the occupants to park a vehicle outside of their property frontage, resulting in parking on the carriageway. This has been flagged given the tracking shown for a refuse vehicle accessing Road 2 which is tight against the back of the bays for Plot 12 which means on street parking will cause obstructions to larger vehicles needing to access the site. Overspill parking may therefore restrict the ability of a refuse vehicle to access this section of the development and the fire tender.

The Highway Authority consider that for the dwellings subject to triple tandem parking that they do not meet the parking standard requirements. However, as the Parking Authority it is for the Local Planning Authority to conclude on this matter and confirm whether the wider parking provision across the site can account for any overspill parking off carriageway as result of the triple tandem provision. This should also consider the need for the proposed dedication of a visitor space for maintenance vehicles to access the substation. The proposal to formally dedicate the bay to provide maintenance access should be reviewed by HBC in their capacity as local parking authority and conditioned appropriately to ensure the provision is delivered.

A margin strip has now been shown to the back of visitor parking bays throughout the site which is considered acceptable.

Walking and Cycling

The Highway Authority also raised the following comments regarding the pedestrian and cycle facilities within the site:

- The requirement to develop a holistic walking and cycle strategy for the site which integrates these links into each parcel of development.
- Widening of the footway to the south of Southleigh Park House.
- Provide alternative cycle routes which do not drop cyclists into parking courts.
- Widen the footway link to the north of Road 4 to 3m to cater for cyclists.
- Provide a footway from the parking courts to Plots 24-25.
- Provide direct crossing locations, delineated with tactile paving.

Discussions have subsequently taken place with the applicant to understand the site constraints and to investigate alternative cycle routes through the

development. The Highway Authority reiterates that a direct north-south cycle route through the development should be provided; however, it is acknowledged that there are heritage and ecology constraints which have resulted in the provision of two indirect routes through the site.

The applicant has revisited the pedestrian and cycle access strategy for the site, resulting in two alternative routes. Route 1 takes cyclists from the south-eastern corner of the development from one of the potential future offsite connection points, before providing access into the car parking court serving Plots 22-27. To improve the safety for cyclists in and around the parking area, the Highway Authority requires a planning condition which secures the provision of a margin strip within the court, delineated via a change in surface course, which identifies a safe space for pedestrians and cyclists to travel. Given the wider site constraints and the inability to provide a direct north-south route through the site, this is considered an essential requirement for providing cyclists with safe access through this area of the development. Cyclists are then required to cycle on-carriageway along the site spine road, before accessing an off-carriageway shared use path to the west of Plots 9-12. This route continues north to another shared use path to the east of Plots 3-5 which provides access to the east-west link provided between Eastleigh Road and Horndean Road which has been widened to 3m to accommodate cyclists.

Whilst this route is still not direct, the Highway Authority understands that the layout around Southleigh Park House is subject to a separate full planning permission which has set the layout, and there are wider planning considerations which prevents a direct route from being provided. In this instance, the Highway Authority therefore accepts this route as the primary route for cyclists, which will be signposted through heritage friendly wayfinding signage which will be secured through a planning condition.

A second route is provided for cyclists through the western section of the development. An alternative offsite connection point is provided in the southwestern corner of the development (which is linked to the southeastern route) which routes north through the development to a shared use path being provided along the frontage of Plots 35-38. The route then passes through the northwestern perimeter of Southleigh Park House before picking up the off-carriageway route noted above.

This secondary cycle route helps to integrate the western and southwestern parcels of the site, removing the need for cyclists to route via Eastleigh Road. However, the Highway Authority have raised concerns with the tight alignment of the route as it passes through Southleigh Park House. Whilst this part of the route is likely to be low flow and speed when considering the scale of development in question, the route is subject to a pinch point with reduced forward visibility. As a result, the Highway Authority requires a Grampian planning condition for the applicant to provide an alternative route to the west of Plots 31 and 32 which would remove the need for cyclists to negotiate this section of the site. The route could consist of a hoggan surface with no dig

construction solutions investigated to understand whether the route could be provided without impacting on existing trees. The Highway Authority are satisfied that these details can be investigated through the Grampian condition.

Furthermore, there is a link shown to the southwestern parcel of development which does not currently cater for cyclists. This link will need to be upgraded to a minimum of 2.5m, preferably 3m, to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists can both safely utilise the route. This should be shown on an amended plan however in the absence of this prior to determination a condition should be applied.

Whilst the Highway Authority maintains that the two routes fail to secure the direct north-south route discussed with the applicant at the pre-application stage, it is acknowledged that the routes identified above represent a compromise given the site's constraints. The additional improvements and conditions sought by the Highway Authority are considered essential for ensuring that the routes are safe and suitable for all users. If the applicant does not agree to the imposition of the conditions and provision of additional measures, the Highway Authority should be contacted for its revised position on the planning application.

A continuous footway has now been provided from the back of Plots 22-24 to allow access to the parking area to the rear of the properties. This is considered acceptable.

The location of crossing points within the site has not been shown on the layout drawings. The Highway Authority will require a planning condition showing the location of each crossing point to appropriately secure these measures.

The Highway Authority also requires a street lighting strategy and plan for the site. These matters can be secured via planning condition.

Recommendation

The applicant has addressed most of the Highway Authority's previous comments. In circumstances where points are still outstanding, the Highway Authority has identified alternative proposals to be secured via planning condition to overcome these concerns.

The Highway Authority therefore recommends no objection, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

- Rights for the public to pass during the lifetime of the development.
- Site Levels.
- Boundary Treatment features including details of the footway outside the FOG.

- Materials (including the margin strip within the parking court serving Plots 22-27).
- Wayfinding facilities.
- A Grampian condition to provide the hoggin route to the west of Plots 31-23.
- Provision of a street lighting strategy and plan for the site.
- Drainage Strategy and Design.
- Hard and Soft Landscaping Features.
- Landscape restrictions within visibility splays to prevent any planting above 600mm.
- Details of the crossing locations throughout the development including cycle access points.
- Details of how the Golpa gravel material will be retained so as not to enter the highway.
- Widening of the footway link to a minimum of 2.5m from plots 39-41 to connect to the proposed secondary cycle route.

I trust that the above is clear. Should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact Chris Hirst on the number noted above.

Yours Sincerely,

Chris Hirst