

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 3193

Date 7 November 2023

My reference 6/3/13/176 050513

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) and associated drawings which the Highway Authority have reviewed and have the following comments to make.

Due to the significant size of the application the response to the Planning Authority has been provided in two phases. The Highway Authority have previously responded on the strategic outline matters in a response dated 12th October 2023. This response therefore covers the remaining matters regarding the internal layout design.

Generally, dimensions should be provided across the layout for review along with visibility splays for vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists as appropriate in accordance with the design standards set out in the Highway Authority's TG3 guidance.

The internal layout should accord with the design principles set out within the Highway Authority's TG10 guidance. This includes an assessment of the internal layout against the healthy streets criteria and reviewing the site layout against the LTN1/20 cycling level of service assessment tool. This is to ensure that people have a real choice to

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

walk or cycle for trips within the development and to access goods and services within the surrounding area.

Street Hierarchy and General Layout

The Design and Access statement covers some key principles for the design of the development. Figure 5.1 sets out the street hierarchy proposed for the development and general layout. It is unclear the difference in engineering terms between the Tertiary Street and Linking Street. The Primary Street seems to terminate unclearly with the proposed design layout and this should be addressed.

At plots 115-117 it is unclear how the street hierarchy applies here and if the parking area is to also form a through route for vehicles, clarity is sought on the design here. Figure 5.1 of the Design and Access statement shows this as a private drive, if this is the case it should not form a continuous connection of the two linking streets.

Emergency Access

Section 9 of the Design and Access Statement sets out the Access and Movement strategy. The emergency access is clearly marked within this area of the supporting evidence base although lacking within the main Transport Assessment documents. This emergency access does not aid to serve the site from College Road itself. The purpose of the emergency access is not to just serve the development should the main spine road be blocked but to ensure efficient response times and access for the emergency services. It is the Highway Authority's view given the scale of the development that an emergency access should be provided from College Road itself. This could be combined with the pedestrian and cycle access to the site to the south of the development, onto College Road.

Tracking of the fire tender has not been undertaken to cover the emergency access arrangement fully and should be provided. Confirmation of its width should also be provided with a minimum width as set out in MfS of 3.7m. The tracking that has been shown demonstrates the fire tender reversing into the access to reach plots 2-10 and coming into conflict with private areas, the movement should be contained within the emergency access arrangement.

There are a number of instances where the emergency vehicle overruns landscaped areas and car parking spaces. This is not acceptable and should be revisited.

Substation Access

Access to the substation provides insufficient parking for a servicing vehicle to leave the carriageway and not obstruct the pedestrian/cycle infrastructure. Parking provision should be suitable to accommodate the required service vehicle clear from obstruction of the highway. The vehicle requirements should be provided and the layout amended appropriately.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Pedestrian Infrastructure

There are a number of areas of shared space which serve a significant number of dwellings. There is sufficient space within these areas for formal footway provision and these should be provided. Shared space environments can work effectively for smaller areas such as those marked on Figure 5.1 of the design and access statement as private drives. Those shown as linking streets and above should have a level of footway provision and not rely on shared space design.

Generally, the parameter path should be provided at a minimum 3m wide to allow cyclists to use it and the route to operate as shared space.

The paths to each plot within shared space areas should not lead out directly to the shared space but turn towards the private drives where possible. Due to the lack of protected space between property front doors and vehicles on the carriageway, along with the safety of the arrangement for younger occupants.

There is the parameter footway on the western side of the development alongside the golf course land. However, there are limited opportunities for pedestrians to join the route with parking and wildflower planting in between the properties and the footway provision. Opportunities to join this path should be provided.

On the eastern boundary of the site in the vicinity of the allotments there is a north/south connection along the boundary which would benefit being designed to promote cycling connectivity.

Crossing provision generally across the site is lacking on any plans and this should be clearly detailed along with the appropriate visibility splays in accordance with TG10 so that the Highway Authority can comment appropriately.

When moving into what are defined as linking streets the footway provision is terminated at the bellmouth access point to that street despite opportunities for the provision to continue further along the street. This should be reviewed and the principles of shared space contained to areas serving 10 or less dwellings.

The parameter path where it meets the carriageway by plots 455-460 creates a poor tie in detail. The connection should tie into the footway provision outside plot 461 with an extension of the proposed footway to meet this point. This is also the case by plots 603 and 610 where the parameter path enters the shared space to continue round, this should be a continuous off-road provision.

Cycle Infrastructure

The proposed cycle route comes into the development via a shared use provision from the main site access. Comments regarding this infrastructure generally have been made within the response dated 12th October 2023. It is noted within the Design and

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Access Statement that the proposed cycle infrastructure is to continue south on the primary street till it reaches a raised table where it is to terminate. The details of this integration point are lacking and the termination at this location cannot be agreed. The Highway Authority consider that the central north/south cycle connection should link to the circular recreational walking and cycling route and be of a level of service appropriate for the size of the development (segregated pedestrian and cycle infrastructure).

There exists an east/west desire line to the south of the development between the Scratchface Lane bridge and the proposed second pedestrian access point on College Road. This route should also cater for cyclists. It is noted that a board walk feature is proposed across the SUDS feature. This would need to be 4m wide to cater for cyclists and have a suitable skid resistance to the surface. This surface PSV issue would also apply for pedestrians. Countryside Services should be consulted on appropriate design materials used elsewhere for such features. The route as identified within the response dated 12th October 2023 is not continuous and there is a section missing between plots 115 and 207 to the south. This should be provided.

The plan in the design and access statement also does not fully reflect the requirements set out within the TA with College Road shown to be for pedestrians only and the link to College Road not catering for cyclists.

Across junctions LTN 1/20 compliant continuous crossings should be provided. The standard detail for appropriate designs is included in the Highway Authority's TG10 guidance. At present some material changes are shown and it is thought these are crossing locations, the material choice and locations could lead to confusion over the priority arrangements for pedestrians and vehicles.

Layby parking on the eastern side of the primary road create a diverted route from the primary pedestrian and cycle provision. These could be accommodated on the western side of the road. Provision of laybys would need to be designed with an offset to the cycle route to avoid the risk of doors opening onto cyclist.

There is a footway link to be provide across the frontage of plots 434-438 and between plots 98-99 and 522-521 which should also cater for cyclists. Other such short connection points to aid general permeability should be designed to accommodate cycling.

Lighting

Street lighting proposals have been submitted in support of the application. Any areas which are proposed for adoption should have lighting provided to the required adoptable standards.

The development site sits within the 'E3' Environmental zone which may be appropriate on completion, but the land currently sits within an E2 zone. The ecology assessment

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

is made on assumptions and specific ecology survey information should be referred to relevant to the site. The Highway Authority's TG13 guidance should be referred to and the design should be in accordance with this guidance. Other detailed information is also necessary on the presence of hazards and existing or proposed road features such as crash barriers or traffic calming features. Given the internal design is not yet agreed generally it is premature to fix the lighting details at this stage. Detailed comments from the Highway Authority's Street Lighting Engineer will be provided separately for amendments by the applicant. Notwithstanding needing to determine the opportunities for lighting Scratchface Lane it is considered that beyond the extent of the lighting, the level, and the general lighting infrastructure proposals the Highway Authority would seek a condition to agree the lighting details. Given that the site is proposed to come forward for adoption the final street lighting design would be agreed via the S38 approvals process.

Two drawings have been provided setting out the areas to be lit. This does not include the consideration of the Scratchface Lane link off site or College Road itself, which should be covered. The development and proposed works on these areas may alter the required lighting provision and this should be assessed. Key areas within the site itself are also not identified to be lit, including the key pedestrian and cycle routes as they deviate from the main carriageway. There are also large areas of housing which are not proposed to be lit and it is unclear on the justification of this decision. This should be reconsidered and the Highway Authority welcome discussions on the extent of lighting with the applicant and the Planning Authority.

Materials

The landscaping plan drawing number GLS_050_110_1303 has been provided setting out the proposed materials for the site. A number are included within the proposed adopted areas including block paving, granite block rumble strips, self-binding gravel and the board walks.

Self-binding gravel is generally not agreed as a generic term and reference should be made to hogging or a particular specification to ensure expectations on the usability of the route are managed. Any routes subject to such material should be still suitable for all users including prams, mobility scooters and wheelchairs.

There is an extensive amount of block paving proposed of various colours within the adoptable carriageway. This should be minimised. Any block paving provision would be subject to commuted sums and the Highways Commuted Sums calculator should be utilised by the applicant to ensure the costs associated with this design are understood and accepted. The use of materials such as block paving can be an effective design tool, however it should be utilised to mark private areas or encourage speed reduction as you progress through the development and identify areas of shared space. The material choices have been used in a manner which does not focus on these design

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

considerations and the material use is inconsistent throughout the site which leads to highway safety concerns relating to the conspicuity of the site.

Granite set rumble strips are shown throughout the development as a speed reducing feature. These are generally not supported both from a maintenance liability perspective and due to the noise and vibration created by such features within residential areas is often found to be a cause for nuisance complaints. The design benefits of these features can be achieved through alternative design features such as raised tables and localised narrowing within the design. They also appear to have been used at crossing points which would not be usable for all pedestrians due to the uneven nature.

Overrun areas have been proposed on a number of bends within the development. These areas cause an ongoing maintenance liability and should be designed out where possible.

Tracking

No tracking has been provided for a private car. The refuse vehicle and fire tender tracking should be shown passing a car. Dot.com delivery vehicle tracking passing a large family car should also be provided and tracking of a large family car in the parking courts should also be shown.

Overrun areas and square corners are not an adoptable approach to the design. The Highway Authority would prefer these areas designed to facilitate two family cars passing and appropriate forward visibility around the bends.

It is noted that a pumping station is proposed in the south-eastern corner of the site. The vehicle required to access this pumping station should be confirmed along with the parking requirements for this vehicle.

The refuse vehicle tracking drawings for the site are generally poor and should be revisited. There are annotations highlighting where the refuse vehicle overhangs private areas, the footway and even into the bin store itself at plot 361-366. This should be revisited. All refuse tracking should be undertaken at a tracked speed at 10mph and should not overrun footways/verges or need to enter areas which will be privately owned and not made up of adopted highway or private management company.

The fire tender tracking is also incomplete, with the tracking not shown in all areas meaning compliance with the MfS requirements do not appear to be complied with. For example the fire tender on drawing DANE/E4993/008 does not show the fire tender entering the turning area for plots 455-460.

Vehicular Parking

Figure 8.5 of the Design and Access statement sets out the parking allocation across the site. A full-scale plan needs to be provided so this can be clearly viewed.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

The site is required in accordance with the standards to provide 1287 allocated spaces.

The assessment has also assumed that parking demand could be met by the unallocated parking standards. However, it is not clear if the use of the standards has been applied correctly or appropriately. The applicant is proposing 953 allocated spaces, 58 allocated car ports, 107 garages, 103 visitor spaces and 139 unallocated spaces. With a further 5 spaces for the community centre and 2 for substation.

The Planning Authority as Parking Authority should confirm if the parking quantum is in accordance with the standards and whether the garage spaces are required to meet the required standards. The Highway Authority welcome engagement on these matters including a breakdown of the parking quantum calculation to ensure there isn't a reliance on on-street parking which will have an impact on the safe operation of the proposed layout.

The Highway Authority are concerned that there is provision of triple tandem parking. Where this is included the garage space should not be counted within the parking quantum. Ideally this provision would be designed out. Generally, there is an over reliance on tandem parking across the development which increases the likelihood of on carriageway parking which would obstruct both servicing of the site and the fire tender access.

Visitor provision appears to be combined with the unallocated allowance for parking. If unallocated parking for the apartment blocks are permitted then visitor spaces are still calculated as an additional 20% of the total parking quantum, not inclusive of.

The Highway Authority have been unable to locate details of the car port design. The Planning Authority should ensure that these create usable parking spaces and that access to vehicles when parked is not obstructed by the location of supporting pillars. The minimum size standards

The parking dimensions have not been confirmed. There are a number of spaces across the site which appear insufficient in depth for example plots 34-43, 162-166 and 203-207. There are a significant number of spaces which abut a vertical feature such as a wall where no allowance has been given for appropriate clearance. Where this occurs, the spaces should be a minimum width of 2.7m or 3m if obstructed on both sides. For plot 39 for example it would appear that the car parks half under the building but this isn't reflected in the house type shown where the property is 3 storey to the front and a raised 2 storey to the rear.

Several parking spaces across the site seem to be inaccessible for example the parking provision for plots 96-97 and 116-119. The location of the visitor parking is also an issue for parking next to 485. All spaces across the site must be easily accessible to prevent parking on street being a more attractive option.

Plots 117 and 118 have the pedestrian access through the parking spaces. The path width is only 1.2m which is below Inclusive Mobility requirements of 1.5m for footway.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

The 1.2m can be accepted however with the parking bays being substandard and the position of the path relying on people parking correctly for it to be useable. This should be redesigned.

Cycle Parking

Cycle parking is proposed in accordance with the standards. Drawing CB_62_265_007 has been provided detailing the locations of the proposed cycle storage. At this stage these details have not been reviewed to ensure access to all store areas can be achieved suitably. A full-scale plan should be provided to the Highway Authority for review once the initial layout amendments required have been made.

The above drawing however does not detail the locations of the 241 visitor spaces. These are also referred to as both sheltered and simple Sheffield stands. Confirmation is sought on the type and location of the provision across the site. There is also no cycle parking provision marked for the community centre which should include its own facilities.

Site Levels

A number of levels plans have been provided for the site showing the levels strategy however highway long sections should be provided and cross sections for assessment. The street scenes provided are insufficient and do not clearly show the plot levels and highway levels tying together.

No level information has been provided for the cycle/pedestrian provision off the main carriageway arrangement and these should be included. Levels should be within the tolerance levels set out within LTN1/20 to ensure the route is desirable for all users.

Drainage Strategy

The LLFA will give consideration to the drainage strategy at this stage. Given the design matters raised within the proposals the drainage from the Highway Authority's perspective has not been reviewed in detail at this stage.

The surface water drainage is proposed to be fed to a system of swales and SUDs features. The expected maintenance organisation should be set out. The drainage strategy must accord with the Highway Authority's TG8-1 and TG8-2.

The Highway Authority will liaise directly with the LLFA to ensure the strategy proposals are agreeable to both interested parties.

Boundary Treatments

Boundary treatments should be set an appropriate distance back from the carriageway with a minimum clearance of 450mm. The use of boundary treatments to the properties should not obstruct visibility for either drivers or pedestrians accessing and egressing

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

their properties. A plan showing the proposed boundary treatment arrangements should be provided for agreement within the planning process.

Visibility/Signing and Lining

No plans showing the achievable visibility splay requirements across the site have been provided nor a signing and lining plan for the development. These should be included to ensure appropriate visibility splays can be achieved for all users including pedestrians and cyclists at crossings. The signing and lining plan is required to determine appropriate priority across the site and ensure the cycleway network and any wayfinding provision within the site is appropriately located.

Areas of relative high flow such as the primary street should include priority give way markings to the side road arrangements.

A number of the bends look insufficient in design to accommodate two cars past each other. Tracking of these arrangements should be provided along with appropriate forward visibility across the bends at the agreed design speed. These forward visibility splays should sit wholly within land to be adopted as highway or under control of a management company if within private areas.

Visibility splays should not be obstructed by parking laybys, and this occurs across the site.

Extents of Adoption

It is noted within the Design and Access Statement that a plan is provided showing the proposed extents of adoption Figure 8.4. This proposes to adopt all roads other than those identified as a Private Street. It is noted that the east/west footway/cycleway is not proposed for adoption, and this should be included. The existing highway in terms of the Public Right of Way network should also be annotated on the plan to ensure the full extents of highway land is understood. Consideration needs to be given to the adoption of all key pedestrian and cycle connections and this should be discussed directly with the Highway Authority.

Generally, the rights to pass and repass over the site should be granted through the S106 agreement across the site whether it is brought forward for adoption or not.

Landscaping

There are a number of trees shown across the site. A plan showing the trees to be adopted as part of the highway infrastructure should be provided. Trees as per LTN1/20 should be set back appropriately to avoid debris and root damage to the infrastructure.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Wildflower meadow planting is proposed adjacent to the highway in various locations. This can cause problems with obstructed visibility splays. These wild planting areas should be positioned outside the adoptable highway layout.

Recommendations

The Highway Authority require a number of changes and additional information before the internal layout could be considered safe and suitable. Given the scale of the application on resubmission of the amended details it is requested that a full hard copy drawing pack is provided to the Highway Authority.

In the meantime, if the applicant would like to discuss the comments, the Highway Authority would welcome this.

Yours faithfully,

Gemma McCart
Team Leader – Highways Development Planning
Hampshire 2050

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook