

**Public Health Response to Land East of College Road, Purbrook,
Waterlooville, APP/23/00488**

Application No:	APP/23/00488
Address:	Land East of College Road, Purbrook
Development:	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.
Comments by:	Hampshire County Council Public Health
Date of Comments:	16 th August 2023
Correspondence to:	Sophia.ibidunni@hants.gov.uk

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application. We would like to submit the following comments and recommendations.

1. Healthy homes

We have a few concerns around the proposed homes and their response to healthy homes approaches. We are unable to comment on internal space of dwellings since this is not included in proposal documents. Having read through the access statement documents we were unable to find any information on how the apartments minimises noise pollution. We are unable to comment whether the housing will be accessible to both older and disabled residents. We noticed that the flats in the northern section of the development appeared to have limited private external communal space. Lessons learnt from Covid and set out in Building for Healthy Life acknowledge that access to external private space is important for people's health and mental well-being.

Recommendation 1.1

Please can you provide us with details of how the proposed dwellings meet the Lifetime Home Standards and respond to aspects of Healthy Homes. We also recommend that the flats and apartments have a larger provision of private communal spaces. In addition, the clarity over what is private and what is public space around the apartment blocks lacks clarity leading to ambiguity in ownership.

1.2 Housing mix and affordability

We are pleased the development complies with local policy regarding two bedroom dwellings as well as a mix houses and apartments, which accounts for 35% of homes across the development site. We support the notion that 30% of the housing contributes to affordable housing. However, it is unclear from the access and design statement document 1, how many bedrooms have been allocated to affordable

homes. From submitted plans it appears many of the affordable homes are positioned further away from the larger open green spaces. Based upon submitted information we are unable to comment on social inclusion and diversity.

Recommendation 1.2

Please can you provide information how these homes will meet the changing needs of the community and how healthy homes approaches have been imbued in the design. It would be important for more of the affordable housing to be positioned nearer a green open space and play areas or that space/play provision is extend further across the scheme (see comments on recreation and greenspace).

2. Sustainable transport and active travel

2.1 Promoting walking and cycling and reducing car use

We support the Hard Landscape Strategy, which states that walking and cycling has been encouraged with the use of tarmac foot paths, timber board walks and cycle stands. However concerns remain regarding how the proposed layout encourages access and use of these modes. For example, using the Master plan, it is unclear where the cycle path continues from the site access, from point P7 and other connections into the wider neighbourhood are also unclear on the submission. The footpath shown at the south western edge of the scheme also ends with no connecting crossing. With regard to the proposed road layout we have concerns that the design fails to respond to guidance set out in Manual for Streets 1 and 2. The streets have a number of issues with sweeping bends, overly wide entrance splays, no side road cross overs, a predominance of frontage parking and the use of unconnected cul-de-sac. While the ambition is for increased walking, wheeling and cycling the layout doesn't illustrate this sufficiently. The use of cul-de-sacs do not provide provision for good street connections and creates longer walking times within the neighbourhood. The over reliance on frontage parking continually breaks the main footpaths, increases pedestrian vehicle conflict and therefore discourages walking and cycling. The proposed sweeping road layout simply encourages increased driving speed and does little to calm speeds as part of the street design (as seen in the Master Plan). We are unable to view the enclosed Travel Plan so unable to comment on the modal shift and whether it encourages a change in behaviour. We are concerned that secure cycle storage has been considered, but mainly in garages and sheds. This is contrary to national guidance which seeks storage as close to people's front doors as possible.

Recommendation 2.1

Please can you confirm how you will ensure that the roads and streets of the development will be walking, wheeling and cycle friendly. It is suggested that working through Manual for Streets 1 and 2 alongside LTN 1/20 would help the design of routes to better accommodate the most vulnerable users. Also how a more connected low speed, street network would allow better internal and external access to the scheme improving opportunities to active travel and greater health benefits. methods you will use to encourage low speeds of 20mph.

3. Green and open space

3.1 Green Space

We support the range of open green spaces have been included in the planning application, which includes accessible routes via board walks and cycle paths. With respect to the Landscape Strategy, we note a range of green spaces includes Sustainable Urban Drainages (SUDs), allotments and wildflower meadows. However, we noticed the green spaces were predominantly in the northern section of the development which means that the rest of the residents won't have access to localised large green spaces. Much of the space provision in the southern section of the site is edge planting, limited space and what appears to be narrow buffer strips. Maybe greater clarity on the function and provision of these areas could be provided.

Recommendation 3.1

Please provide detail of how you will extend these greens to other areas of the development, improve connections and ensure equitable provision across all parts of the site.

3.2 Open and Recreational Space

We note that play areas have been proposed to cater for children of younger ages and to encourage people to increase their physical activity, as well as relaxation and contemplation. We note the play areas considers smaller NEAP's and larger LEAP's across the northern section of the development Public Open Space (POS). However, these play areas are a bit hidden from the main housing provision and not well overlooked. It is noted there appears to be a deficiency of space for older children/young adults across the scheme and we would welcome some better clarification of how this is accommodated as part of the proposal.

Recommendation 3.2

Please can you inform us how you plan to make the play areas highly visible and accessible to all residents on the development. Please include opportunities for older children and young adults.

3.3 Biodiversity and Overheating

We note from your design and access statement document 1, that you intend to provide a biodiversity net gain element, but we are unable to comment the methods used to prevent internal and external overheating of buildings and spaces.

Recommendation 3.3

Please set out with clarity how the building design and landscape will mitigate key issues such as over-heating and climate change.

4. Healthy Neighbourhoods

4.1 Health Services and Social Infrastructure

We have a few concerns around health services and social infrastructure. We are unable to comment on whether the local NHS/ICB partners have been informed of the development. From the documents provided, we cannot see any detail of co-location or multi-use of buildings apart from the community centre which will be for community use and a nursery.

Recommendation 4.1

It would be good to know if there is potential for the community centre to be used for the resident's health requirements other than the nursery, as proposed.

4.2 Local Food Environment

We support the proposal for healthy eating with the use of community allotments, to encourage home grown foods.

Recommendation 4.2

Is there an opportunity for the community centre to provide some elements of the local food provision?

4.3 Air quality and noise pollution

The site is bounded by the A3(M) and College Road leading to Air Quality and Noise concerns. It is recognised that no level of air pollution is a safe level of air pollution, and the Public Health Team would wish to ensure stringent prevention and management measures. We would also seek to ensure that the appropriate levels of air quality assessment work are carried out for the scheme itself and for the construction phases when issues of dust

and disturbance will add to the impact on air quality. Climatic factors of wind and weather and in particular microclimate impacts on air particulate movement around the scheme also need to be factored in. Particulates modelling should include PM10, PM2.5, fine particles and those created from tyre abrasions should be included. We note from the design and access statement document one that an acoustic fence has been proposed in the development to minimise noise traffic from the A3(M) and college road. The Public Health Teams would suggest stringent noise prevention and management measures are put in place.

4.4 Public realm

The board walks allow for social interaction but no mention of how the development interacts with the surrounding neighbourhoods. The proposal fails to describe how the development allows access for those with mobility issues or a disability to access the building. We also noted that there are limited opportunities for residents to rest, socialise and interact with one another away from the main green space.

Recommendation 4.4

Please provide detail how you will increase opportunities for residents to relax, socialise and interact with one another.