

Addendum to Transport Assessment prepared by Transport Works following receipt of comments/observations by Mr J Driver, Havant Borough Council Environmental Health Officer, dated 2nd April 2020, in relation to withdrawn planning application ref: APP/20/00061.

Paragraph 1

EHO Comment:

It is noted that public consultees have raised concerns about the intensified use of Sultan Road contributing to local pollution. I also note that Network Rail has material concerns which would be better characterised as 'highway capacity' concerns relating to the impact on access to railway land / assets.

Transport Works Response:

There will be minimal intensification of Sultan Road, with minimal addition in local pollution.

The number of staff rises from 5 to 7 and reference is made to the potential of new and existing staff being able to car share, walk, cycle and use public transport.

Temple Ford Design has undertaken dialogue with Network Rail Asset Protection. It is anticipated that a meeting will be required with Network Rail in due course to discuss the project in more detail.

Paragraph 2

EHO Comment:

I have reviewed the submitted transport assessment, and would broadly agree that the development land is 'highly accessible', with generally good pedestrian & cycle links, and excellent proximity to public transport (rail and bus).

Transport Works Response:

Noted.

Paragraph 3

EHO Comment:

Section 2.7 of the TA refers to 'Pedestrian footways within Sultan Road'. I note that this is only true as far as the pedestrian platform access, and beyond here access is via shared surface serving pedestrians, cyclists, private motor cars & HGV's. A significant intensification in the expected number of pedestrian trips might warrant some consideration of pedestrian safety, at least within the red-line area.

Transport Works Response:

There will be no additional visitors to the site, only staff will access the site. Thus, there will be no significant intensification of the site.

Furthermore, the increase in vehicular movements remains the same, with deliveries and collections the same as they are now

Paragraph 4

EHO Comment:

Section 3 addresses the traffic impact of the development, with figure 6 indicating a very low number of movements which is expected to be entirely unchanged by the proposed development.

Transport Works Response:

Noted.

Paragraph 5

EHO Comment:

I am unclear on how a development of this scale is expected to lead to a net-zero increase in transport demand and could remain economically justifiable. The origin of the existing figures is unclear, as is the expected trip demand (e.g. no TRICS estimates presented, no specific indication of staffing levels, etc.). It is similarly unclear whether the values are intended to represent 1-way or 2-way trips - one way is assumed given the odd numbers, the text comment describing the tidal nature of staff transport trips, and the notice on gates indicating evening closure for security purposes.

Transport Works Response:

As outlined in the response to Paragraphs 1 & 3 above and my brief introductory note above, the business is purely for on-line sales and used as a hub for receiving deliveries and despatching of orders of equipment and goods, pertinent to the current business.

Racquet Sports would not, I assume, propose to increase the size of their outlet, if there was no financial business case for such a scheme? Furthermore, the comment about financial viability is not relevant in Planning terms, or any other. It is purely for the Client to determine.

The values do indeed represent 1-way trips which could be updated to show 2-way. Should it be required, the TA can be updated to suit. Either way, there is a very minimal increase.

Paragraph 6

EHO Comment:

The provision for parking for private motor vehicles is equal to the total daily trips expected (including the HGV trips), which would seem like an over provision given the unusual construction details needed to achieve those spaces.

Transport Works Response:

As with comments above, there is minimal increase in vehicles for staff members. Visitors will be purely vehicles conveying items, that will be individually sorted into new despatch items, collected by a proprietary parcel Company at the end of the day.

As stated by Mr Driver, the proposed parking provision is more than adequate and is therefore compliant with current standards.

Paragraph 7

EHO Comment:

As a result, I have low confidence in the numbers presented, but (unless they are wildly misleading-) they are nevertheless indicative of a relatively low transport demand. It is considered that the net increase in transport demand represented by the proposed development will be negligible with respect to emissions / local air quality. I would expect however that the submitted TA is unlikely to satisfy Network Rail in its present form.

Transport Works Response:

Notes above refer.

Temple Ford Design has undertaken dialogue with Network Rail Asset Protection. It is anticipated that a meeting will be required with Network Rail in due course to discuss the project in more detail.

Paragraph 8

EHO Comment:

I would also highlight that the tracked HGV turning movement shown in the TA does not appear to be feasible - see the cross section drawing for the probable manoeuvre, which relies upon land not within the red-line for the development. I am unclear as to whether this is permissible in planning terms (or not) - it is not material to pollution / emissions / air quality - this comment is intended as an observation only.

Transport Works Response:

Noted.