

F.A.O. Daphney Haywood, Case Officer App/19/00427

With regards to Planning Application App/19/00427, having read the i-Transport reports and the recently published Hampshire County Council (HCC) response (Ref: 6/3/13/182 dated 14th Nov 2019), I wish to register my disappointment and submit the following objections aimed specifically at HCC's response:

1. The Increased Traffic levels will create an Increased Danger on the Shared Road Section

The only access to this proposed new development is through the conservation area via Lower Road which is narrow with two very sharp bends and **no pavement**. The 50 new houses (and up to 100 additional vehicles) will create a significant increase in traffic on the narrow, shared spaces with treacherous blind bends and will cause a very real increased risk to everyone who uses the road. This aspect has been totally disregarded by HCC. The statement made in the developers' proposal of 'impeccable safety record' is entirely misleading and inaccurate. The increased traffic levels on this road, shown in the picture below, will create a higher level of danger to users.



Walker's, cyclists, school children, parents with prams, horse riders along with the disabled and elderly will all be put in greater danger. The road simply cannot support the increase in traffic that this development would bring. It would just be a case of an accident waiting to happen. Any additional traffic (pedestrians, vehicles, cyclists, mobility scooters etc.) will obviously increase the danger presented to all users in the shared space. The safety of the additional children predicted within the proposed site has not been accounted for when using the shared space for school or recreation. The report from i-Transport has stated that Lower Road already has high levels of pedestrians and cyclists and this has also been disregarded by HCC.

2. The Blind Bend Near Misses have not taken into account

As a resident, I can assure you that I have had many near misses on the Lower Road blind bends both day and night, and have taken evasive action on many occasions to avoid Cyclists and Vehicles over the last 14 years, even at only 15 miles an hour. The local residents Near Miss statements have already been sent to HBC and a recent accident on this section has also been reported to HBC. The HCC response is unsympathetic on this issue and a Freedom Of Information email from Peter Marshall to David Hayward sent on 24th May 2018 at 11:42 sums up the attitude from HCC in the quote shown below:

"Yes we engineers never take any notice of "It's an accident waiting to happen" until we get an accident!"

From: Marshall, Peter Sent: 24 May 2018 11:42 To: Hayward, David <david.hayward@havant.gov.uk>

HCC's flippant statement above on the safety concerns of local residents is unacceptable and one I trust HBC will not support.

3. No visibility calculations provided for both sides of the Lower Road blind bends

The developer has not provided full corner visibility calculations for both sides of the Lower Road blind bends which would highlight the problem encountered for all users of this road and has been disregarded by HCC.

4. The limited Road accident data provided is out of date

The road accident data provided within the planning proposal is from May 2011 to April 2016. This is now well over three years out of date and hasn't been addressed by HCC.

5. Incorrect calculations provided on Shared Road collisions

The proposal contains a Shared Road collision figure of 0.056% (Para 6.8.8) which is complete nonsense. The chances of a pedestrian/cyclist meeting a car at 04:00 is very low but what is the probability half an hour either side of 08:30 or 16:30? The maths is incorrect (0.056% is 56 in 100,000) and should be corrected prior to granting any planning permission. What else is incorrect within the planning submission and has also been disregarded by HCC?

6. Safety issue created by increased traffic along Kingscroft Lane

The increased traffic will add to the flow of traffic through the narrow Kingscroft Lane as driver behaviour will look for alternative routes to avoid queuing at the top of Brookside. This will inevitably create additional safety problems adjacent to the Bidbury Mead recreational area which is now within the Conservation Area. This safety concern has not been addressed by HCC.

7. Detrimental effect on already congested nearby Roads

The adjoining road of Bedhampton Hill is already a very well-used road as it provides access to/from the A3 and A27. Traffic often queues in all directions from the mini roundabout, and often leading all the way back to the 'Rusty Cutter' roundabout. Please see the picture below, taken during the rush hour this week, of gridlock on the 'Rusty Cutter' roundabout due to queues along the Bedhampton Hill road.



The approved plans for Forty Acres will add to this congestion and only make the situation even worse. This aspect has been reported as "resulting in 1 additional movement every 4 minutes across the peak hours" and has clearly not been addressed properly and has therefore been disregarded by HCC.

8. The neglect of exit traffic effects on the mini roundabout

There is no assessment for the mini roundabout / Brookside Road entrance in the light of possible changes to the mini roundabout. The mini roundabout prior to turning right into Brookside Road from the West approach can become grid locked when too many cars are waiting to enter Brookside Road due to the extremely short distance allocated for cars to wait as seen in the photograph below:



The proposal is missing how the additional "right turn" traffic from Brookside Road will affect the mini roundabout which will have a significant impact on all road users. This has been conveniently disregarded by HCC?

9. The mini roundabout traffic incidents are not referred to in the proposal

The reported traffic incidents on the mini roundabout on the exit to Brookside Road are not referred to in the proposal. There have been a number of incidents on the mini roundabout which have been conveniently omitted from the development proposal and have been disregarded by HCC. The increase in traffic levels due to the proposed development will certainly add pressure to the mini roundabout and cause increased accident levels.

10. Alternative Lodge Road footpath is not a viable option

Using the Lodge Road footpath as an alternative to using the Lower Road bends is not a suitable alternative. It is too narrow for Motability scooters and prams to pass. You can't see the far end of the footpath from either end and it is very intimidating for pedestrians. Some pictures are provided below to highlight the limited illumination provided on this footpath.



Natural human behaviour would be to take the shortest route, which is via the Lower Road shared space. The footpath would remain unused and to suggest it as a viable option within the mitigation to avoid the dangerous sections of Lower Road is irresponsible and inaccurate. HCC seem unconcerned about resident's personal safety on this subject.

11. Increased cyclists and pedestrians along Lower Road from the recently approved Forty Acre site

Due to the Forty Acre site planning application being approved, additional pedestrians and cyclists will utilise Lower Road. Human nature will lead people to use the shortest route regardless of any mitigation put in place and this aspect has not been considered.

12. Lower Road is liable to flooding which creates a danger

Lower Road is liable to flooding due to blocked drains which I have cleared many times in the past. Also, when snow falls the road becomes very dangerous to navigate and takes a long time to clear due to the shade effect of the nearby trees. This aspect has not been considered either.

13. The proposal neglects the state of the pathways near the blind bends

The pathways leading to the blind bends are in poor condition and users find them difficult to navigate, especially the elderly and disabled. The paths are narrow and not suitable for wheelchairs, buggies or mobility scooters which are then forced to use the road. The pathway leading to the corner by the Elms is shown below:



The absence of any pathways between the bends creates safety problems for pedestrians and passing vehicles which HBC and HCC have already acknowledged but the poor condition of the leading pathways has been neglected.

14. Inadequate response provided by i-Transport to the Road Safety Concerns

The revised traffic predictions and response to HCC questions is inadequate and condescending. The cavalier attitude to the serious safety concerns raised is unprofessional and their attitude to the clarification responses requested are dismissive in their reasoning. Unfortunately, HCC have just taken the information provided as correct even though evidence that contradicts some of the data has been provided to HCC.

In summary, the residents safety related objections raised above have not been adequately assessed by HCC and some concerns have been completely dismissed. I strongly object to the method in which HCC have dealt with the safety concerns and hope this flawed and poor-quality planning application is again reviewed in the professional manner expected before any decision is reached. Please add this objection to the Planning Application Documents within APP/19/00427.

Please can you acknowledge receipt of this objection.

Regards