



Head of Planning

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

*Economy, Transport and Environment Department
Elizabeth II Court West, The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD*

Tele: 0845 603 5638 (General Enquiries)
0845 603 5633 (Roads and Transport)
0845 603 5634 (Recycling Waste & Planning)
Textphone 0845 603 5625
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

<i>Enquiries to</i>	Holly Drury	<i>My reference</i>	HD 6/3/13/175
<i>Direct Line</i>	01962 826996	<i>Your reference</i>	APP/17/00007
<i>Date</i>	3rd March 2017	<i>Email</i>	Holly.drury@hants.gov.uk

For the attention of David Eaves

Dear Sir,

Outline planning application for the erection of up to 210 residential dwellings (including affordable housing) and 0.6ha for apartments with care (C2), structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space, children's play areas, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) vehicular access from St Mary's Road and associated ancillary works. All matters reserved with the exception of the main vehicular access.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above application.

Policy Review

The transport assessment (TA) considers the policy background to the proposals, providing a summary of national, regional and local policies.

The proposed development does not form part of the current Core Strategy or Havant's adopted Allocations. In preparation for the emerging Local Plan to 2036 Havant Borough Council have adopted a Local Plan Housing Statement. This sets out the proposed development to 2036 and splits the sites into 'Early Release' sites, those which are deemed suitable to come forward ahead of the adoption of the emerging local plan. This proposed site does not sit within this list. Development at Rook Farm sits within a category of 'uncertain potential' and are therefore considered to require further investigation regarding infrastructure issues relating to a number of services including highway capacity on Hayling Island.

Whilst a review of the application with regards highway matters has been undertaken, this is in advance of the emerging Local Plan and the

*Director of Economy, Transport and
Environment*

infrastructure delivery review to support planned growth. This is to demonstrate that any planned for development on Hayling Island contributes towards necessary infrastructure. I would therefore request that this position is noted when considering this application.

Site Location

The proposed development site is located on land to the north and west of St Mary's Road. The site access is located on the adopted highway of St Mary's Road between property numbers 115 and 123 for a 30m long section. This would form the single vehicular access to the site. The north/south section of St Mary's Road also provides vehicle and pedestrian access to Mengham Infant School and a public car park.

St Mary's Road is located to the south of Hayling Island which has only a single connection to the mainland.

There are a number of public rights of way which bound the site. This includes Footpath 93 along the northern boundary, 92 along the western boundary and then onto Manor Road. This also connects to Footpath 94 which provides a link to the east/west section of St Mary's Road and run along the remainder of the western boundary of the site.

Site Access

Access to the site is proposed via a simple priority junction onto St Mary's Road. The details of the proposed access are provided on drawing number P16031-001D.

Speed surveys have been undertaken and demonstrate recorded 85thile dry weather speeds of 29mph northeast bound and 20mph southwest bound. Based on these recorded speeds, Manual for Streets visibility splays are deemed appropriate. Whilst site lines have been provided on the drawing, both from the site access and proposed pedestrian crossings, visibility splays dimensions need to be included in order to be able to confirm their acceptability.

The site access will also require swept path analysis of a pantechicon vehicle. In addition tracking should be provided by the developer to assess the changes to the junction improvements of St Marys Road/Church Road and the bus lay-by.

The swept paths for the refuse vehicle demonstrate the vehicle crossing the centre line of the new access, putting it into conflict with other vehicles that would be there. This is not acceptable and when reviewing the swept paths the applicant should ensure that a Super Large Refuse Vehicle is used.

The articulated lorry tracking has not been shown from Church Road (south) into St. Marys Road and vice versa, this should be submitted to the highway authority.

For movements from Church Road (north), the artic vehicle's tracking speed is not quoted and should be shown on the drawing. The artic tracking submitted indicates that the vehicle will use the whole width of St. Marys Road because of the proposed pedestrian refuge. The applicant should consider further how this movement will be accommodated and the timing of the pedestrian refuge works should planning permission be granted.

A Road Safety Audit has not been submitted within the TA. One should be submitted to fully assess the relationship between the site access and its close proximity to the St Mary's Road/Elm Grove junction.

Trip Generation

Trip rates have derived from the Land South of Beech Grove application APP/12/00966. This approach is considered acceptable to the highway authority and was agreed during pre-application discussions.

Traffic Distribution and Assignment

The methodology for assigning traffic onto the network was also agreed as part of the pre-application discussions and considered acceptable to assess the impact of development traffic.

A3023 Capacity Assessment

An assessment of the capacity of the A3023 has been undertaken. This assessment refers to a morning peak of 09:00-10:00am. It is not clear why this time period has been used for the assessment and whether it represents the busiest morning hour and this will need to be supported with appropriate data.

The highway authority have reviewed the data presented in the Transport Assessment with data collected from a permanent counter on the A3023 bridge. When interrogating the data collected over the same period, 22/09/2016 – 28/09/2016, the vehicle flows included within the Transport Assessment are lower than that collected from the permanent counter. The two way 5 day average flows recorded by HCC are higher by 302 and 349 in the AM and PM peak respectively. The applicant is asked to review their data and consider updating their assessment using the data collected from the permanent counter.

Notwithstanding this, the traffic flows have then been assessed against DMRB theoretical capacity guidelines as set out in TA 79/99. Whilst for the bridge itself a classification of an Urban All-Purpose Road type 1 may be appropriate this is only a very short section of the route. North of the bridge the road would be classified as a UAP2 road and to the south would be a UAP3. Given that the route is continuous a simple examination of the capacity at one very small section is not appropriate to assess whether the capacity of the road will be compromised by additional development in the south of the island. Therefore additional assessments should be undertaken to the south and north of the bridge, including an assessment of journey time reliability and delay.

Junction Assessments

The impact of traffic from the development has been assessed for the following junctions:

- A27/A3023 Langstone Road/Park Road South
- A3023 Langstone Road/Langstoke Technology Park Access
- A3023 Havant Road/Church Road Roundabout
- A3023 Manor Road/St Mary's Road/Station Road Junction
- Elm Grove/Cherrywood Gardens Junction
- St Mary's Road/Cherrywood Gardens Junction
- St Mary's Road/Tournerbury Lane/Elm Grove/Church Road Staggered Crossroads

Traffic surveys were undertaken to determine the current operation of these junctions. These surveys collected information on turning movements and queue lengths as well as volume of traffic.

This assessment has demonstrated that the junctions in the immediate vicinity of the site have a peak hour at school collection time (15:30-16:30) which is in excess of the traditional PM peak. It was therefore requested that for these junctions three peak periods are modelled.

A27/A3023 Langstone Road/Park Road South

This junction is managed by Highways England who will be responding separately on the impact on the operation of this junction.

A3023 Langstone Road/Langstoke Technology Park Access

The 2016 base model results suggest that that junction is currently operating with reserve capacity during the AM and PM peak hours. The maximum RFC in 2016 is of 0.65 on the Technology Park Access left turn during the PM peak hour. In the development scenarios the junction is predicted to continue to operate within capacity during the AM and PM peak hours with the highest RFC of 0.83 predicted on the Technology Park access left turn in the PM peak hour in the '2021 with Development Sensitivity Test' Scenario. The maximum queue is of 4.3 PCUs on the same movement in the same peak hour and scenario.

A3023 Havant Road/Church Road Roundabout

The 2016 base model results suggest that that junction is currently operating with some reserve capacity during the AM, PM and School peak hours with a maximum RFC of 0.74 in the AM peak hour on the Church Road approach. In 2021 scenario without development the junction is predicted to operate within capacity during the AM, PM and School peak with the highest RFC of 0.81 on Church Road approach in the AM peak hour in the '2021 without Development' Scenario. In the development scenarios the junction is predicted to operate above practical capacity during the AM, PM and School peak hours with the highest RFC of 0.90 predicted on Church Road approach

in the AM peak hour in the '2021 with Development Sensitivity Test' Scenario. A queue of 7.9 PCUs occurs along with this RFC.

Given the high RFC on Church Road it is recommended that the junction is modelled in Junctions 9 'Lane Simulation' model in order to provide a more accurate understanding of queueing and delay at the junction.

A3023 Manor Road/St Mary's Road/Station Road Junction

The following concerns are raised with regard to the geometric parameters used within the model:

- Width of Arm C Manor Road opposite Arm B Station Road - when street lining is taken into account carriageway width appears to be approximately 6.3m rather than the 7.55m entered into the model.
- Visibility for the vehicles turning right from Arm C Manor Road into Arm B Station Road along Arm A Beach Road appears over-optimistic given trees and a parking lay-by within the line of sight.

St. Mary's Road is modelled as one lane plus flare. It is recommended that this is modelled as two lanes in line with TRL.

A zebra pedestrian crossing is located on Beach Road- approximately 40m south of St Mary's Road. It is suggested that the impact of this facility on junction capacity should be tested in the model.

The model should be updated and resubmitted for further review.

Elm Grove/Cherrywood Gardens Junction

The maximum RFC value modelled at this junction for the 2021 scenario is 0.29 which demonstrated this junction will continue to operate within capacity.

St Mary's Road/Cherrywood Gardens Junction

The 2016 base model results suggest that that junction is currently operating with significant reserve capacity during the AM, PM and School peak hours with a maximum RFC of 0.15 in the PM peak on the St Mary's Road (N) right turn approach. In the development scenarios the junction is predicted to continue to operate within capacity during the AM, PM and School peak hours with the highest RFC of 0.18 predicted on the St Mary's Road (N) right turn approach in the PM peak hour in the '2021 with Development Sensitivity Test' Scenario.

St Mary's Road/Tournerbury Lane/Elm Grove/Church Road Staggered Crossroads

The traffic flows entered for St Mary's Road in the model do not match the flow diagrams in Appendix C. In each scenario PCUs assigned to the left turn movement to Arm C Church Road (incorrectly labelled as Elm Grove) have been assigned to Tournerbury Lane in the model. The HGV percentages also need to be revisited accordingly.

Proposed Site Access

The modelling demonstrates that the site access would operate within capacity.

Based on the above, it is recommended that the following models are re-visited:

- J3 A3023 Havant Road / Church Road;
- J4 A3023 Manor Road / St Mary's Rd /Station Road;
- J7 Church Road / Tournurbury Lane / Elm Grove / St Mary's Road, and;

Sustainable Modes of Access

Footway provision on the north/south section of St Mary's Road is currently lacking in the vicinity of the site. Pedestrian crossing facilities at the Elm Grove junction are also lacking. The applicant has proposed improvements to address both of these points. Whilst they are both welcomed they require further work before they could be considered as acceptable mitigation, as set out below.

Footway Provision St Mary's Road

The plan P16031-001D shows improvements to footway provision along St Mary's Road. The footway on the northern side of St Mary's road narrows adjacent to No. 109 to below 1.8 metres to 1.3 metres. Whilst the applicant was asked to explore an option here to continue the footway, having reviewed the proposals the highway authority consider the width to be substandard and that the extended footway is not provided, with pedestrian crossing to use the existing footway on the southern side.

The applicant should note that footway construction and tactile paving used at the car park access will have to be designed for vehicle overrun as this is likely to occur.

Crossing Improvements St Mary's Road Junction with Elm Grove

Drawing P16031-002 shows proposed improvements to the St Mary's/Elm Grove junction. The tactile paving proposed on the north side of St. Marys Road is located on an access and therefore will have to be reconsidered. The proposed pedestrian refuge on Church Road (south of St Marys Road) is too narrow and should be a minimum width of 1.5m.

The proposed alterations to the bus layby (north of St Marys Road) will impact on access to Electric Sub-Station, potentially highway drainage and the operation of the bus stop. The developer should further investigate this and look into relocating the bus stop.

East/west connectivity

The proposals do not provide measures to connect the site to West Town, West Beach and the ferry to Portsmouth and it is recommended that a review of existing rights of way around the site is undertaken to identify potential improvements to facilitate sustainable access to these locations.

In addition, access to the west from the development should be explored by the applicant as well, again reviewing the opportunity to upgrade rights of way to provide improved sustainable access to the site.

Access to Public Transport

Buses

The nearest bus stops are located on Elm Grove to the east of the site. They are located within 400 metres from the site access. The service provides a link to Havant rail station. It should be noted that the distance to the bus stops increases for dwellings further into the site.

Rail

The nearest rail station is at Havant which is located over 7.5km away from the site access. Services include London Waterloo, London Victoria, Brighton, Portsmouth Harbour and Southampton Central. Whilst the rail station provides frequent services, the distance from the site will only result in a limited uptake and use of the car to travel to the station..

Personal Injury Accidents

The Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data included within the TA is over a five year period from 1st June 2011 to 31st May 2016. The study area includes the A3023 from its junction with the A27 and Park Road South in Havant to the north, to its junction with Sea Front (Beachlands Roundabout) in the south. Also included is Church Road from its junction with the A3023 and Sea Front to the north and south respectively as well as St Mary's Road and Cherrywood Gardens. This data and study area is considered acceptable.

During the agreed study period, a total of ninety one recorded accidents occurred. Of these, seventy five accidents were recorded as slight and sixteen were recorded as serious, no fatal accidents were recorded. For ease, the accident data has been broken down into three smaller areas.

South Island Area

Four slight accidents have been recorded at study junction 7, Church Road/Tournerbury Lane/Elm Grove/St Mary's Road. Of the four accidents, two involved mobility scooters and one pedestrian being hit following a rear end shunt collision involving three vehicles. The highway improvement scheme, as shown on drawing P16031-002, looks to improve the safety of non-motorised users by introducing a refuge island although this will need to be improved in line with the comments provided in this response.

Two accidents occurred at study junction 5, Elm Grove/Cherrywood Gardens. One was recorded as serious and one was recorded as slight, both are attributed to driver error.

Four accidents, one serious and three slight, occurred along the Cherrywood Gardens/St Mary's Road corridor. The serious accident occurred when a cyclist swerved into an oncoming vehicle, it should be noted that the cyclist was impaired by alcohol. The TA commentary does not go into further detail of the slight accidents and the accident data should be provided. No accidents occurred on St Mary's Road adjacent to the proposed site access.

A total of five accidents occurred along the Manor Road/Beach Road corridor. Two of which were serious and three were recorded as slight. None of the accidents were attributed to the layout of the road and were caused by other factors. Seven slight accidents have been recorded on the A3023 to the East of Church Road and the southern end of the study area and were all attributed to driver error or impairment of alcohol.

North Island Area

There has been thirty five recorded accidents on this section of the A3023 corridor. Six serious and twenty nine slight injuries have been recorded. The six serious injuries have not been attributed to deficiencies of the highway layout and have been caused by a driver using a telephone, inexperienced motorcycle driver, aggressive driver and distractions to the driver inside and outside of the vehicle.

Some of the slight accidents did occur in foggy weather conditions and during darkness. The causation factors of the slight injury accidents include a cyclist entering the road from the pavement without looking properly, vehicles travelling too fast and too close to other vehicles, drivers failing to judge the speed and path of other vehicles, poor manoeuvring and inexperienced drivers or riders.

Mainland Area

Along the mainland stretch of the A3023, fifteen accidents have been recorded, of these, two have resulted in serious injuries. Both have not been caused by the layout of the road. The remaining slight accidents have been attributed to driver error, speeding, weather, impaired by drugs and wet carriageway conditions.

There has been one serious accident on the section of A27 located within the study area which has been attributed to speed. There has been seven slight accidents occur on the A27 roundabout. Two of these seven were isolated incidents caused by medical episodes and one was caused by foggy weather conditions.

The TA contains commentary on the accidents however does not contain the raw accident data which should be provided to fully assess all accidents.

Parking and Internal Layout

Matters relating to parking and the internal layout shall be responded on by our agent at Havant Borough Council under the terms of the agency agreement.

Travel Plan

The Framework Travel Plan (FTP) has been assessed using Hampshire's (HCC) evaluation criteria for the assessment of travel plans - "A guide to development related travel plans". The Framework Travel Plan will require only minor further amendments, as set out below,

- The FTP should commit to future liaison with public transport operators and cycle shops as part of the role of the Travel Plan Coordinator (TPC).
- The span of the bus timetables should be added for the 30 and 31 services.
- Section 7.8.2 makes reference to Hants Car Share. This is no longer funded by HCC and reference to it should be removed.
- Although a budget has not yet been set, ideally, a figure for a bond would be included in the condition for a full travel plan and would be secured through a Section 106 agreement. This is normally based on a percentage of the costs for measures
- The suggested timeline in the interim plan is acceptable. Details of the TPC should be provided to HCC at least three months prior to occupation.
- The FTP states that frequency of the surveys will be discussed with HCC. The surveys should include a baseline survey as detailed in the FTP followed by repeat surveys in years 1, 3 and 5 of the travel plan. A summary of the results must be shared with HCC within three months of each survey.
- The FTP states that the house builder/TPC will aim for 35% response rate. The FTP should identify some measures to encourage this response rate.

A commitment should also be made to paying HCC's fees for approval and monitoring.

The issues raised should be addressed in a new revision before it can be considered acceptable for submission in conjunction with the proposed residential site. The location of the revisions should be highlighted in a summary page.

Recommendation

Additional information is sought from the applicant relating to the following:

- The Site Access
- Proposed improvements at Elm Grove/St Mary's Road junction
- Proposed footway improvements on St Mary's Road

- Linkages to the right of way network and improvements to facilitate walking and cycling
- Travel Plan
- Capacity of the A3023
- Junction modelling
- PIA accident data

If you are minded to determine the application before this additional information is submitted, I would request that the application is refused for the following reasons:

- In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with the National Planning Policy Framework in that the significant movements generated could not be accommodated adequately on the existing transport network. This would result in a severe impact on the road safety and operation of the local transport network contrary to the NPPF and DM12 of the Havant Borough Council Core Strategy.
- In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with the National Planning Policy Framework in that proposed access are inadequate to accommodate the development safely. This would result in an unacceptable impact on the safety of users of the development and adjoining highway contrary to the NPPF and of the Havant Borough Council Core Strategy.
- In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with the National Planning Policy Framework in that there is insufficient provision of, or support for, sustainable transport options. This would result in a greater number of trips by private car which will create a severe impact on the local transport network and environment contrary to the NPPF and policy DM11 and DM12 of the Havant Borough Council Core Strategy.

I trust that the above is clear but I would ask you not to hesitate to contact Holly Drury should you wish to discuss anything further.

Yours faithfully

Ben Clifton
Team Leader- Highways Development Planning.

CC Peter Marshall, Development Engineer, Havant Borough Council