

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 Sophie Osborne

Direct Line

Date 19 July 2024

My reference 053545

Your reference APP/24/00342

Email havantdc@hants.gov.uk

Dear Ms Taylor,

Woodcroft Farm Development Site, Woodcroft Lane, Waterlooville

Outline Planning Application for the development of up to 190 units, with associated vehicular access, infrastructure and landscaping (all matters reserved except access).

Thank you for your consultation on the above outline planning application. To support this planning application the applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (TA) dated March 2024 and supporting drawings which the Highway Authority have reviewed and have the following comments to make.

Pre-application advice

The applicant engaged in pre-application advice with the Highway Authority in March 2024. The response requested further information on a number of matters. The TA notes that the pre-application comments have not been addressed within this TA. Comments raised within the pre-app and any outstanding matters are discussed where appropriate throughout this response.

Policy Status

The TA provides a summary of the relevant transport and planning policies. The site is not allocated within the East Hampshire District Council Local Plan – Housing and Employment Allocations dated April 2016, however, it has been identified as an allocation within the emerging local plan under reference HDN1 (not HD-024 as referred to within the TA).

Policy HDN1 within the emerging local plan suggests that the allocation has the capacity to provide a residential development for 164 dwellings. It is noted that the proposed quantum of 190 dwellings exceeds this allocation.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Specifically in relation to HDN1 and the highway matters the emerging policy requires:

- New vehicular connections via recent development to the south and adjoining rights of way networks e.g. new connections necessary to support development improving permeability for walking and cycling and enabling healthy and active lifestyles
- Improved pedestrian connections through to the Weacock Recreation Ground and on to the community centre at Weacock Farm should be investigated

The applicant should review the Highway Authority's response to the Reg18 consultation and comments have been made within this response which accord with the Reg18 position.

Site Location

The site is located to the north of the Catherington Park housing development. To the north, west and southwest the site is bound by agricultural fields with existing residential development to the south and east. The site is currently a greenfield site.

Transport Assessment Methodology

It was requested at the pre-app stage that any future TA aligned with the Decide and Provide approach. This would assess and prioritise any opportunities to significantly improve sustainable transport provision for all modes (walking, cycling and public transport) before determining if there are any remaining significant residual impacts to safe and efficient operation of the highway.

The TA to support this planning application has not considered the Decide and Provide approach. Narrative on the existing transport infrastructure is lacking and the same as put forward at the pre-application stage. No further assessment work has been undertaken on the existing routes on their quality and suitability to accommodate additional demand for sustainable transport modes. No opportunities for improvements have been proposed where the existing infrastructure is of poor quality, lacking or substandard in accordance with guidance. This is imperative to be undertaken to establish whether there are appropriate opportunities to improve the existing infrastructure, encourage travel by sustainable modes and reduce the reliance on the private car to comply with the adopted LTP4 policy.

Sustainable Access

A WCHAR in accordance with HCC TG19 has not been submitted to support this application. The commentary suggests a full WCHAR is to be carried out at the RM stage which is not agreed. All off-site highway works and improvements are to be secured and agreed at the outline stage.

The TA provides as an assessment of the local facilities and services available to the development and the distance of these from the centre of the site. Active Travel

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

England identify that a site should have a sufficient number and range of local facilities within an 800m (10-minute walking distance via an accessible walking route. This includes the following:

- A food shop which sells fresh fruit and vegetables
- A park or green space
- An indoor meeting place (pub, café, community centre or place of worship).
- A primary school
- A post office or bank
- A GP surgery

Of the above list an indoor meeting place, post office or bank and GP surgery fall outside of these recommended walking distances. Notwithstanding the base level of infrastructure required by Active Travel England, considerations must be given to access to secondary school and employment opportunities albeit it is considered appropriate for these to be beyond the 800m walking distance.

The requested WCHAR assessment will need to assess the walking and cycling routes to these facilities as listed above and identify any defects within the existing infrastructure that would benefit from improvements to reduce the reliance on the private car to access these facilities. The Highway Authority reserve the right to make further comments on receipt of the WCHAR assessment.

As previously requested, the WCHAR should include a Healthy Streets Audit and consideration should also be given to the use of ATE's Route Check Tool to consolidate the requirements of the WCHAR and Healthy Streets Assessment. Given the presence of the bridleway/restricted byway and the interaction of the site access arrangements the British Horse Society should be consulted through this process with specific consideration on the implications of where the bridleway meets areas subject to vehicular traffic.

Catherington Park (On-site) Accessibility:

The narrative is limited on the existing walking infrastructure with the TA. Whilst the Catherington Park development is still under construction the applicant should be made aware that consent was given nearly 10 years ago. Design guidelines have since progressed and therefore revisions may be required internally within the development to accord with current standards and guidelines. Any infrastructure through the consented application that this application is reliant on must be constructed prior to occupation of any part of this proposed development to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority to ensure safe and suitable access is achieved.

Circa 2.0m footways flank either side of Merritt Way. Dropped kerbs with tactile paving are present at the side road on the eastern side of Merritt Way and at its junction with Baker Close.

The current pedestrian infrastructure at Powell Drive is poorly connected at present due to the temporary arrangement for the show homes. The requirement for this

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

amendment to remain is unclear and should be clarified. As identified at the pre-app stage, the footway on the eastern side of the carriageway between Merritt Way and Budd Close is substandard in width and should be widened to a minimum width of 3.0m to provide inclusive footway facilities for all users, particularly parents accessing the primary school with pushchairs. It is unclear from the consent whether the provision on Powell Drive is also intended to cater for cyclists and this should be clarified. With the increase in development proposed it would be appropriate to facilitate cycle use on Powell Drive segregated from vehicular traffic.

The intended purpose of the existing fence on the carriageway of Powell Drive should be clarified, and a design solution reached which does not result in a fence being within the areas subject to vehicular traffic.

No commentary is provided within the TA regarding the footpath connection to the south of Budd Close on the western side of Powell Drive. This runs to the rear of a fence line providing access to Wecock recreation ground and a leisure route towards Hobby Close. The Highway Authority raised at the pre-application stage that the footway is currently of a poor quality and substandard width. Additionally, the route is currently overgrown and not clear that this is for use of pedestrians. It remains necessary for this to be widened and resurfaced to provide an attractive alternative route to the existing footway on the eastern side of Powell Drive. This has not yet been considered within the assessment work undertaken and it is requested that this is explored.

Narrative has also not been provided for access into the site and the pedestrian infrastructure via Wilkes Way. It is requested that this is undertaken as part of the required WCHAR assessment.

Regarding cycling, it is unclear whether any dedicated cycle infrastructure is present within the direct vicinity of the site albeit the Highway Authority consider the Catherington Park development generally to be conducive to on-carriageway cycling notwithstanding the comments regarding Powell Drive. Whilst this is the case, given the shared use provision at both access points into the proposed development, opportunities to better connect cyclists within the Catherington Park development should be explored. The design is currently poor with a mixture of on and off-carriageway cycle provision both within existing and proposed development causing confusion for both vehicle users and cyclists. Opportunities to provide off-carriageway cycle infrastructure should be explored through the WCHAR assessment.

Off-site Accessibility

The TA is misleading when suggesting that dropped kerb crossing points with tactile paving are provided across all junctions. This is not the case on the ground for junctions on the southern side of Eagle Avenue. The Highway Authority do not agree with the footway widths and consider at their minimum a 1.5m footway is present which is substandard. There are opportunities to widen the footways in the majority of locations and this should be explored and identified within the WCHAR. HCC TG10 guidance

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

allows reductions in the required 2.0m if there are clear constraints which is not considered the case along Eagle Avenue.

The TA suggests 'good' provision is present to the south of the site however no narrative has been provided on the quality of these routes, widths and whether these would benefit from any improvements. The TA refers to the Havant Cycle Map which identifies Woodcroft Lane and Milton Road as a 'suggested cycle route'. The southern end of Milton Road is a signed cycle network route with sections of off-road cycle infrastructure offering a good level of service. No commentary has been provided on the suitability of this exiting infrastructure connecting the site to this point of the network and whether it would benefit from any improvements. These matters should be identified through the WCHAR assessment.

Notwithstanding the evidence base within the TA, Milton Road itself is identified on the adopted Havant LCWIP as a secondary cycle route (Route 359.2) with 5 potential improvements (359.2.1-359.2.5). This route connects into NCN 222. In general, along this route, the LCWIP identifies that high traffic volumes and speeds along this route along with disjointed shared use infrastructure acts as a barrier to cycling. It is therefore not considered that Milton Road is particularly conducive to on-carriageway cycling despite assumptions within the TA. Additionally route 359.1 identifies improvement opportunities along the route towards Horndean Technology College (the catchment secondary school for the site). Study work is being undertaken along the Hambledon Road corridor improving connectivity with Elettra Avenue on the opposite side of the B2150. There is currently a funding shortfall for the implementation of this scheme. It is highly likely that a financial contribution will be necessary towards the improvements as identified within the Havant LCWIP and ongoing study work to prioritise active transport modes and reduce the car dependency complying with LTP4. The Highway Authority welcome further discussion with the applicant on this point following the outcome of the WCHAR assessment as laid out below.

Public Rights of Way (PRoW):

There are a number of PRoW's which border the proposed development. Restricted byway 119/46/1 abuts the northern boundary with bridleway 108/1b/1 and 119/30/1 abutting the eastern and western boundaries of the site respectively. Both bridleways also provide connections into and through the Catherington Park development.

The applicant identifies that the current surfacing of the restricted byway is poor and currently unsuitable for use in most locations. Additionally, they identify that all PROWs identified are overgrown and would benefit from lighting provision to encourage use of these routes.

The commentary within the TA on engagement with Hampshire Countryside services is not agreed. Any contributions or improvement works sought to the PRoW network should be secured through the outline planning application. The Highway Authority understand that contributions towards improving the PRoWs (namely restricted byway

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

119/46/1 and bridleway 108/1b/1) are to be sought from Hampshire Countryside Services through any future S106 agreement for this outline planning application.

Connections onto restricted byway 119/46/1 would increase the attractiveness of cycling to egress the site via a traffic free route. It is understood based on the indicative masterplan layout that footway connections onto the byway are proposed within the western parcel. No consideration has been given to these connections within the eastern parcel. This should also provide opportunities for cyclists to access the byway considering the nature of this PRoW facilitates use of bicycles. Additionally, within the southeastern corner of the eastern parcel shared use connections onto bridleway 108/1b/1 should also be explored.

Restricted Byway 119/46/1 is likely to be a key walking and cycling route for future residents accessing the Tesco Express via Woodlands Avenue and for onward connections to Horndean Technology College, the catchment secondary school. Improved connections onto this route should therefore be sought to provide a traffic free route out of the development site, also reducing the walking and cycling distances.

Buses:

The TA identifies 3 bus stops available for future residents of the proposed development located along Eagle Avenue. The 'Curlew Gardens' bus stop is the closest to the site (c.550m) located adjacent to the east of Powell Drive. It is noted that this only provides an EB service. The closest WB bus service ('Dove Close') is c. 750m to the west of Powell Drive. It is noted that both of these stops fall outside the recommended walking distance in accordance with the ATE guidance (400m), however given the frequency of the service a longer walking distance is considered acceptable in this instance, although the quality of the routes will require review.

The eastbound bus stop consists of a flagpole and timetable information only with the westbound bus stop subject to a shelter, albeit this is old and is not subject to RTI provision. Both stops would benefit from RTI with a new and replacement shelter provided for the eastbound and westbound stops respectively. Improvements to these bus stops and the routes of access should be investigated through the WCHAR.

Both bus stops are served by services 7 and 39 providing c. 4 services an hour to Portsmouth, Havant and Canfield Monday-Saturday with a c. 1-2 services an hour on Sundays. Additionally, school service 652 runs from these stops providing services during typical school pick up and drop off periods.

The TA also refers to the Milton Road roundabout bus stops and Lovedean Lane bus stops located along Hambledon Road and the A3 London Road c. 3km and 1.3km away from the development respectively. These bus stops given the distance of these stops from the site and the additional service provision available are unlikely to facilitate sustainable transport provision from the site.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Rail:

The nearest rail service to the site is located in Rowlands Castle, approximately 7.5km from the site. Given the identified distance, it is unlikely that occupants of the site will choose to utilise this mode of transport, unless they also travel via private car.

Personal Injury Accidents (PIA)

The applicant has submitted PIA data from Hampshire Constabulary records for a 5-year period from October 2018 to September 2023. The study area has been previously agreed with the Highway Authority at the pre-application stage. It is noted that this accident data is nearly a year out of date and therefore an internal review of accident data has been undertaken to establish if more recent accidents have been recorded within the study area.

For a time period- from February 2019 to January 2024 in total 28 accidents have occurred within the study area (1 'fatal', 6 'serious' and 21 'slight'). No accidents have occurred within the vicinity of the site access at Powell Drive. A fatal accident occurred along Milton Road within the vicinity of the Milton Road/Eagle Avenue roundabout. It is understood that the motorcyclist lost control and that no highway mitigation measures have been identified as necessary.

There are also a cluster of accidents at the Lovedean Lane/A3 London Road junction and between the Sunnymeade Drive/Milton Road and Hart Plain Avenue/Milton Road junctions. It is noted that a number of these accidents have involved cyclists. Improvements to the cycle infrastructure to improve the safety of routes and encourage use by bicycle should be identified through the WCHAR assessment.

Stage One Road Safety Audit (RSA1)

The applicant has undertaken an RSA1 to support both access proposals into the development. The RSA1 has raised 6 audit items (3.1.1-3.1.4 and 3.3.1-3.3.2) which are discussed where relevant throughout this response.

It is agreed that items 3.1.1 relating to the PSV of the shared surface connection, and 3.1.3 relating to the carriageway profile and drainage provision can be resolved at the detailed design stage. These matters will be suitably conditioned to be agreed prior to commencement in the interests of safe and suitable access into the site.

Item 3.1.2 relating to a road restraints risk assessment in accordance with TG14 will need to be undertaken at this stage to ensure that implementation of any features can be achieved in accordance with the proposed plans and that safe access can be provided.

Item 3.1.4 relates to buildout construction. These have since been removed from the access proposals and therefore this audit item is no longer relevant.

Items 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 relate to visibility splays are unresolved and discussed further within this response.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

The applicant is reminded that an RSA1 will be required for the internal road network as part of any future reserved matters planning application.

Site Access

The existing field gate access in the north-western parcel of the site is to be permanently closed as due to reduced visibility access in this location is no longer pursued. This is consistent with the emerging local plan position in terms of the access into the site.

The site is to benefit from the existing access into the Catherington Park development from Eagle Avenue. Currently this comprises a bellmouth junction albeit this is due to be upgraded to a mini roundabout in line with the access requirements identified at the planning stage for this site. It is understood that S278 technical approval for these works have been granted and the Highway Authority are awaiting confirmation from the development as to when these works are intended to commence on the site access.

As raised at the pre-application stage, the applicant should be made aware that any development expansion of Catherington Park will not be permitted to commence on site until the delivery of the mini roundabout site access works and any associated mitigation works, namely the Milton Road/Lovedean Lane junction improvements have been implemented to completion certificate standard.

Access into the development parcel itself is proposed via two separate access points: Merritt Way and Wilkes Way. The roads are currently unadopted however the Highway Authority understand that a S38 agreement is currently being progressed. The timescales are however unknown.

Additional opportunities to improve the pedestrian and cycle infrastructure from both access points and Powell Drive itself should be considered within the WCHAR assessment.

Confirmation has not been provided within the TA as to whether the site access points are to be offered for adoption by the Highway Authority. In the absence of this being confirmed the Highway Authority have assessed this on the basis that the site is being put forward for adoption. The access points should be designed in accordance with HCC Technical Guidance, Standard Details ([Highway construction standard details | Hampshire County Council \(hants.gov.uk\)](https://www.hants.gov.uk/highway-construction-standard-details)) and Notes for Guidance ([HCC11 Standard Details Notes for Guidance \(hants.gov.uk\)](https://www.hants.gov.uk/hcc11-standard-details-notes-for-guidance)).

Merritt Way (Eastern Parcel Access):

Merritt Way is currently a cul-de-sac with carriageway widths of 6.0m and footway provision flanking both sides of the carriageway. The widths of these footways have not been confirmed. Where substandard provision is provided in accordance with HCC TG10, opportunities to widen the existing provision should be pursued.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

It is noted that the proposed extension of Merritt Way cuts across bridleway 108/1b/1. This has not been identified within the aforementioned drawing and no proposals to accommodate this established route within the site access design has been put forward, which is unacceptable. The interaction of the site access and bridleway should be considered going forward and a priority crossing should be provided for the PRoW movements due to the extensive requirements required under DMRB for equestrian users. A priority crossing would remove the requirement of visibility splays instead relying on appropriate intervisibility splays for drivers where the access road would cross the bridleway.

On the western side of the access road a shared use footway/cycleway is proposed in accordance with LTN 1/20 to tie into the existing 1.8m footway along Merritt Way. The Highway Authority are concerned with the achievable forward visibility and potential conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians due to the alignment of the shared use path. Consideration should be given to segregated facilities around the bend or opportunities for a more direct connection segregated from the carriageway provision. To the south, the width of the existing footway is substandard and does not accord with HCC TG10. Opportunities to widen this to provide inclusive walking facilities should be explored. Corduroy paving is in the wrong location and should be provided before the proposed dropped kerb to ensure its effectiveness in making those with visual impairments aware they are entering a shared area.

Based on the access design that footways are not proposed on the eastern side of the access road; appropriate crossing facilities with dropped kerbs and tactile paving should therefore be provided to access the footway on the eastern side of Merritt Way when accessing and egressing the site. These crossing points should be supported with visibility splays in accordance with HCC TG2/TG3.

Visibility:

Due to access into the site being an extension of the existing Merritt Way no junction visibility splays have been provided. Notwithstanding, due the alignment of the access road into Phase 3 forward visibility splays have been provided (drawing 167.0006-0005 Rev P03).

The forward visibility splay provided fall outside of the site access footprint and red line boundary of the site. The applicant should confirm whether this falls under the ownership of the landowner or to be adopted by the Highway Authority. Visibility splays should not be reliant on 3rd party land.

Refuse and Servicing:

Swept path analysis for a refuse vehicle and delivery vehicle passing a car can be seen within drawing 167.0006-0003 Rev P04 at 10mph. The tracking provided should be consistent with the requirements for secondary-to-secondary street hierarchy as laid out

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

within TG2 with the correct dimensions utilised for the private car and delivery vehicle. Whilst it is acknowledged in accordance with TG2 guidance the refuse and fire tender are not required to pass a car, appropriate passing places and/or forward visibility should be identified. Tracking should also be provided for all movement scenarios when accessing and egressing the site.

The position of the car when passing the refuse is not considered to be a realistic position where the refuse will pass. A consistent track plot should be shown with the full manoeuvre to be undertaken. The vehicles should not be placed on the drawing where it could pass the refuse vehicle.

No tracking has been provided for a fire tender and two cars passing. This should be provided in accordance with TG2 with appropriate passing places identified for the fire tender where it cannot pass.

Tracking should also be undertaken for the proposed turning head to ensure that the required movements can be undertaken appropriately.

Wilkes Way (Western Parcel Access):

Similarly to Merritt Way, Wilkes Way is a cul-de-sac accessed via Hudson Gardens, with the access road extending to the north before routing north-west. At the pre-application stage the Highway Authority raised concern with the use of Wilkes Way to access a significant proportion of the site due to the constraints of the agreed layout and presence of on-street parking. It is concerning that the majority of the development (60%) is to be accessed via Wilkes Way confirming the concerns raised during the pre-app process.

The applicant raises that the roads are currently unadopted and therefore parking restrictions cannot be implemented nor enforced by the applicant. Even if a TRO can be implemented in the future the provision of a TRO does not override the concerns with the quantum of development proposed to be accessed via Wilkes Way. The Highway Authority consider the Merritt Way access to be more akin for a greater quantum of development than Wilkes Way due to the constraints with the existing layout and presence of on-carriageway parking to access Wilkes Way as laid out above. Merritt Way itself has a more direct access from Powell Drive than Wilkes Way.

The existing carriageway width of 6.0m is to continue into the site before narrowing to 5.5m further within the development parcel with variations in carriageway width until this point. It is unclear on the need for inconsistencies in the carriageway width along this access road and a consistent width should be provided to improve the design.

Following comments raised at the pre-app stage the number of pinch points has been reduced to one singular buildout and the proposed raised tables have been removed. The build out will reduce the carriageway width to 3.8m. The carriageway width does not accord with paragraph 5.7.6 of TG10 whereby widths between 3.2m-3.9m should

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

be avoided. The carriageway width where the pinch point is present either needs to be wider to provide sufficient width for vehicle users to overtake cyclists should they not be on the shared use path or narrower to make it clear there is not sufficient width for overtaking to take place. The width provided currently provides safety concerns for cyclists should vehicle users try and overtake.

As requested at the pre-app stage the existing footpath has been catered for with the crossing point location however the narrowing doesn't align with the footpath alignment. The footpath should be adjusted to align with the crossing point or vice versa.

On the western side of the carriageway a 3.0m shared use footway/cycleway is proposed before crossing over on to the eastern side of the carriageway with the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving. The applicant should confirm the width of these crossing points and ensure they are wide enough to accommodate use by cyclists. It is unclear whether the shared use path is to continue internally on the western side of the carriageway as the internal road network progresses. A 90-degree bend is proposed in the alignment which is not considered appropriate for shared use provision and should be revised if the shared use is to continue in this location. Wayfinding provision may be considered appropriate to direct cyclists onto the continuation of the shared use path on the eastern side of the carriageway.

The Highway Authority note that the corduroy paving is in the wrong location based on the location of the dropped kerb to allow cyclists to access and egress the shared use provision. Corduroy paving should be provided before the proposed dropped kerb to ensure its effectiveness in making those with visual impairments aware they are entering a shared area.

Visibility:

Intervisibility splays for vehicles have been shown within drawing 167.0006-0006 Rev P03. The Highway Authority are content that appropriate intervisibility is provided. Visibility splays have been provided for the private drive of 25.0m or 15.0m to the tangent.

Additionally pedestrian visibility splays have been submitted for the proposed tactile crossing points (drawing 167.0006-0007) based on a 30mph design speed. It is unclear why visibility splays for a 30mph design speed have been provided when it is understood a 20mph design speed is proposed. This should be clarified.

In general, the applicant should confirm whether all visibility splays fall within land under the applicant's jurisdiction or proposed to be adopted by the Highway Authority. Visibility splays should not be reliant on 3rd party land. Visibility splays have not been drawn in

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

accordance with HCC TG10/TG3 as a 0.3m offset has not been provided and should be revised. Audit items 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 therefore remain unresolved.

Refuse and Servicing:

Swept path analysis has been demonstrated within drawing 167.0006-0004 Rev P04. Tracking should be provided in accordance with a secondary-secondary street hierarchy as laid out within TG2 with the correct dimensions utilised for the private car and delivery vehicle. This should be provided for all movements when accessing and egressing the sites.

In general, the tracking provided is very tight however does appear to be achievable. Where the refuse vehicle cannot pass appropriate intervisibility has been demonstrated for vehicles to stop and wait where passing can occur. Notwithstanding, the tracking should be updated with the correct sized vehicles before any firm comments can be provided on the suitability of the proposed access. This should also take into consideration the revised carriageway widths for the buildout as raised above.

No tracking has been provided for a fire tender and two cars passing. This should be provided in accordance with TG2 with appropriate passing places identified for the fire tender where it cannot pass.

Emergency Access:

The PSN notes that an emergency access is to be provided in the form of a 3.0m shared pedestrian and cycle link providing connections between the two parcels for emergency access if necessary. The Highway Authority note that 3.0m is not wide enough for emergency access provision. HIWFRS should be consulted on this matter to establish their design requirements for an emergency access. The emergency access should be indicatively shown at the outline stage with details secured to be provided through the RM application. Additionally, consideration should be given towards a more direct route through the site for pedestrians and cyclists that the alignment currently shown.

Internal Road Network

An indicative masterplan for the internal road network is shown within drawing IM001. The masterplan is extremely limited in nature however the following high-level comments are provided.

In general footpath connectivity through the site is poor. Comments above regarding additional connections onto the PRow to be secured at the outline stage will influence the development of the internal road network. Further consideration should be given for pedestrian connections throughout the site. Additionally, where play areas are proposed there appears to be a lack of footpath connectivity to access them. Internal footpath connectivity should be considered at the RM stage.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

The concerns raised with the quantum of development accessed via Wilkes Way will likely alter the proposed layout moving forward.

It is understood that the internal road network is to be designed to 20mph with visibility splays provided in accordance with this design speed. The Highway Authority agreed the principle of this approach during the pre-app process.

The internal road network is to be formed of the main access road, secondary streets along with courtyard and private drives. Since comments were made at the pre-application stage HCC TG1 and TG2 have been released providing guidance on the internal road network and junction design. Any internal layout put forward as part of the RM stage should therefore be designed in accordance with this guidance.

It is unclear whether the internal road network will be put forward for adoption at the RM stage. If the site is to be offered for adoption, then adoptable design standards should be adhered to and should be designed in accordance with the HCC Technical Guidance, Standard Details ([Highway construction standard details | Hampshire County Council \(hants.gov.uk\)](https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards)) and Notes for Guidance ([HCC11 Standard Details Notes for Guidance \(hants.gov.uk\)](https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards)).

Notwithstanding, should the site remain private, it is advisable that the developer ensures that the roads and footways are designed to minimum industry standards and / or Hampshire County Council's best practice as set out in <https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards>, and that an appropriate Private Management Plan is put in place to deal with any future issues.

Additionally, developers should also be made aware of the Advanced Payment Code (APC) that will be required by the Highway Authority. Details of this can be found via the following link:
<http://documents.hants.gov.uk/transport/APCProcess-Guidancedocumentforwebsitev22018-04-02.pdf>

The Highway Authority offer a pre-application advice service on the internal layout, and it is strongly recommended that the applicant engages in this service at the earliest stage possible to ensure feedback can be integrated into the design before the layout is fixed. The Healthy Streets approach should be considered and embedded within any future internal layout design. This framework is identified within TG10. Introduction of places to stop and rest and things to see and do for example can improve the placemaking and social cohesion of the area.

Refuse/Servicing:

The TA lays out that as part of any future RM application the internal layout will be designed to accommodate the required movements of an 11.20m 'super large' refuse vehicle and fire tender. The vehicles will be able to access dwellings in line with the requirements laid out within Manual for Streets. This is noted.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Swept path analysis will also be required for a car and delivery vehicle in line with HCC TG2 based on the street hierarchy for the internal road network. The street hierarchy will be agreed at the RM stage.

Parking Provision

The TA lays out that car and cycle parking will be provided in accordance with EHDC's Parking standards at the RM stage. HCC TG2 also provides specific requirements on parallel parking space dimensions in accordance with TSRGD should these be proposed throughout the internal road network. EV charging provision is also to be provided. This is noted.

Trip Generation

A trip generation assessment for the development has been undertaken utilising the TRICS database. The proposed trip rates as agreed at the pre-app stage are as follows:

	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)		PM Peak (17:00-18:00)		Daily 12 hours
	Arr.	Dept.	Arr.	Dept.	
Trip Rate	0.144	0.368	0.358	0.152	4.456
Trip Generation (200 dwellings)	29	74	72	30	891

The applicant has also undertaken a review of the trip rates agreed through the consented Catherington Park site. Given that the proposed trip rates for this development are broadly in line with those agreed for the previous development, the Highway Authority at the pre-application stage considered these trip rates to be suitable as a baseline scenario.

An MCC count was also undertaken to assess the existing traffic flows for the Catherington Park development. The survey indicated 134 and 130 two-way vehicle movements within the AM and PM peak periods respectively which is broadly in line with the agreed trip rates as part of the assessment work undertaken.

The Highway Authority requested that a 'decided and provide' approach to trip generation was provided within any future TA. This has not been included within the assessment work and therefore the trip generation has not been reviewed in any further detail. As requested at the pre-application stage engagement should be had with the Highway Authority to determine the assessment scenarios to consider under the Decide and Provide approach, along with how improvements to sustainable transport modes may feed into this process and encourage modal shift from the private car to accord with LTP4.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Multi-Modal Trip Generation:

The applicant has utilised the same parameters for vehicular trip generation using the TRICS database to analyse the proposed multimodal trip generation. The WCHAR assessment undertaken should assess the suitability of the local road network both internally within the Catherington Park development and offsite to accommodate the forecast additional 264 walking and cycling trips a day as a result of the development (assumed that access to all public transport services will be undertaken via foot or bicycle, albeit given the distance to the railway stations this may be overly robust). The applicant is yet to demonstrate that the infrastructure is of sufficient quality and standard to accommodate these additional walking and cycling trips. This is vital to reduce the car dependency of the development to comply with LTP4.

Traffic Distribution/Assignment

The applicant has undertaken traffic surveys to establish baseline conditions on the local road network for distribution purposes. The following junctions have been surveyed:

1. Powell Drive/Eagle Avenue
2. Eagle Avenue/Milton Road
3. Hart Plain Avenue/Milton Road
4. Milton Road/Lovedean lane
5. A3 London Road/Lovedean Lane/A3 Portsmouth Road/Prochurch Road
6. A3 Portsmouth Road/Catherington lane/B2149 Dell Piece West

As requested at the pre-app stage, the applicant has provided a breakdown of the peak hours for the above junctions. The assessment work undertaken outlines differing peak periods for each of the 6 junctions surveyed. It is proposed to utilise an AM peak period of 07:45-08:45 and PM peak period of 16:00-17:00 which covers the busiest periods at all junctions. Use of these peak periods are considered acceptable.

The data derived from these surveys for the above peak periods suggest the following turning movements at the Powell Drive/Eagle Avenue junction:

Turning Movement	AM Peak	PM Peak
Left (towards Milton Road)	90%	91%
Right (towards Hart Plain Avenue)	10%	9%

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Based on the above survey and distribution of turning movements at the site access, the distribution for the development has been identified within Appendix I. Whilst the method for trip generation is not agreed and not based on a decide and provide approach, the Highway Authority have reviewed the method of the trip distribution exercise.

It is noted that Appendix I only contains the distribution for the development trips and not the percentage splits at the junction. Without understanding the wider distribution and percentage splits it is unclear where some vehicles are arriving from and departing to at junctions which is confusing. For example, vehicles appear to originate from turning right into Hart Plain Avenue (W) from Milton Road (N) and where left turning vehicles into Hart Plain Avenue (W) approach from Milton Road (S) both within the AM and PM peak periods. This should be clarified within any future distribution drawings.

Using the above turning movements, the trips provided within the distribution drawing at the site access do not align, particularly for arrivals within the AM and PM peak periods. It is unclear how the development trips have therefore been split at the junction and is requested that this exercise is revisited.

TEMPro Growth Factors:

The applicant has utilised TEMPro Growth Factors to provide the 2029 baseline traffic scenario from the 2023 survey data obtained. The growth rates utilised to establish the future year scenarios for the modelling work have been previously agreed with the Highway Authority are the pre-app stage and are as follows:

	AM Peak	PM Peak
2023-2029	1.0571	1.0591

Committed Development:

The applicant suggests that there are no committed developments within the area which will utilise the junctions being modelled as laid out below. Notwithstanding, it is understood that c. 10 units remain unoccupied. Any unoccupied dwellings within the Catherington Park at the time of the traffic surveys being undertaken should be included as a committed development.

Junction Assessments

The applicant has undertaken modelling work using Junctions 9 for the following junctions as agreed at the pre-application stage:

- Powell Drive/Eagle Avenue priority junction and proposed mini roundabout
- Eagle Avenue/Milton Road mini roundabout
- Milton Road/Lovedean Lane priority junction and proposed mini roundabout

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

The modelling scenarios were also agreed during pre-application discussions:

- 2023 baseline
- 2029 baseline
- 2029 baseline + development

For all models the applicant has validated the model queue lengths with data obtained from the MCC surveys. As the input parameters of the model (generation and distribution), and junctions modelled are yet to be agreed the model builds have not been reviewed in detail. The Highway Authority reserve the right to make additional comments once this additional assessment work has been undertaken. Additional modelling may be required as a result of the revised trip generation and distribution assessment as laid out above in accordance with the Decide and Provide approach.

Notwithstanding the above comments, the Highway Authority have reviewed the modelling outputs and have the following comments to make.

Powell Drive/Eagle Avenue:

The applicant suggests that in the absence of the mini-roundabout proposals being implemented, the priority junction operates within sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional development trips. Whilst this is acknowledged with a maximum RFC of 0.28 in the PM peak period this development will not be permitted to commence on site until the mini roundabout is implemented. This mitigation was considered necessary to support the existing development and reduce vehicle speeds on Eagle Avenue. The Highway Authority would not support any additional development to be permitted in the absence of these works being implemented.

The Highway Authority note that the applicant has not modelled the proposed mini-roundabout due to the details not being publicly available. This is not considered an acceptable narrative and the applicant should obtain the relevant drawings from the landowner of the extant permission for the modelling work to be undertaken. This is considered necessary to ensure that the permitted scheme can accommodate these additional trips generated by this development which will be in place before the commencement of development.

Eagle Avenue/Milton Road:

The maximum RFC for the baseline 2029 + development scenario is 0.87 in the AM peak period. The additional development increases this by 0.08 RFC in the 2029 baseline scenario. The model is therefore reaching practical design capacity of 0.90 RFC, but not actual design capacity of 1.00 RFC. It is evident that the additional development traffic increases the RFC value of this junction. The delay of 32.93 seconds equating to a queue of 6.5 vehicles on the Eagle Avenue arm also provides a concern in terms of the operation of the roundabout with the additional development traffic.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

It is therefore vital for sustainable transport improvements to be provided to encourage sustainable travel through a decide and provide approach, to reduce the reliance on the private car and offset the additional development trips travelling through this junction.

Milton Road/Lovedean Lane:

The maximum RFC for the baseline 2029 + development scenario is 1.04 in the AM peak period suggesting that the junction is over capacity with the additional development traffic. Notwithstanding, as raised above, a mini roundabout has been agreed to be provided through the extant Catherington Park permission (APP/13/00804) which is yet to be delivered. Due to the clear capacity constraints at this roundabout even in the base year scenario development will not be permitted to commence on site until this mini roundabout is implemented. This mitigation was considered necessary to support the existing development and the Highway Authority would not support any additional development to be permitted in the absence of these works being implemented.

Similarly to the above Powell Drive/Eagle Avenue junction scenario, the applicant has not modelled the proposed mini-roundabout due to details not being publicly available. As raised above this is not acceptable and the applicant should obtain the relevant drawings from the developer. The same comments on the necessity of this being undertaken remain here.

Travel Plan

Given that the WCHAR has not been undertaken to support the planning application at this stage, the travel plan has not been reviewed in any detail. Measures and deficits identified as part of the WCHAR assessment work that could be incorporated within the travel plan should be considered. The Highway Authority will review the travel plan once the required assessment work has been undertaken to support this outline planning application.

Recommendations

The Highway Authority have insufficient information to provide a formal recommendation on this planning application at this time. Of particular concern is the lack of assessment work undertaken on the suitability of the sustainable transport infrastructure and identification of deficits to support use of sustainable modes to reduce car dependency and comply with LTP4. The Highway Authority are yet to be satisfied that sustainable modes can be encouraged as a suitable alternative to the private car in the absence of a suitable mitigation package being proposed.

Additionally, further work is required to satisfy the Highway Authority that safe and suitable access into the site can be achieved in the absence of the additional information requested being provided.

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

I trust that the above is clear but please do not hesitate to contact Sophie Osborne should you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,

Gemma McCart
Transport Team Leader – Highways Development Planning
Hampshire 2050

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook