

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

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

Tel: 0300 555 1375 (General Enquiries)
0300 555 1388 (Roads and Transport)
0300 555 1389 (Recycling Waste & Planning)
Textphone 0300 555 1390
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries To Sophie Osborne

Direct Line 0370 779 5232

Date 14 December 2022

My reference 047766

Your reference APP/21/00989

Email havantdc@hants.gov.uk

Dear Ms Wells,

Cabbagefield Row, opposite 123-133, Swanmore Road, Havant

Outline planning application for the development of 150 dwellings (3-bed; 4-bed and 5-bed dwelling houses and 1-bed and 2-bed apartments) addressing layout, scale and access, including biodiversity enhancements and buffers and species-specific enhancements, SUDS and car parking (with appearance and landscaping matters reserved).

Thank you for your reconsultation on the above outline planning application. For clarity the following further information was requested in our previous response dated 30th November 2021:

- Applicant should engage with the PRow team in order to connect footpaths/cycle infrastructure with the existing PRow connections;
- Applicant should engage in conversations with the emergency services for the required width of the emergency access;
- Amend the offsite footway/cycleway provision to a footway with appropriate opportunities for cyclists to re-join the carriageway;
- Update the accident data and provide a revised narrative based on the most recent data;

*Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI*

- Additional clarity sought on the form of the emergency access, including width, measures to prevent inherent vehicle use, division of space for pedestrians and cyclists;
- Improve cycle connectivity within the site and through to Bridleway 120;
- Amendments to the offsite highway works proposed to address the outstanding safety audit items;
- Additional information and consideration to be given to the internal layout as set out within the response. The applicant should engage with the Highway Authority as early as possible to agree on an appropriate internal design for the site; and
- Amendments to the Travel Plan

Following the formal response, the Highway Authority engaged in direct discussions with the applicant regarding the internal layout design. Where the following comments were made:

- Consideration needs to be given to the impact of the additional traffic on the existing safety issues at Middle Park Way/Dunsbury Way junction and along the St Clare's Avenue/Woolston Road/Middle Park Way route;
- Most recent 5-year PIA data using Hampshire Constabulary records to be provided providing narrative on the above locations;
- Clarification as to whether the emergency access is still being provided or not;
- Tracking required for the following scenarios:
 - Tracking of a fire tender
 - Tracking of refuse past a car at the site access (currently it is a refuse over a refuse so unclear to see whether a car will be able to pass a refuse at this point;
 - Tracking speeds also required to be submitted for consideration
- Confirmation of parking space dimensions for the parallel parking spaces;
- Parking spaces need to be numbered fully to see what spaces are allocated to which plots;
- The designer's response has only been provided for the revised RSA1 – the full audit should be provided for consideration;
- Materials plan should be submitted;
- Visibility splays will need to be provided within the adoptable highway and not be reliant on the maintenance of any third-party land;
- Confirmation requested on the number of cycle parking spaces;

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

- Amendments to the travel plan

In response to our formal response and direct discussions, the applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA) and the following revised drawings:

- Drawing 10731/101 Rev 7 Access Plan;
- Drawing 28079-PD181 Rev D Highways Plan Adoptable Highways;
- Drawing 10731/2200 Rev 4 Refuse Vehicle Tracking;
- Drawing 10731/2201 Rev 1 Fire Appliance Vehicle Tracking;
- Drawing 10731/2250 Rev 2 Site Visibility;
- Drawing 303795-SWH-XX-XX-DR-C-0505-P02 Drainage Strategy – Attenuation and Ecology Pond Layout and Profile;
- Drawing 303795-SWH-XX-XX-DR-X-0500-P04 Drainage Strategy 1 of 2;
- Drawing 303795-SWH-XX-XX-DR-C-0501-P04 Drainage Strategy 2 of 2 and
- Drawing 303795-SWH-XX-XX-DR-C-0502-P05 Manhole Schedule

The Highway Authority have reviewed the above and have the following comments to make.

Personal Injury Accidents (PIA)

The applicant has requested PIA data from Hampshire Constabulary records however there is currently a 6-month delay on data being provided. PIA data will be circulated to the Highway Authority once it has been obtained. The Highway Authority will provide comments following receipt of the PIA data.

Emergency Access

It is noted that the emergency access is no longer being put forward as part of this planning application with just a footway/cycleway connection proposed as shown in drawing 10731/101 Rev 7. Considering the emergency access is now redundant, the applicant should relocate this pedestrian and cycle connection further east to tie in with the proposed pedestrian crossing point along Swanmore Road to accord with desire lines for residents. The emergency services should be consulted on whether the site is acceptable to be brought forward in the absence of the emergency access.

Walking and Cycling Provision

The footpath to the eastern boundary of the site has now been proposed as a shared footway/cycleway as shown in drawing 28079-PD111 Rev K. Whilst this provides an appropriate off-road cycle connection through the site to Bridleway 120 there are a lack of connection points throughout the site to allow cyclists to access the path if living

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

further within the development. Connection points for cyclists should be provided throughout the site in the following locations as annotated in green below to increase cycle permeability throughout the site. This should be accompanied with dropped kerbs to allow cyclists to access and egress the shared use path in an appropriate manner:



It is also unclear why in the northern corner of the site the shared footway / cycleway bends drops straight into a parking court which may cause a conflict between manoeuvring vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. The shared use path should be straightened in this location as shown below creating a more direct route for pedestrians onto the proposed footway around plot 150. Cyclists wishing to access Bridleway 120 could reasonably drop into the parking area alongside the footway and access via a dropped kerb facility on the northern kerbline. Details of this arrangement should be provided through discharge of condition.

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI



There are ongoing discussions as part of the Havant Thicket proposals about whether the footway between the Pennerly Court bus stops and the Havant Thicket access is to be upgraded to a shared use path or remain as a footway. The Highway Authority are aware of a recent position change in relation to integrating the bridleway alongside Havant Thicket with the footway along the northern side of Swanmore Road. Having regard to this, the Highway Authority accept the 3.0m shared use provision proposed by the applicant as part of their site access proposals from the St Clares Avenue bus stops and the Pennerly Court bus stops. Should the shared use path discussions not be finalised at the S278 stage for this development, the Highway Authority will seek to secure a contribution in lieu of works in the S278 to sign the shared use path at a later date.

It is not clear on drawing 10731/101 P7 whether the shared use path ties into the existing infrastructure present at the St Clares Avenue bus stop. An annotation should be provided on the drawing for clarity.

Internal Road Network

It is noted that tabletops are proposed throughout the internal road network of the site however no ramps are present. Ramps are required should tabletops be proposed. Drawing 28079-PD181 Rev D should be updated appropriately.

Refuse/Servicing

Drawing 10731/2200 Rev 4 shows revised refuse tracking. It is noted that tracking has been provided at 4kph which is unacceptable and undertakes an unrealistic speed that the refuse vehicle will travel. Tracking speeds should be provided at a minimum of 10mph throughout the development. Whilst this is the case, the Highway Authority have still reviewed the submitted tracking and have the following comments to make.

As noted previously, the refuse tracking assumes a one-way movement throughout the site. The refuse authority should be consulted as to whether this one way arrangement throughout the site would be agreeable. Should this be the case the Highway Authority

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

are minded to agree with this arrangement. If the refuse authority are not happy with the one-way arrangement then tracking should be provided for all scenarios that the refuse vehicles would be expected to undertake. In addition to the above, a refuse vehicle should also be tracked past a large family car throughout the whole development.

It is unclear whether the carriageway around the landscape amenity space within the centre of the site is to be a one-way movement and should be clarified. It would seem sensible that this was to be one-way considering the nature of the road and what it serves and would be the preferred approach of the Highway Authority. Clarification is requested on this point. Tracking should be provided for a refuse and fire tender past a car in this location should it not be a one-way arrangement.

Refuse arrangements should also be clarified for the apartment blocks 49-60 as to whether kerbside collection is to be undertaken or whether the refuse is to enter the parking court. Should the latter be proposed, tracking should be provided of the refuse reversing into the parking court. It is also noted that this parking court is not to be put forward for adoption. Should the refuse be expected to manoeuvre into the parking court, it should be built to adoptable standards to withstand the weight of a refuse vehicle.

Tracking for a refuse past a car at the site access is also shown in drawing 10731/2200 Rev 4. The overhang seems to conflict with the car waiting at the stop line which may not be acceptable. This issue also likely to be exacerbated further with tracking provided at the appropriate speed of 10mph. This tracking should be revised and provided for all likely movements. Tracking should also be provided for a refuse past a car at the site access approaching from Elderfield Close, to see whether this movement can be undertaken with the proposed stagger. If these movements cannot be undertaken simultaneously appropriate intervisibility would need to be provided between conflicting movements to ensure vehicles are able to wait in locations where it is appropriate for them to pass.

Tracking for a fire tender has been shown in drawing 10731/2201. The same concerns laid out above relating to tracking speeds should be revised to a minimum speed of 10mph.

Parking Provision

Whilst parking is a matter for Havant Borough Council to comment on as Local Parking Authority the Highway Authority still have the following concerns with the parking proposals as they stand. These are as follows.

The applicant has confirmed that the dimensions of parallel parking spaces are to be 2.1m X 6.0m with parking spaces to be 2.4m X 4.8m. Whilst the standard parking spaces are in accordance with the Havant Borough Council's parking standards the dimensions of the parallel parking spaces are considered narrow and could cause the

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

vehicle to overhang onto the carriageway causing obstructions of the main access road. Spaces should be widened to a minimum of 2.4m in width for parallel parking spaces.

Drawing 28079-PD181 Rev D has now been updated with plot numbers the spaces are allocated to. No parking spaces have been provided for plot 9 or plot 124 and should be provided. It is noted that several parking spaces are located a fair distance away from their associated plots (68, 85, 86 and 88) which would encourage on-street parking. Allocated parking spaces should not be provided along the adoptable highway. Unallocated and visitor parking spaces are however acceptable.

The parking layout should therefore be revised based on the comments above.

Cycle parking:

The applicant confirms that cycle parking is to be provided in accordance with Havant Borough Council's Parking SPD. The Highway Authority will be satisfied with the provision subject to written confirmation from Havant Borough Council that cycle parking has been provided in accordance with the standards.

Stage One Road Safety Audit (RSA1)

The applicant has undertaken a revised Stage One Road Safety Audit (RSA1) following the amendments made to the internal road network. The Highway Authority have reviewed the RSA1 and have the following comments to make.

Audit problem 3.1.1 relates to footway obstructions on Swanmore Road. It is agreed that this can be resolved at the Section 278 submission stage, however an appropriate annotation should be provided on drawing 10731/101 P7 noting the street furniture to be relocated as part of this process.

Audit problem 3.1.2 relates to the shared use path along Swanmore Road where sufficient dropped kerbs should be provided to allow cyclists to access and egress the shared use path where necessary. It is agreed that this issue has been resolved. Drawing 10731/101 P7 has been updated showing a dropped kerb cycle access at the start of the shared use path provision east of the St Clares Avenue bus stop.

Audit problem 3.3.1 related to forward visibility splays being obstructed by trees and planting, with trees to be removed from sightlines to ensure unobstructed visibility. The designers response notes that vegetation is to be removed. The Highway Authority do not agree that this problem has been addressed as visibility splays are still noted to be obstructed by vegetation and trees. This point is further explored below.

Visibility Splays

Forward visibility splays and pedestrian visibility splays in some locations run through areas that are not to be offered for adoption. This is unacceptable. The full extent of the visibility splay within landscaped areas should be offered for adoption. It is noted that the majority of forward visibility splays are also obstructed by parking spaces and trees. This is unacceptable and was picked up within the RSA1. A minor obstruction by a tree

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

may be acceptable depending on the species of the tree and the width of the trunk blocking visibility. This should be confirmed.

Pedestrian visibility splays are missing for the crossing point north of the site access and at the site access. These should be provided for consideration in accordance with HCC Technical Guidance TG3.

The visibility splay at the parking court for plots 49-60 is partially obstructed by a parking space to the left. As noted previously the parking arrangement requires some amendments and this factor should also be considered when amendments are undertaken. Drawing 10731/101 Rev P7 has been revised showing the site boundary and the highway boundary. It is agreed that visibility at the site access can be achieved without the need for any third-party land.

Materials

It is proposed that areas to be offered up for adoption are to be tarmac or coloured tarmac with block paved permeable paving only present in car parking courts. The principle of the materials is agreed, subject to parking courts being unadopted areas. Details regarding materials are to be agreed at the reserved matters stage and will be suitably conditioned as part of this outline planning consent.

Traffic Distribution/Assignment

It was requested that the applicant provided further consideration towards the impact additional traffic generated by the development will have on the existing issues at Middle Park Way / Dunsbury Way junction and along the St Clares Avenue / Woolston Road / Middle Park Way route.

It is noted that the content within the TAA is a repetition of what was previously stated within the TA. Whilst it is agreed that the junctions can operate within capacity for the 2028 forecast year + development scenario, the additional traffic will exacerbate the existing safety issues that are currently present in these locations. This has not addressed the previous comments regarding further consideration towards these sensitive junctions on the network. The applicant will be required to provide a proportionate contribution towards safety engineering measures along this Middle Park Way and towards the LCWIP in the vicinity of the site to offset their proposed development traffic at these constrained parts of the network.

Drainage

Drawing 303795-SWH-XX-XX-DR-C-0500 P05 and 303795-SWH-XX-XX-DR-C-0501 P05 shows the drainage strategy for the site and drawing 303795-SWH-XX-XX-DR-C-0502-P05 shows the manhole schedule. The Highway Authority have provided comments via the LLFA directly on any comments regarding future maintenance regarding the strategy. Whilst this is the case, there are several matters that should be addressed concerning the onsite drainage measures. These are as follows:

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

- Clarification is requested as to whether the grassland to the north of the site is to be classified as a SINCE – should this be the case then this is likely to have future maintenance issues with any assets near the SINCE, therefore ecological surveys and mitigation would be required;
- It should be ensured that attenuation basins can be accessed and maintained appropriately under the adoptable highway;
- It is unclear what the purpose of the attenuation tanks are, and this should be clarified;
- Clarification requested as to whether SWMH01 is 3.0m deep from the levels;
- Depth of chambers should be provided on the manhole schedule; and
- Chambers 5.0m deep under the highway are a concern, therefore a drawing detail must be provided to ensure suitable maintenance can occur.

The applicant should be mindful at the detailed design stage that it is the Highway Authority's intention to adopt the gullies and links proposed within the drainage strategy. Appropriate HCC Standard details should be used throughout the submitted documentation for adoptable drainage. All covers are to be Grade D within the highway boundary. It is noted that all pipes are to be 100mm. This should be reviewed and be in line with HCC requirements.

It is understood that the highway boundary excludes tanks and ponds. The applicant should be made aware that private drainage will not be permitted to discharge into the highway drainage, so appropriate access points will need to be dealt with outside of the highway boundary. The applicant should be mindful of any easement requirements at the detailed design stage.

SuDS features are located a minimum of 5.0m from the adoptable highway and thus their location is considered acceptable.

The details of the drainage can be secured through an appropriate planning condition to be submitted prior to commencement.

Street Lighting

No street lighting strategy has been submitted for the site. Street Lighting details will be secured under an appropriate planning condition with details to be agreed prior to commencement. The proposed lighting will need to be demonstrated to meet appropriate adoptable design standards at the detailed design stage. Any street lighting within adoptable areas will need to comply with HCC Technical Guidance TG13.

Levels

Site levels have been shown in drawing 28079-PD121 Rev C. The submitted plan is not

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

detailed enough for the Highway Authority to provide comments at the planning stage. The final ground level plans should be secured through an appropriate planning condition to be submitted prior to commencement to ensure that the levels do not create concerns for highway safety through inappropriate gradients and or adverse cambers.

Arboriculture

The supporting Arboriculture plans have been reviewed by the Highway Authority in relation to highway assets. Should pruning and removal of G2 fall on HCC operational land, then mitigation will be sought via the CAVAT amenity evaluation system, clearance of the trees on the frontage are likely to require road space booking and permission to work on the highway, they may therefore be subject to a requirement for a s278 legal agreement.

Travel Plan

This framework travel plan has been assessed using Hampshire County Council's (HCC's) evaluation criteria for the assessment of travel plans – *A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans*. Whilst the quality of this travel plan is generally good, some amendments are required before it can be approved.

Introduction and background:

An indicative site masterplan should be included (if available) – this can be included as an appendix if necessary.

The developers view on travel planning should be included in these sections. This can take the form of a statement of support for the travel plan from the developer.

Site accessibility and travel choices:

The section regarding walking and cycling should include walking and cycling isochrone maps.

-

Site audit:

Section 5 should include information on the local authority parking SPD used to inform vehicle and cycle parking provision.

Measures:

The following measures should be considered for inclusion within the travel plan:

- Coordinate with local schools to organise walking to school events

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

- Sustainable travel vouchers offering a choice of cycle and/or public transport discounts should be included
- The developer should consider the provision of bike service stations within the development
- The travel plan coordinator should offer personalised travel planning sessions/advice to residents
- The TPC should look to hold and/or promote events
- The travel plan should be advertised via a site-wide newsletter and website. Use of social media for advertising the travel plan should also be investigated
- Home delivery services and home working (where applicable) should be promoted by the TPC
- Good quality broadband should be provided

Delivery and enforcement:

The section on delivery and enforcement should include a commitment to include the payment of HCC's evaluation and monitoring fees, and a travel plan cash deposit in the S106 agreement.

Conclusion:

This travel plan will require further amendments as set out above before it can be considered acceptable for submission in conjunction with the proposed site.

Recommendations

Whilst the layout has improved from the previous submission, the following further information is still requested from the applicant before a formal recommendation can be made:

- The applicant should relocate the pedestrian and cycle connection further east to tie in with the proposed pedestrian crossing point along Swanmore Road to tie in with desire lines;
- The emergency services should be consulted to see if the site is acceptable to be bought forward without the provision of the emergency access;
- Lack of connection points throughout the site to allow cyclists to access the shared use path throughout the development which should be addressed;

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

- Shared use path should be straightened in the northern corner of the site to not drop into the parking court causing a conflict between manoeuvring vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians;
- Clarity should be provided regarding the proposed shared use path tying into the existing infrastructure at the St Clares Avenue bus stops – an appropriate annotation should be provided on drawing number 10731/101 P7;
- Drawing 28079-PD181 Rev D should be updated showing ramps where tablespots are proposed;
- Tracking speeds should be provided at a minimum of 10mph and not 4kph for both the refuse and fire tender;
- Refuse authority should be consulted with to confirm whether the proposed one-way arrangement through the site is agreeable;
- Tracking should be provided for a refuse past a car throughout the whole development;
- Clarification requested on whether a one-way system is proposed around the landscaped area which would seem sensible considering the nature – if not tracking should be provided for a refuse and fire tender past a car should this not be a one-way arrangement;
- Refuse arrangements should be clarified for apartment blocks 49-60 as to whether kerbside collection is to be undertaken – if not tracking should be provided of the refuse reversing into the parking court;
- Should the refuse be expected to reverse into the parking court, it should be built to adoptable standards to withstand the weight of a refuse vehicle;
- Tracking at the site access for a refuse past a car seems to conflict with the car waiting at the stop line which is likely to be exacerbated further if tracked at the correct speed and should be revised;
- Tracking should be provided for a refuse past a car at the site access approaching from Elderfield Close to see whether the movement can be undertaken with the proposed stagger present;
- Parallel parking spaces should be widened to a minimum of 2.4m;
- No parking spaces have been provided for plot 9 and plot 124 and should be provided;

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

- Parking layout should be revised as several parking spaces are located a fair distance away from their associated plots (68, 85, 86 and 88) encouraging on-street parking;
- Allocated parking spaces should not be provided along the adoptable highway – however unallocated and visitor parking spaces are;
- Drawing 10731/101 P7 should be amended annotating the street furniture to be relocated as part of the S278 shared use path works;
- Tree species and width of the trunk should be confirmed for all trees that are shown to obstruct visibility;
- The full extent of forward visibility splays and pedestrian visibility splays running through landscaped areas should be offered for adoption as the current proposals are unacceptable;
- Pedestrian visibility splays should be provided for the crossing point north of the site access and at the site access;
- Visibility splays at the parking court for plots 49-60 is shown to be partially obstructed by parking spaces however amendments to the parking layout may resolve this issue;
- Proportionate contribution should be provided towards safety engineering works along Middle Park way and towards the LCWIP in the vicinity of the site;
- Amendments to the drainage layout as noted within the response; and
- Amendments to the travel plan as laid out above

I trust the above is clear, but please do not hesitate to contact Sophie Osborne on the above number/email should you require any further information.

Yours faithfully,

Ben Clifton - Strategic Transport Manager

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI