

Consultee Comments - Narrative Applicant Response:

Architectural:

Submitted Drawings:

28079-PD110E Site Context Plan
28079-PD111K Site Layout Plan CAD
28079-PD111K Site Layout Plan
28079-PD120C Fig Ground Storey Height Plan
28079-PD121C Site Levels Plan
28079-PD122C Ecology and Landscape Plan
28079-PD123A Site Access Plan
28079-PD155D Apartment Blocks A and B Ground and 1st Floor Plan
28079-PD156D Apartment Blocks A and B 2nd and 3rd Floor Plan
28079-PD157D Apartment Blocks A and B Roof Plan
28079-PD158D Apartment Block C
28079-PD159D Apartment Block D
28079-PD181D Adoptable Highways Plan
28079-PD300E Cross Sections

Mix of units:

It should be noted the schedules on drawings and application form were incorrect it stated there were 12 nr 1-bed 2 person apartments when there are 16. The schedule on drawing PD111K now shows the correct mix of units. The total number remains as 150.

Hampshire Swifts:

Integral bricks will be proposed and will be shown on the appearance and landscape reserved matters application. Number of boxes TBC.

Ramblers Association:

Drawing 28079-PD123A updated to show the PRoW bridleway Havant 120 and Havant 121 labelled and routed correctly. Route to reservoir site omitted due to comments from ecology consultee.

Crime Prevention Officer:

Layout amended to remove possibility of rear access paths linking through to the next road. Buildings staggered so rear access is limited to no more than 6 dwellings from one communal access path. Gates to the paths shown as being lockable.

Comments about front boundaries to be addressed in landscape and appearance reserved matters application. Current layout shows space in front/ to the side of dwellings and blocks of flats to accommodate defensible planting/ boundaries.

Unallocated car parking and visitor cycle spaces shown at northern end of the site to accommodate members of the public accessing the public open space/ bridle ways and countryside beyond.

Community Orchard boundary detailing to form part of the landscape reserved matters application.

Landscape Officer:

Layout amended so that 3-storey back to back dwellings are 28m apart.

Cycle route was already shown as 3m wide (dimensioned as such on Adoptable Highways Plan).

Every effort has been made to break up car parking and have landscaping between runs of car parking, whilst addressing the number of car parking spaces a development of this scale requires. Car parking numbers have been reduced against policy requirements given the full affordable tenure of the development and the data which shows lower car use for such developments to mitigate against excessive hard landscaping where not required. No run of spaces is more than 5 spaces long with most being 3 or 4 spaces long. Landscaping and trees currently shown are indicative and the full detail of the soft landscaping will be addressed in the reserved matters application.

Drawing 28079-300E has been updated to provide cross sections and street scenes across the development to show the amended layout and separation distances between proposed dwellings.

Highways latest comments, based on the latest plans:

Submitted Drawings:

10731 - RSA1 - EC.2022.04.GTA2
10731 - TPF - Cabbagefield Row – 1
10731- DR to RSA - Cabbagefield Row – 1
10731- TA Addendum - Cabbagefield Row – 1
10731_101_P7_Access Plan
10731_2200_P4_Refuse Vehicle Tracking
10731_2201_Fire Appliance Vehicle Tracking
10731_2250_P2_Site Visibility

The addendum report is formed as a response to each of the Highways points raised:

- Consideration needs to be given to the impact of the additional traffic on the existing issues at Middle Park Way/Dunsbury Way junction and along the St Clare's Avenue/Woolston Road/Middle Park Way route; **GTA: Covered in the TA Addendum**
- Most recent 5 year PIA data using Hampshire Constabulary records to be provided providing narrative on the above locations; **GTA: Covered in the TA Addendum. Updated PIA data has been requested (08/09/2022), there is a 16-week waiting time for Hampshire to supply the data.**
- Clarification as to whether the emergency access is still being provided or not – there is conflicting information on several plans whether this is still being provided? If it is to be provided, the 2.0m width is unlikely to be sufficient and the applicant should engage with the emergency services to gather the required width for this as previously requested at the pre-application stage and in our first response;
 - There are again some discrepancies between drawings as to whether it is a vehicle crossover or a bellmouth if this is to be an emergency access – if the emergency access is not to be provided anymore consistency should be shown across all plans for ease of interpretation; **GTA: Emergency access is not to be provided and has been omitted from all plans.**
- Tracking required for the following scenarios:
 - Tracking of a fire tender **GTA: Provided drawing No. 10731/2201**
 - 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; **GTA: Provided drawing No. 10731/2200/P4**
 - Tracking speeds also required to be submitted for consideration **GTA: Default 4kph as included on the 'general notes' of each tracking plan**
- Confirmation of parking space dimensions for the parallel parking spaces; **GTA: Provided in the TA Addendum (2.1m x 6m)**
- Parking spaces need to be numbered fully to see what spaces are allocated to which plots – spaces seem to be numbered but this seems to be the number of parking spaces and not which plots these have been allocated too. This will allow us to assess the walking distances to the allocated parking plots and whether there will be a risk of on-street parking providing a hazard; **GTA: Suggested allocated plot numbers have been provided on the Highways Plan produced by the architects, see drawing No. 28079-PD181D**
- The designers response has only been provided for the revised RSA1 – the full audit should be provided for consideration **GTA: Audit is re-submitted;**

- Materials plan should be submitted; GTA: Suggested materials have been provided on the Highways Plan produced by the architects (the materials would be covered in the landscaping and appearance reserved matters application which are to be dealt with at a later date as this outline application is only addressing access, layout and scale).
- Visibility splays will need to be provided within the adoptable highway and not be reliant on the maintenance of any third party land – it is noted that the majority of visibility splays provided are not within the adoptable highway; GTA: Covered in the TA Addendum, the layout has been adjusted to ensure that the 2.4m x 25m SSD sight lines at each junction within the layout (indicated by the orange lines on drawing No. 10731/2250/P1 Site Visibility and drawing No. 28079-PD181D Adoptable Highways Plan) are within the area proposed for highway adoption. The access plan, drawing No. 10731/101/P7, has been updated to include the land ownership boundary
- Confirmation requested on the number of cycle parking spaces; GTA: Summarised in the TA Addendum, and as shown on drawing No. 28079-PD181D Adoptable Highways Plan, 284 long-term cycle spaces are to be provided (1 per 1-bedroom unit and 2 per all other units) together with 58 cycle spaces to be provided.
- Amendments to the travel plan as laid out within our previous response.” GTA: Separate Framework Travel Plan document has been provided. It is considered that a Full Travel Plan will be required under condition of outline planning consent. The Framework Travel Plan has been updated to set out the principles of which the Travel Plan will provide full detail on submission of a detailed application.

Drainage:

Submitted Drawings:

303795-SWH-XX-XX-DR-C-0500 P05 Drainage Strategy Sheet 1 of 2
 303795-SWH-XX-XX-DR-C-0501 P05 Drainage Strategy Sheet 2 of 2
 303795-SWH-XX-XX-DR-C-0502 P04 Manhole Schedule
 Existing Qbar run-off rates (Northern Development Area)
 Existing Qbar run-off rates (Southern Development Area)
 SW - Northern network - 22.09.27
 SW - Southern network - 22.10.07

The drainage has now been designed to match the existing 1 in 1 year greenfield run off rate except for the proposed 1 in 100 year + 40% which is slightly over. However, this can be refined when the detailed domestic drainage is undertaken.