



Head of Development 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*

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

<i>Enquiries to</i>	Sophie Osborne	<i>My reference</i>	6/3/13/210
<i>Direct Line</i>	0370 779 5232	<i>Your reference</i>	APP/22/00439
<i>Date</i>	4th August 2022	<i>Email</i>	Sophie.osborne@hants.gov.uk

For attention of Mr G Christie

Dear Sir,

Re: Redevelopment of southern section of site to provide 102 dwellings comprising 56 No. 2, 3 & 4 bed houses and 46 No. 1 & 2 bed flats with associated parking, landscaping, waste and cycle storage. New roundabout access from College Road | The South Downs College, College Road, Purbrook, Waterlooville, PO7 8AA

Thank you for your consultation on the above full planning application. The Highway Authority have reviewed the information within the Transport Assessment (hereafter, TA) and have the following comments to make.

Policy Status

The application site was allocated in the now withdrawn Havant Borough Council emerging local plan under policy reference H45. The policy suggested H45 has the capacity to provide residential development for about 95 dwellings when supported by suitable measures. It is noted that the number of proposed dwellings exceeds the allocation number. The TA, which supports this application, provides a summary of the relevant transport planning policies.

Specifically in relation to the H45 allocation, and the highway matters, the policy required:

- Transport Statement;
- Ensures that pedestrian and cycle routes are integrated throughout the development and provide connectivity between College Road, this site and the East of College Road site (Policy H41);

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

- An appropriate means of vehicular access established in a co-ordinated manner with the adjacent site (Policy H41); and
- Integrates cycle and pedestrian routes to and from College Road and the adjacent housing allocation (Policy H41)

Pre-Application Advice

The applicant engaged in pre-application discussions with the Highway Authority. The following comments were raised by the Highway Authority during pre-application for the applicant to address at the planning stage:

- Details of existing sustainable modes of travel should be provided;
- Details as to how the site is proposed to integrate within the adjoining Campdown development;
- Access from the site to key services and areas of employment to be provided;
 - Deficits in existing infrastructure should be outlined with proposed improvements as appropriate;
- PIA data using Hampshire Constabulary records for the most-recent 5-year period should be provided and extended from that included within the TN to include the College Road/Purbrook Way junction;
- Updated speed surveys required to satisfy DMRB criteria for mini roundabouts;
- Fundamental concerns with the site access proposals which are as follows;
 - DMRB CD166 states mini roundabouts should not be used as a new junction;
 - DMRB CD166 states mini roundabouts are not suitable with large volumes of cyclists/motorcyclists/inexperienced cyclists – likely to be the case with a college situated to the north;
 - Junction form not consistent with other junction types along the route which could create safety issues with drivers;
 - No deflection on the roundabout causing northbound / southbound vehicles to travel with speed across the junction;
 - Concerns with the imbalance of flows at the roundabout increasing a highway safety risk regarding continuity of junction form;
 - Swept paths not provided for any vehicles approaching and crossing the roundabout; and

- Stage One Road Safety Audit not been provided for mini roundabout proposals;
- Pedestrian and cycle links through the site into Campdown should be investigated further to provide a cohesive and integrated walking and cycling route through both developments;
- Junction modelling to be provided for baseline without development scenario for site access (when agreed) and junctions noted below;
- Confirmation requested on the 'others' flows for committed developments;
- Distribution diagrams detailing committed development assumptions should be provided to check agreed distributions;
- Modelling should be provided for the following junctions to confirm that traffic flows from the proposed development can be accommodated on the network and not require any further improvements; and
 - College Road/Purbrook Way;
 - College Road/Crookhorn Lane;
 - Stakes Hill Roundabout;
 - Crookhorn Lane/Portsdown Hill Road;
 - A3(M) Junction 4;
 - ASDA roundabout; and
 - Bedhampton Hill Roundabout
- Framework Travel Plan to be provided

Site Location

The proposed development is accessed from College Road which runs along the western boundary. The site is further surrounded by South Downs College to the north and greenfield land to the east and south. The land to the south is subject to a Hybrid Planning Application (APP/19/01101) for 130 dwellings at full application stage and a further 650 dwellings at outline. The applicant is required to consider this interaction with this development as part of its application.

Existing Traffic Conditions

ATC surveys were undertaken 30m north and south of the proposed site access on College Road and 70m back from the give-way line on Apollo Drive between 28th February – 6th March 2022. The applicant states that the weather conditions were dry for 5 of the 7 days with the 2 wet days discounted from the data set to provide a more accurate representation of vehicle speeds. The results of the traffic surveys at all 3 locations are shown below:

College Road - North of site access			
Direction	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)	PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	85 th Percentile Speed (mph)
Northbound	174	131	35.2
Southbound	137	232	35.1
College Road – South of site access			
Direction	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)	PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	85 th Percentile Speed (mph)
Northbound	125	90	37.4
Southbound	110	170	37.7
Apollo Drive			
Direction	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)	PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	85 th Percentile Speed (mph)
Northbound	11	23	24.0
Southbound	20	16	23.6

It is noted that the 85th percentile recorded speeds both north and south of the site access are in excess of the 30mph design speed.

Sustainable Access

Walking and Cycling:

Current pedestrian infrastructure along College Road consists of a street lit footway on the eastern stretch of the carriageway south of the proposed access with footways on both sides of the carriageway from Apollo Drive to the college Road / Purbrook Way signalised junction. Circa 20m north and 30m south of the South Downs College access uncontrolled pedestrian refuge crossings with dropped kerbs and tactile paving are present.

Off-road footpaths connect Atlantis Avenue with Crookhorn Lane via Athena Avenue and Apollo Drive providing pedestrian access to local facilities within Crookhorn Precinct. The current infrastructure would require pedestrians from the site to go against desire lines when accessing Crookhorn Precinct via Apollo Drive. The applicant should explore the scope to provide a footway along the southern side of the Apollo Drive junction with tactile crossing facilities south of the proposed site access. Additionally, a footway and crossing facilities should be provided at the Atlantis Avenue junction to tie in with the existing infrastructure present. A drawing should be provided for consideration.

At the College Road / Purbrook Way signalised junction two-way stage signalised crossings are present providing pedestrian connections east and west along Purbrook Way. A continuous footway/cycleway circa 3.0m in width runs east to west along Purbrook Way on the northern side of the carriageway until the signalised junction where cyclists cross and continue along the southern side of the carriageway. The northern side of Purbrook Way is subject to a 1.5m footway where the shared footway/cycleway is not present providing a continual pedestrian connection along this stretch. This shared footway cycleway merges to provide a connection with National Cycle Network Route 222. In order to improve cycle connections, the footway on the eastern side of the carriageway along College Road from the proposed site access should be widened to a shared use footway/cycleway to tie in with the existing shared used path where it terminates north of the college access on College Road. This will provide a continuous cycle connection from the site to the existing provision on the northern side of Purbrook Way. The applicant should submit a drawing for consideration with this proposal with dropped kerbs and tactile paving provided at the South Downs College access.

The shared footway/cycle way also forms part of Bridleway 108/28/3. Bridleway 108/28/3 runs through Gundymoor Wood for circa 250.0m before merging with footpath 108/524/1. Both Public Rights of Way provide pedestrian and cycle connections to Bedhampton.

Pedestrian access into the development will be via a new footway within the development to connect into the existing footway along the eastern side of College Road at the four-arm roundabout. No commentary has been provided on the width of the proposed footway. Thus, the Highway Authority are unable to provide comments on whether this would be acceptable or not.

Uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points are proposed to be provided on the access road roundabout arm and further within the development. No visibility splays have been provided at these crossing points and must be submitted. Forward visibility will also need to be submitted for the crossing points located on the roundabout arms in accordance with Hampshire County Council Technical Guidance TG3.

The applicant will be required to provide a WCHAR assessment in accordance with Hampshire County Council Technical Guidance TG19 of walking and cycling routes in the area noting any deficits that may require improvements. This should consider matters raised within this section.

Buses:

The nearest bus stops to the proposed development are on College Road circa. 170.0m and 230.0m (northbound and southbound, respectively). The bus stops provide access to bus services 37 and 39 providing connections to Havant, Bedhampton, Waterlooville and Petersfield. School services 654 and 7C also runs from these stops at typical school pick off and drop off times.

The Crookhorn Precinct bus stops (circa 800m from the site) provide access to bus service 7 and 20 providing frequent connections to Portsmouth, QA Hospital and Havant.

Rail:

Bedhampton is the closest railway station to the site circa 2.0km southeast from the site. Havant Station is also located circa 3.0km from the site. Both stations can be accessed by the 37 bus or via pedal cycle. As noted above, providing the missing section in the shared use provision between the site access and north of the college access will improve cycle connectivity to both Bedhampton and Havant railway stations.

Both stations provide direct connections to Portsmouth and London with Havant station also providing direct connections to Southampton and Brighton.

Personal Injury Accidents (PIA)

The applicant has provided PIA data for a 5-year period between 1st July 2016 and 30th June 2021. It is noted that this data is a year out of date, and thus, is not considered acceptable. It was requested during pre-application discussion that the scope of the PIA data should also include the College Road/Purbrook Way junction which has not been considered in the assessment.

The Highway Authority will require the applicant to supply PIA data for the most recent 5-year period for the study area included within the TA as well as the College Road/Purbrook Way junction using Hampshire Constabulary records.

Local Facilities

The TA provides a review of local facilities and services available to the proposed development. It is noted that these distances are measured from the site access, rather than assuming a more conservative position within the development. The applicant should amend these distances accordingly and submit them for consideration. The WCHAR should include routes to all facilities included within the TA.

Proposed Site Access – Mini Roundabout

Access to the site is proposed via a new 4-arm mini roundabout at the College Road/Apollo Drive junction as shown in drawing PHL-101 Rev C. The eastern arm of this roundabout is to provide vehicular access into the development. During pre-application discussions the Highway Authority raised several fundamental highway safety concerns with mini-roundabout access proposal. These are as follows:

- DMRB CD166 states mini roundabouts should not be used as a new junction;
- DMRB CD166 states mini roundabouts are not suitable with large volumes of cyclists/motorcyclists/inexperienced cyclists – likely to be the case with a college situated to the north;

- Junction form not consistent with other junction types along the route which could create safety issues with drivers;
- No deflection on the roundabout causing northbound / southbound vehicles to travel with speed across the junction; and
- Concerns with the imbalance of flows at the roundabout increasing a highway safety risk regarding continuity of junction form

These issues remain considering the same access proposal has been submitted at the planning stage. A number of additional concerns have since been picked up in accordance with DMRB CD116 which include:

- A 4-arm mini roundabout shall not be used where the predicted two-way annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) data on any arm of a junction is below 500 vehicles a day unless the design incorporates a feature to encourage vehicles to give way on all approaches;
- Mini roundabouts shall only be used on roads with a speed limit of 30mph or less and where the 85th percentile dry weather speed of traffic is less than 35mph within a distances of 70m from the proposed give way line on all approaches;
- Mini roundabouts can be inappropriate for use on routes frequently used by HGVs and buses due to difficulty in completing turning manoeuvres;
- A 4-arm mini roundabout introduces additional conflicts and can create difficulty for drivers' perceptions of the layout and turning flows;
- A 4-arm mini roundabout shall not be used where the sum of the maximum peak hour entry flows for all arms exceeds 500 vehicles per hour; and
- 4-arm mini roundabouts introduce additional conflicts and can create difficulty for drivers' perceptions of the layout and turning flows

The introduction of a mini-roundabout should be assessed to check that queues created by the mini-roundabout to not adversely impact upon the operation and safety of the junction or adjoining network, including the proposed access to the Campdown development.

It is important to note that as the 85th percentile recorded speeds are in excess of the 30mph design speed stated, DMRB guidance would apply in this instance, rather than Manual for Streets as recorded speeds are greater than 37mph.

Refuse/Servicing:

Drawing 01-ATR-102 shows tracking for a 'super large' 11.20m refuse vehicle navigating the proposed roundabout and accessing / egressing the site and Apollo Drive. It is noted that no dimensions have been provided for the large car which has been tracking past the refuse vehicle. These should be

provided for consideration. The Highway Authority have the following concerns with the tracking provided which are all unacceptable:

- **Drawing One**
The refuse vehicle overruns the opposite side of the carriageway and overhangs the footway upon accessing the proposed site from College Road North. The refuse runs very tight to the large car, however dimensions are required before any firm comments can be made.
- **Drawing Two**
The refuse vehicle overruns the footway when accessing the site from College Road South. Similarly, to the above, the refuse runs tight to the large car.
- **Drawing Three**
The refuse vehicle overruns the opposite side of the carriageway upon egressing the site via College Road South. Tracking has not been shown for a refuse past a car at this point and should be provided.
- **Drawing Four**
The refuse vehicle overruns the opposite side of the carriageway upon egressing site via College Road North. Tracking has not been shown for a refuse past a car at this point and should be provided.

The drawings should be resubmitted maintaining refuse tracking within the correct side of the carriageway and amendments as noted above. Tracking speeds should also be submitted for consideration.

Drawing 01-ATR-104 shows a 'super large' 11.20m refuse vehicle accessing and aggressing Apollo Drive. This however only assumes that a refuse vehicle will access Apollo drive via College Road South and egress via College Road North. The following additional scenarios should be provided for consideration:

- Accessing Apollo Drive via College Road North;
- Accessing Apollo Drive via proposed site access;
- Egressing Apollo Drive via College Road South; and
- Egressing Apollo Drive via proposed site access

Tracking should also be provided showing a refuse vehicle navigate the proposed roundabout and access Atlantis Avenue via Apollo Drive and vice versa for all scenarios listed above.

Upon egressing Apollo Drive the refuse looks to run tight to the existing bus stop. Before comments on the suitability can be made, a bus should be in situ, to see the ability of a refuse to pass if required. The applicant will also be required to provide tracking for a bus navigating the proposed mini roundabout and accessing the bus lay by north of Apollo Drive.

Tracking for a 16.50m articulated vehicle has been shown in drawing 01-ATR-103. As mentioned above, the mini roundabout has limited deflection meaning HGVs almost straight line the roundabout, without any need to reduce

vehicular speeds. This is unacceptable. As noted above the Safety Audit highlighted the deflection matter as a safety issue and the designer's response refers to splitter islands which are not shown on the drawings.

Whilst drawing 1017-01-ATR-101 shows tracking for a 11.20m 'super large' refuse vehicle within the development, it has not been tracked in one continuous movement. It is noted that the drawing assumes that the refuse vehicle will take one route throughout the development. Refuse tracking should be provided for all scenarios. The drawing should be updated to reflect this. Tracking should also be provided of a 'super large' refuse vehicle passing a standard size vehicle throughout the whole of the development.

No tracking has been provided for a fire tender; the applicant is required to submit this for consideration. Fire tenders should be able to access within 45.0m of dwellings and should not have to reverse more than 20.0m as per chapter 6.7.2 of Manual for Streets.

As requested during pre-application discussions the applicant has provided an RSA1 for the mini-roundabout site access proposals as well as two alternative access proposals to the development. The applicant states that the mini roundabout was deemed to be the safest access proposal following the RSA1 however this is not agreed.

The Audit Report highlights a number of concerns raised by the Highway Authority at the pre-application stage in relation to the mini roundabout design. It is unclear why the roundabout junction form was chosen to be the most appropriate as the TA does not provide any narrative on the alternative junction forms considered.

The audit report for the proposed roundabout has been considered by the Highway Authority. In particular the audit raises the following problems in relation to the mini roundabout proposal.

1. The capacity of proposed four arm mini roundabout junction is insufficient. The designer's response has sought to disapply the issue as a result of modelling work undertaken however the modelling at present is not agreed. In addition, no comments are provided on the request within the audit for a separate pedestrian/cycle access and this should be considered. The Highway Authority would be concerned with two lane entry to the roundabout given the difficulties with deflection of the design.
2. Lack of adequate entry deflection, this matter has been covered in detail above and the Highway Authority are not satisfied that this matter has been addressed.
3. Lack of swept path analysis, tracking has been provided and detailed comments have been provided within this response.
4. Location of existing 30/40mph speed limit interface, it is recommended within the report that this is relocated. The proposed development wouldn't significantly change the frontage of College Road given the

retained hedgerow and position of the buildings. However, the Highway Authority would welcome an extension of the 30mph speed limit south-westwards to cover the extent of the developed area on both sides of the carriageway. The exact extent of the change would need to be discussed further as any access arrangement design is refined.

5. Lack of pedestrian crossing facilities and increased crossing movements make navigating the roundabout difficult for pedestrians and cyclists. Comments on the proposed crossings have been provided above.

At present all points raised within the Road Safety Audit for the roundabout design remain outstanding in the view of the Highway Authority and without further changes would not be considered acceptable. It is unclear at this time whether the roundabout design could be altered sufficiently to meet design standards. Any outstanding unresolved matters within the audit would be subject to the need for an exemption report and agreement by the Highway Authority's Chief Engineer. This is not a guaranteed process.

Alternative Junction Forms

It is noted that two alternative junction forms were considered in the Road Safety Audit. The applicant has not provided any details of the alternative junction forms considered or why these have been discounted. The Highway Authority have reviewed the drawings appended to the Safety Audit report and the issues raised in relation to these alternative junction forms. No designer's response has been provided by the applicant on these alternative junction arrangements.

Crossroads with Apollo Drive:

1. The audit considered the proposed layout to be a confusing and inadequate junction layout, this is agreed by the Highway Authority as a result of the substandard turning lane arrangements presented within the design.
2. No swept path analysis was provided for this junction design and would be needed if it was to be considered fully.
3. Relocation of the speed limit was raised regarding the mini roundabout design and the response remains the same for this access proposal.
4. The lack of pedestrian crossing facilities was also raised for the roundabout design and would need to come forward within any revised considerations.

Staggered Junction with Apollo Drive:

1. Limited swept path analysis has been provided for this junction design; further tracking would be needed if this junction form was to be considered fully. It is noted that the refuse vehicle dimensions are too small and therefore the impact of the actual vehicle would be much

greater (11.20m 'super large' refuse vehicle tracking should be provided)

2. The audit considered a lack of stacking capacity for right turning drivers and riders, this is agreed as a result of the lack of deceleration right turn lane provision in both directions
3. Relocation of the speed limit was raised regarding the mini roundabout and crossroads design. The response remains the same for this access proposal.
4. The lack of pedestrian crossing facilities was also raised for the mini roundabout design and the crossroads. This would need to come forward within any revised considerations

It is noted that the junction arrangement is not DMRB CD123 compliant. There is no measurement between the centreline of both accesses (Apollo Drive and Site Access) and therefore it cannot be confirmed if the stagger distance is greater than the recommended 50.0m minimum length. Anything less than this may not be considered acceptable and will require a departure from standard. College Road would need to be widened to cater for a deceleration lane and hatching. The RSA1 finds that all three site access options have specific engineering challenges. Further detail on all access opportunities is required before the Highway Authority can provide any comments on whether any of the proposals are acceptable.

Internal Road Network

Whilst a drawing has been submitted showing the internal road network it is lacking key information. The drawing should include annotated dimensions of carriageway and footway widths, forward visibility splays and visibility splays at all crossing points within the site before any comments can be provided on the suitability of the internals. Tactile crossing points should be provided within the site providing pedestrians and those with reduced mobility a safe place to cross where necessary.

It is noted that the applicant intends the internals to remain private except for a circa 40.0m stretch of the access road from the mini roundabout. Despite this, it would be advisable that the developer ensures that the roads and footways are designed to minimum 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.

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>

A Stage One Road Safety Audit should also be undertaken for the internal road layout and submitted with a designer's response for consideration by the Highway Authority.

A levels plan and street lighting plan for the internal road network and site access road should also be submitted for consideration by the Highway Authority at the appropriate time. This can be secured through condition if necessary.

Drainage

Drawing 01-PDL-1001 Rev A shows the preliminary drainage layout for the site. The following comments are made on the drawing provided:

- Manholes should be positioned with future maintenance in mind. Covers should be placed in a location to allow for appropriate traffic management, whilst ensuring access for residents;
- Proposed SuDS should be a minimum of 5.0m from the highway; and
- Gully connections on the main carrier sewer must not be positioned under raised tables or in areas of block paving as this will cause additional maintenance issues

If the site does come forward for adoption the Highway Authority may have additional comments on the adoptability of the strategy and the methods of management.

Parking Provision

The applicant proposes that vehicle and cycle parking will be provided in accordance with Havant Borough Council's parking Supplementary Planning Document. The applicant is proposing 161 allocated parking spaces and 8 visitor parking spaces providing a total of 169 parking spaces. Whilst the number of allocated parking spaces exceeds the requirements of HBC's parking SPD visitor spaces are short leading to a deficit of 23 parking spaces and increasing the likelihood of on street parking.

It is noted that the SPD states that a shortfall in parking could be accepted where developers can demonstrate that lower standards would be appropriate. Without the applicant submitting an internal layout drawing and tracking of a refuse vehicle past a car, the Highway Authority cannot confirm whether this would be acceptable on highway safety terms. Once this additional information has been submitted the Highway Authority would be able to provide comments on whether this under provision could be accommodated by on-street parking and that it would not result in parking outside the site.

College Parking Numbers:

The Highway Authority note that this application requires removal of a significant number of parking spaces currently available to the college. The Highway Authority seek clarity on how the loss of parking is justified and how parking demand for the college will be managed in the absence of this area.

Appropriate management will need to be put in place to ensure overspill parking within this development or the existing residential areas does not arise from the removal of this parking provision.

Trip Generation

It was agreed during pre-application discussions that the applicant would utilise the trip rates for the Campdown development which equated to 62 two-way trips in the AM peak hour and 69 two-way trips in the PM peak hour.

The applicant has since provided a trip generation assessment using the TRICS database for affordable dwellings. The calculated trip rates and trip generation for the development are shown below:

	Trip Rate (per 1 dwelling)			Trip Generation (102 dwellings)		
	Arr.	Dept.	Two-way	Arr.	Dept.	Two-way
AM Peak (08:00-09:00)	0.134	0.228	0.362	14	23	37
PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	0.144	0.139	0.283	15	14	29

The use of affordable trip rates are not agreed as a robust measure of forecast trip generation unless the type of affordable housing is restricted through planning and matches the TRICs rates produced. It is useful to keep in mind these potential lower trip generations which further reinforces the fact that a mini roundabout as a site access arrangement in this location would not be suitable, due to the low flows generated from the eastern arm. The college arrival and departure peak periods should also be provided for assessment.

Multimodal Trip Generation:

The applicant has provided multimodal trip generation for the development using the proposed trip generation and the modal split for trips to work based off 2011 Census Data for 'Havant 011'. These rates are based on the affordable housing trip generation assumptions and should be revisited. In addition, multi model trip generation should be set out for both the peak periods and for the day.

Offset trips:

The TA outlines a reduction in trips from the College due to the relocation of students from the South Downs campus to the Havant campus of HSDC. Circa 30% of students have relocated. The applicant has undertaken a TRICS assessment to estimate the reduction in trips as shown below. It is unclear the purpose of this assessment and the basis in which the 30% has been reached. Current traffic flows would be utilised for any off-site assessments and therefore suitably account for any reduction in movements as a result of the relocation of students. The new development is standalone from the

College site, so it does not seem wholly appropriate to consider offsetting of trip generation.

Traffic Distribution/Assignment

It was agreed during pre-application discussions that traffic distribution from the adjacent Campdown development would be utilised for this site. The distribution assumes the most direct route will be taken to a destination. The first turn distribution estimated from census data is as follows:

Link	Distribution
College Road (N)	79%
College Road (S)	21%

The following distribution of traffic on the wider highway network was agreed at the pre-application stage:

Direction from Site Access	Route (Direction)	% Traffic
South	Portsmouth Hill Road Westbound	12%
	Portsmouth Hill Road Eastbound / Bedhampton Road	9%
North	Stakes Road	7%
	Stakes Hill Road	13%
	A3(M) Southbound	44%
	Hulbert Road / A3(M) Northbound	7%
	Purbrook Way Eastbound	8%

Committed Developments:

The applicant has included trip distribution and trip rates on the adjacent Campdown development. Whilst the Forty Acre development (APP/18/00450) is thought to be a significant committed development, the applicant has not included this due to the distance from the proposed site. This is not agreed, and the applicant should demonstrate how any traffic growth as a result of Forty Acres is accounted for.

Traffic Growth:

The applicant has undertaken a turning movement survey at the College Road/Apollo Drive junction on the 1st March 2022. A future year growth scenario of 2027 has been assessed to understand the impact of the proposed development on the local highway network. TEMPro growth factors

have been applied to the flows to predict the turning movements at the proposed site access junction which are as follows and agreed:

Time Period	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)	PM Peak (17:00-18:00)
2022-2027	1.0471	1.0452

Junction Assessments

The proposed site access has been assessed through the construction of a capacity model and tested using ARCADY software. The applicant has only tested this scenario for a 2027 + development which is not acceptable. The site access should be modelled up to 2022 for a base year assessment and a plus 5 years scenario. This point is further explored below.

Given that the trip generation is not agreed nor the principle of the junction form the Highway Authority have not reviewed the detail of the modelling provided.

It was requested during pre-application discussions that junction modelling should be provided for the baseline without development scenarios to assess the impact of development flows compared to baselines scenarios. Considering two years have passed since pre-application discussions, the Highway Authority would expect the following scenarios to be modelled:

- 2022 baseline;
- 2022 baseline + Apollo Drive + committed development;
- 2022 baseline + Apollo Drive + committed development + proposed development;
- 2027 baseline + Apollo Drive + committed development; and
- 2027 baseline + Apollo Drive + committed development + proposed development

It was also requested during at the pre-application stage that modelling may need to be provided for the following junctions. This has not been submitted and there is no narrative on why the wider impact has not been assessed. The Highway Authority still require this to be provided for consideration for the following two junctions:

- College Road/Purbrook Way;
- College Road/Crookhorn Lane;

The applicant will be required to model these junctions using the scenarios noted above and at the site access once the form has been agreed.

Travel Plan

It was agreed during pre-application discussions that a framework travel plan would be submitted within the TA. This has not been provided. However, as this is a full planning application, a Full Travel Plan will need to be submitted for review.

Recommendations

A considerable amount of further information is required from the applicant before a formal recommendation can be made.

If you are minded to determine the application prior to further information being provided, I can provide specific highway reasons for refusal.

I trust that 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,

Gemma McCart
Team Leader – Highways Development Planning