

From: Alex Stephenson
Sent: 19 May 2022 12:36
To: Drury, Holly **Cc:** Ethan Brighton; Rob Hardyman
Subject: Bartons Road, Havant - Outstanding Comments

Hi Holly,

Apologies for the delay but please find attached a full pack of revised drawings for this project which I trust will address the outstanding comments.

We've updated our tracking drawings to show the slightly larger vehicles requested. We've also updated the access drawing to show the slightly longer visibility splays as requested. There are no physical changes to the arrangements compared to our previous drawing package which accompanied the revised development proposal.

We have made some revisions to the internal layout to address the comments raised. These changes are shown by drawings 300-303 which are described below:

- 300 – shows the dimensions of aisle widths as requested and also shows that no parking spaces open doors onto the carriageway
- 301 – shows a refuse vehicle turning in the turning head and shows that the refuse storage room has been moved to the east side of the apartment block for better access
- 302 – shows forward visibility around the bend in the access road as requested in place of widening the bend
- 303 – shows pedestrian visibility splays at each crossing point along the north to south route through the site

The total number of parking spaces is unchanged as we've introduced parking at the west of the site to replace the spaces lost for the above changes.

The comments made by HCC previously are below along with our response to each.

1. Swept path analysis includes wrong vehicle dimensions that are less than required. Swept-path size for Super-Large Refuse = 11.20m x 2.53m, which is larger than the vehicle shown. Swept-path size for Family Car = 4.89m x 1.94m; again, this is larger than shown. It is recommended that the designer uses the vehicles dimensions above in order to establish a more accurate impact. NB: Vehicle track runs should be 'driven' at a reasonable min speed (abs min 10mph). [Revised drawings show the larger vehicles manoeuvring through the access successfully, with no changes to the arrangements previously shown required.](#)
2. The refuse vehicle turning left out of Knightswood Ave and then right into the development gets very close to the edge kerb and island whilst performing the manoeuvre. This should be

checked carefully when track plots are rerun using the Super-large Refuse vehicle. [This movement still works successfully as shown on the drawings.](#)

3. Swept path shows an encroachment by the refuse vehicle into the 'turning length' whilst turning left into the development from Bartons Road, however this does not appear to impact vehicles waiting in the right turn lane. Further assessment is recommended upon receipt of revised track plot information. It would also be easy at the detailed stage to amend the radius to eliminate this potential concern. [This slight encroachment still happens but as noted does not impact vehicles waiting in the right turn lane. This refuse vehicle movement will also occur just once per week \(or not at all if the vehicle approaches from the west\). There is no need to amend the radius which would further increase the pedestrian and cycle crossing distance to the detriment of pedestrians and cyclists.](#)
4. Access visibility is still shown at 43.0m and this doesn't accord with the required vis within the TG. [Visibility splays looking east are now shown at 49m in accordance with the recorded 85th percentile speeds.](#)
5. There are no turning heads within the development, so vehicles are turning around using parking spaces. [It is highly likely that empty spaces will be available to assist turning movements should vehicles need to turn round in the aisle. Should no empty spaces be available, the 6.0m aisle widths are sufficient for turning if required as demonstrated in the tracking drawing. Turning in the road is a standard part of a driving test and is a common manoeuvre, with 6.0m being wider than most UK residential streets. It is not common for car park aisles to provide turning heads for cars and doing so would result in the loss of parking spaces and would be visually unattractive. It is possible that any turning heads provided could be obstructed with parked vehicles anyway.](#)
6. There are few dimensions shown within the development to accurately comment on road widths, radii, and aisle widths etc. [These dimensions are now shown.](#)
7. The layout requires long reversing movements for refuse collection. BS 5906: 2005 recommends a maximum reversing distance of 12 m. Longer distances can be considered, but any reversing routes should be straight and free from obstacles or visual obstructions. [The refuse storage room has been moved and is now accessible from the east side of the building. This means that refuse vehicles may turn where the parking aisles meet and no reversing is required, beyond that associated with the turning movement itself.](#)
8. The internal road should be wide enough to allow the super-large refuse vehicle to pass a car, this will likely necessitate local widening on radii. [Appropriate forward visibility is shown around this bend and so a refuse vehicle is not required to pass a car as previously agreed.](#)
9. The drawings show door opening out onto the areas marked as carriageway. [This no longer occurs with the removal/ relocation of some parking spaces.](#)
10. There appears to be proposed tree planting close to tactile crossing locations. Minor obstructions <550mm would be acceptable, but future growth should be considered. [Trees will be maintained by the management company and crossing points/ footways will be kept clear of obstruction.](#)
11. Visibility splays within the development have not been shown for comment and there appears to be crossing locations which would be obscured by parking. [All crossing points along the north-south route are provided with 1.0 x 25m visibility splays commensurate with a 20mph design speed. In reality, speeds are likely to be significantly lower than 20mph.](#)

For reference, our previous correspondence on some of these points is shown on the attached email chain.

As above, I trust the outstanding comments have now been addressed. If you could confirm that this is the case that would be brilliant.

Kind Regards

Alex Stephenson

Principal Transport Planner

BEng (Hons)