

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 Chris Hirst
Direct Line 0370 779 0563
Date 24 May 2022

My reference 036459
Your reference APP/22/00001
Email havantdc@hants.gov.uk

Dear Sirs,

Land to the rear of 49 - 71, Fathoms Reach, Hayling Island

Demolition of Nos 61-69 Fathoms Reach (inclusive) and development of 51 dwellings, to include 19 No. 2 bed, 18 No. 3 bed, 4 No. 4 bed, 3 No. 1 bed apartments and 6 No. 2 bed apartments, with play area and associated infrastructure; new vehicular and pedestrian access to Fathoms Reach and footpath link to Southleigh Grove; includes works to trees the subject of Tree Preservation Order No.1249.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the full planning application for the above site. The Highway Authority have considered the information provided within the Transport Statement (hereafter, TS) and the comments regarding the proposed development are set out below.

Policy Status

The application site was allocated in the now withdrawn Havant Borough Council emerging local plan under policy reference H28. The allocation was for the development of 55 dwellings with vehicular access provided via the demolition of existing residential properties adjoining the site.

Specifically in relation to the H28 allocation, and the highway matters, the policy requires:

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

- Submission of a Transport Assessment with reference to the Hayling Island microsimulation model;
- Submission of a Travel Plan to address highway matters associated with the development;
- Protecting and enhancing the existing rights of way; and
- Providing for a high degree of permeability for cyclists and pedestrians to and from the site, the Rook Farm allocation (H27) and the public footpaths adjacent to the site

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 discussions for the applicant to address at the planning stage:

- A WCHAR should be undertaken to identify any improvements required to facilitate sustainable transport connections to local facilities;
- Further details regarding the pedestrian/cycle connection in the north-eastern corner of the site should be provided, ensuring permeability between this development and Rook Farm;
 - This should include the width of the path and an off-site landing point;
- Further details sought regarding the north-western connection point onto Footpath 92 to understand at which point the off-site connection and footpath will connect;
- Further details should be provided as to how the development could tie into Footpath 94;
- PIA data should be provided for the most recent 5-year period using Hampshire Constabulary records;
- Further information regarding the site access proposals;
- The applicant should confirm whether the internal road will be constructed to the site boundary to allow for further connectivity and emergency access between this proposed development and Rook Farm given no emergency access proposals;
- Details of opportunities for improved access to the Hayling Billy

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

- The Highway Authority will require a contribution from the site towards the measures identified within the Hayling Island Transport Assessment along the A3023 proportionate to the scale of development; and
- A Travel Plan should be provided due to traffic sensitives on the island and the benefit of promoting modes of sustainable transport to reduce impact on the local road network.

Site Location

The proposed development is located to the northeast of West Town. The site is bound to the south and west by residential properties, and to the north and east by Rook Farm (APP/21/01434), another proposed housing development on Hayling Island which is currently subject to a live planning application.

Sustainable Access

Walking:

Continuous footways are available north and south along Fathoms Reach, connecting into Manor Road and St Mary's Road. The latter only benefits from a footway on the southern side of the carriageway, with no crossing facilities available when approaching from Fathoms Reach. The routes around Fathoms Reach are street lit and generally 2.0m wide.

As requested during pre-application discussions, the applicant is required to undertake a WCHAR assessment in accordance with HCC TG19 guidance to identify whether there are any deficits in the local network which may require improvement. The WCHAR may identify further improvements required to facilitate improved access for suitable users to the site. The assessment should cover the route to the Hayling Billy Trail, local footpaths, the route to school and the pedestrian and cycle facilities surrounding the site.

There are a number of Hampshire Public Right of Way (PRoW) routes in the vicinity of the proposed development. PRoW 92 and 94 merge to provide PRoW 93 providing an off-road connection to Church Road around the perimeter of the adjacent Rook Farm development. A 1.5m direct pedestrian connection from the site to PRoW 92 is proposed in the northern parcel of the development to provide a more direct connection to the north and west. This footway width is considered substandard and should be widened to 2.0m. The travel plan makes reference to this being a footway/cycle connection. For cycle use this would need to be a minimum of 3m in width. As noted above, the WCHAR should assess the quality of the local footpaths to ascertain whether any improvements are required to accommodate the additional pedestrian footfall from this development. Further detail regarding the links from the site to these footpaths is provided within this response.

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

Cycling:

There is limited narrative provided regarding cycle connections to and from the site. The WCHAR should also audit routes utilised by cyclists to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is in place. The Highway Authority have a long-term aspiration to improve the provision for cyclists along the Hayling Billy Trail (1.0km west of the site), removing cycle traffic from the A3023. Consideration should therefore be given towards access to the Hayling Billy Trail, particularly whether local footpaths can be upgraded to cater for cyclists accessing the trail.

The Hayling Billy Trail also forms part of an off-road section of NCN Route 2 providing cycle connections to Havant and the wider cycle network.

Buses:

The closest bus stops to the site are located on Manor Road, circa 400m from the proposed development. It is noted that the transport statement states that these are circa 290m from the proposed development; however, measurements should be taken from the centre of the site to provide a more accurate walking distance.

Bus service 30 (southbound) and 31 (northbound) serves these stops, providing connections to the Island and Havant. The facilities at these stops are of a poor standard and would benefit from improved waiting facilities and real time information. The applicant should investigate improving these bus facilities to encourage the uptake of sustainable travel from the site.

Rail:

Havant railway station is the closest form of rail travel to the site, located circa 9.0km north of the proposed development. The train station can be accessed via the 31 bus and by cycle via the Hayling Billy Trail. The station provides frequent services to Portsmouth, Southampton, Brighton and London. Whilst the station provides frequent services, the distance from the site will only result in a limited uptake of sustainable transport and a heavy reliance on the private car to travel to the station.

Local Facilities

The TS provides a review of local facilities and services available to the proposed development. These facilities are assessed against the walking distances set out in various guidance documents, including LTN 91/05 which identifies 3.2km as the 'maximum walking distance'. The Highway Authority disagrees with the key walkable distances outlined in the TS. The CIHT identifies 2km as the maximum walking distance in their guidance document 'Providing for Journeys on Foot' which should be used to assess facilities within a walkable distance from the development.

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

Out of the facilities identified within Table 3.1 of the TS, only Mill Rythe Infant and Junior School is close to the maximum walking distance, at 1.8km from the site. However, it is noted that Mengham Infant and Junior School is located 1,100m from the development and is therefore more accessible for occupants of the proposed site.

Personal Injury Accidents (PIA)

PIA data has been obtained for a 5-year period (September 2015-August 2020) using Hampshire Constabulary records. It is noted that this data is a year and a half out of date, and thus is not considered acceptable. However, the Highway Authority have reviewed more recent data to August 2021 and are content that there would be no changes to the conclusions drawn from the data provided. Therefore, no further data sets need to be obtained.

The scope of the PIA assessment covers the following areas:

- Fathoms Reach;
- Southleigh Grove;
- Manor Road; and
- St Marys Road

In total 5 PIA's (3 'slight' and 2 'serious') were recorded within the study area. No accidents have been recorded however on Fathoms Reach, Southleigh Grove, St Mary's Road or at the Fathoms Reach/A3023 junction or the St Mary's Road/A3023 junction.

Site Access

No site access drawings have been provided to demonstrate that safe vehicular access to the site can be achieved.

In the absence of this information, and a supporting Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, the Highway Authority are unable to provide comments on the access which is a fundamental consideration of the planning application.

Internal Road Network

It is unclear whether the applicant is proposing to offer the internal site layout for adoption under a Section 38 agreement, a position the Highway Authority would strongly support. Nevertheless, a review of the proposed internal layout has been undertaken and further information will be required before it can be considered acceptable in principle.

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

Drawing 19-1105-005-A shows the proposed internal network for the development. No tracking drawings have been provided to demonstrate that a refuse vehicle can safely manoeuvre through the site passed parked vehicles. Refuse access into the parking court for numbers 40-48 could be difficult given the skewed angle of the access. The Highway Authority requires the provision of these drawings to confirm that the tracking throughout the site is acceptable.

It is noted that the spine road is proposed at 4.8m wide throughout the development. The TS refers to Manual for Streets figure 7.1 which shows that two-way vehicle movements on a 4.8m wide carriageway are achievable; however, the manoeuvre is tight, particularly for a car passing a larger vehicle where the movement is likely to be unachievable. MfS only shows 4.8m carriageway on a straight section of road and the design width of the carriageway should be determined through appropriate tracking which allows safe and suitable access to the site. The presence of parked cars on the spine road, which are considered a likely occurrence due to the parking provision across the site, would prevent restrict access for emergency vehicles, deliveries, and refuse vehicles. Tracking should be provided demonstrating that a car can pass a refuse vehicle suitably around the site. Fire tender tracking should also be provided.

A pinch point of 4.4m is provided on the access road heading eastbound into the development. The TS states that adequate forward visibility is available to allow a larger vehicle to wait if an approaching car is already en-route. Given the concerns noted above regarding the width of the internal road, the Highway Authority are concerned that the proposed alignment and width will result in safety concerns. The internal layout needs to be amended to remove the need to provide a pinch point on the access road into the site.

No forward visibility splays have been provided around the bends in the site. Splays will need to be shown to 25m (20mph design speed) to demonstrate that adequate visibility can be achieved through the site in accordance with Hampshire County Councils' TG3 requirements.

A number of connection points through the internal layout are shown to connect into the neighbouring footpaths. Whilst the principle of the connections are supported, the applicant is required to review the quality of the existing paths through the requested WCHAR and engage with HCC's Countryside Services Team to discuss any potential improvements.

The Highway Authority requires a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit to be undertaken for the internal layout given the safety concerns and constraints noted above. The Highway Authority's comments to date are made on the basis of additional matters may arise as a result of the Road Safety Audit.

Parking Provision

The applicant proposes that vehicle and cycle parking will be provided in accordance

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

with Havant Borough Council's Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document. Despite this, the applicant states that there would be a shortfall of 8 unallocated parking spaces which goes against the standards provided. This is likely to exacerbate the already highlighted highway safety and operational matters as a result of the site design. Cycle parking will be provided either in sheds or garages for private houses or in cycle stores for those residing in flats. Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure will be provided for each private residential dwelling.

It is noted that a number of plots (1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 19 and 51) rely on triple tandem parking which is unacceptable. As such, a revised parking layout should be submitted.

The applicant should be made aware that subject to any planning permission being granted, the final decision regarding parking is with Havant Borough Council as the local parking authority. Thus, the applicant should secure confirmation with HBC about whether the proposed parking provision, and the shortfall of 8 allocated parking spaces will be accepted or not.

Trip Generation

The applicant has provided proposed trip generation using the TRICS database. Proposed trip generation is as follows:

	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)			PM Peak (17:00-18:00)		
	Arr.	Dept.	Total	Arr.	Dept.	Total
Trip Rate	0.130	0.419	0.549	0.354	0.161	0.515
Trip Generation	6	20	25	16	7	24

Traffic Impact

During pre-application discussions, the Highway Authority raised the requirement for a proportionate contribution to be secured towards mitigation works along the A3023 to mitigate its cumulative impact on this key corridor. However, the mechanism and amount has not yet been agreed. The Highway Authority requires further discussions on this matter, specifically in relation as to how the cumulative impact at the Manor Road roundabout and the A27 Langstone Roundabout.

It also important to note that the Local Plan position has been updated since the pre-application response with the Inspector highlighting the need to assess network operation during the seasonal peak hours. To date this work is still outstanding. It is also key to note that there are a number of other significant applications in the area which should be considered holistically. That being the following applications:

- St Mary's Road application,

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

- Fathoms Reach;
- The Oysters site; and
- Saltmarsh Lane.

Therefore, it is being requested that the cumulative impact be assessed through local modelling for all of these sites considering all current applications as committed development. Given the sensitivity of the corridor and the strategic network requirements, modelling should be undertaken for a 10-year forecast period from year of opening to a 2036 forecast year, to comply with the strategic modelling carried out for Hayling Island, the following scenarios should therefore be assessed for the traditional and seasonal peaks:

- Baseline existing layouts (year of opening - 2024);
- Baseline existing layouts (year of opening - 2024) + this development.
- Future year existing layouts (2036) + committed development;
- Future year existing layouts (2036) + committed development + this development; and
- Future year (2036) + committed development + development + improvement scheme.

The final modelling scenario is required to understand the operation of the roundabout with the signalised improvement scheme in place as identified within the Hayling Island Transport Assessment. Whilst the Paramics model has assessed the junction at a strategic level, the Highway Authority require Linsig modelling of the scheme to confirm that it will sufficiently accommodate the development when assessing the modelling at a more detailed level. To date, this work has not been undertaken and whilst some funding has been secured towards improvements along the A3023 improvement measures as a whole, specific funds have not yet been allocated to this scheme.

Whilst the Highway Authority have considered the package of improvements to the A3023 at a strategic level for the Local Plan there is no agreement that the measures at Manor Road roundabout are the most appropriate ones to manage traffic volumes and other user demands.

Seasonal Assessment:

Within the TS, the applicant has undertaken a qualitative assessment of the seasonal traffic impacts which concludes that whilst background traffic increases seasonally, development flow would not increase at this time.

When reviewing the local plan, the Inspector requested specific seasonal peak modelling to demonstrate that traffic associated with proposed allocations would not

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

result in a severe impact on the local road network. As noted above, this work remains outstanding and will need to be provided before a recommendation can be made on the proposed development.

Travel Plan

This Travel Plan (TP) 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 TP is generally good, it still requires some amendments before it can be approved.

Title page and version control:

The document control sheet and introduction should contain the following additional information between them:

- Site postcode and address
- Type of travel plan (Framework / Full)
- Description of the site
- Site masterplan – this is listed in the appendix but does not appear in the version submitted
- History of the site
- Previous planning applications
- Reference to the Framework Travel Plan (where applicable)
- Known applications in the vicinity, likely to impact this proposal
- Purpose of the travel plan
- Developer's view on travel planning / statement from the developer supporting the contents of the travel plan
- Travel plan report structure

Guidance:

Section 1.3.1 should reference additional national and local policy documents relevant to the TP. These may include, but are not limited to:

National

- National Planning Policy Framework – update to 2021 iteration
- Planning Practice Guidance 'Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements' (2014)

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

- IHT's 'Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot' (2000)
- CIHT's 'Buses in Urban Developments' (2018)

Regional

- Hampshire County Council's 'A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans' (2019)
- Hampshire County Council's Parking Standards

Local

- LPA Clean Air Policy (where applicable)
- Neighbourhood Plans (where applicable)

This section should also reference the developer's policies on sustainable travel. If the developer does not have a policy on sustainable travel, a statement of support for the aims of the Travel Plan from a senior member of staff at Taylor Wimpey would suffice.

Existing site conditions / site audit:

Section 2 should include the following details:

- Class use
- Site access
- Plan
- Photographs
- Footways and cycleways, including:
 - Walking Isochrone Map
 - Cycling Isochrone Map
 - Local Facilities
- Bus stops in the area, including:
 - Provision / Route Map
 - Timetable
 - Description of walk to closest stop

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

- Nearest (or relevant) train stations, including:
 - Provision; car parking, cycle parking (quantity and type), waiting areas, accessibility etc.
 - Timetable
 - Description of journey to station

Table 2.2 should be shown in map layout to better display the proximity of these facilities. The detail on 'walkable neighbourhoods' is excellent.

Note: paragraph 2.4.6 contains an error message.

Proposed site layout:

Further information required for section 3 includes the following:

- Detail on type of cycle parking – how is it intended to ensure that the proposed facilities are used for cycle parking and not more general storage?
- Associated parking arrangements for both cycle and vehicles

Measures:

There are a number of additional measures which should be considered for inclusion within this TP:

Walking

- Promotion of free health apps
- Coordinate with schools to organise walking to school events

Cycling

- Sustainable travel voucher
- Provision of cycle route maps and improvements to signage
- Formation of a Bicycle Users Group (BUG)
- Assistance to residents in accessing information about safe cycling, appropriate clothing, local cycle routes etc. – not just via social media
- Annual bike maintenance events e.g. Bike Drs in partnership with local cycling shops

Public Transport

- Sustainable travel voucher

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

- Collaboration with local public transport providers to improve services, negotiate discounts and trial initiatives – change wording in paragraph 6.3.9 to ‘commit to’ rather than ‘endeavour to’

Marketing and Promotion

- Provision of information to all residents on how to access the site by means other than the car through a variety of methods, including
 - Personal travel planning
 - Notice boards / team meeting agenda
 - Newsletters
 - Hold events
 - Focus groups
 - Introduction of a personalised journey planning scheme

Smart Working Measures

- Actively promote home delivery services
- Actively promote home working, where possible

This section must include a final total cost estimate for all measures which will be used to set the Travel Plan Cash Deposit.

Consultation and Partnerships:

The FTP should contain evidence of preliminary liaisons with local cycle shops and public transport operators to scope the possibility of arranging for discounts on equipment and services respectively. These communications can then form the basis for further negotiations between these companies and the Travel Plan Coordinator (TPC). This should take place prior to first occupancy to ensure any benefits secured are available for residents immediately when the potential for mode shift and new travel patterns is strongest.

Management / TPC role:

Section 5 should include the following details:

- Name (cannot be generic at the Full TP stage, such as a consultancy name)
- Job title
- Organisation

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

- Non generic contact details, including:
 - Email address
 - Work address
 - Phone number
 - Website (where applicable)
- A concise breakdown of:
 - Start date (to be at least 3 months prior to occupation to ensure uptake)
 - Time spent on travel plan per week
 - Number of weeks per year to be working on the travel plan
 - Cost per hour
 - End date (cannot be before the end of the travel plan, unless another TPC is to be employed)
 - Overall cost – this will be used to determine the cash deposit amount

Monitoring:

Section 4 should include the following details:

- Monitoring timetable as laid out below:

	Baseline (Year 1)	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Level of report	To be submitted one year after occupation. This will include the baseline survey results found in the updated Full Travel Plan and a monitoring report.	Monitoring Report	Full Surveys - Monitoring Report	Monitoring Report	Full Surveys - Monitoring Report

- Full survey years to include TRICS SAM survey
- Snapshot surveys to be conducted for years where a full survey will not be carried out.
- Recognition that HCC requires a 35% response rate for questionnaire surveys.
- Measures to ensure that this response rate is met, e.g., a voucher for supermarket or online retailer.

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

- Alternative method of survey if 35% response rate not achieved

A minimum 35% response rate must be attained in order for travel questionnaire surveys to be considered statistically significant; commitment to this figure should be included in this section. There are currently no measures in place to encourage residents to complete a questionnaire survey. Entry into a prize draw could be offered to those who complete a survey, although it should be noted that the prize should not be travel-related (e.g., bus tickets, cycle vouchers, etc).

A sample questionnaire survey should be provided in the appendices.

Action plan:

As per HCC's guidance, section 7 of the travel plan should demonstrate how each measure will be achieved and most importantly, the expected cost of each measure, including the full cost of the TPC post over the monitoring period. This information is essential for setting the cash deposit amount. An example table showing the required information is included below:

Objective	Measure	Start Date	Due Date	Responsibility	Mode affected	Cost Estimate	How to measure success

Table 4 - Example Action Plan

Delivery and Enforcement

The section relevant to enforcement should include the following detail:

- Paragraph explaining the role of the Section 106 agreement – particularly where measures listed in the TP are included in the Section 106 such as infrastructure changes
- Commitment to pay HCC's monitoring and approval fees
- Commitment to provide a Travel Plan Cash Deposit of equal value to travel plan measures
- Sanctions in the event of non-compliance

Conclusion:

A final paragraph should conclude the travel plan summarising the key points from each section.

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

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

Recommendation

The Highway Authority require the following further information before a recommendation can be made on the planning application:

- A WCHAR to audit local walking and cycle facilities;
- Investigation into improving local bus facilities;
- Site access drawings;
- Further information regarding the internal site layout;
- Stage 1 Road Safety Audit for both the site access and internal layout;
- Modelling for Mill Rythe Roundabout;
- Assessment of the seasonal peak hours on Hayling Island; and
- Amendments to the Travel Plan.

I trust that the above is clear. Should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact Chris Hirst on the number noted above.

Yours faithfully,

Gemma McCart – Transport Team Leader.

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