

Technical Note

Project No: ITB17351
Project Title: Bartons Road, Havant
Title: Cycle Route Review
Ref: ITB17351-001 TN
Date: 22 October 2021

SECTION 1 Introduction

- 1.1 Redrow Homes has instructed i-Transport LLP to provide highways and transport advice in relation to the Reserved Matters Application APP/21/00678 for the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of 70 dwellings and associated works on land at Camp Field, Bartons Road, Havant.
- 1.2 County Council (HCC), in its capacity as the local highway authority, has responded to the consultation on the application. A number of comments have been raised and amendment of the layout has been recommended. In particular, HCC has requested the provision of a 3m wide shared cycle footway through the site, extending from cycle infrastructure at both the site and emergency accesses.
- 1.3 This Technical Note has been prepared to review the response to ascertain whether the provision of a 3m wide shared use link within the site is necessary and in keeping with current infrastructure design guidance.

SECTION 2 Background

2.1 Outline Consent

- 2.1.1 Outline planning consent was granted by Havant Borough Council (HBC) under reference APP/19/00007. The permission granted the construction of up to 72 new homes on the southern half of the site, which lies within the HBC administrative area, with the northern parcel situated in the East Hampshire District administrative area. The latter area was safeguarded to allow for the potential for further new homes to be provided should East Hampshire District Council choose to allocate development as part of their Local Plan review.

- 2.1.2 The safeguarded area has the potential to serve a further 70 dwellings, and the split between the parcels can be seen within the Masterplan drawing accompanying the outline planning permission, extracted as **Image 2.1**. In total, the site has the ability to accommodate circa 140 new homes.

Image 2.1: APP/19/00007 Masterplan



Source: APP/19/00007

- 2.1.3 As part of the HCC response to this application, dated 23rd September 2019, the responding Officer commented:

"To tie into the proposed shared use provision from this development and the shared use path due to be implemented as part of the Land South of Bartons Road and Eastleigh House applications, a shared use connection is required between the emergency access and site access internal to the development to link this provision together. This should be included within any subsequent reserved matters application."

- 2.1.4 No obligations were placed on the development through the associated S106 Agreement to provide such a link, and condition 34 of the outline planning consent states:

"The reserved matters layout shall make provision for potential future vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access to the northern area of the site beyond the existing residential part of the site."

- 2.1.5 This condition requires the internal layout to provide access to the northern part of the site as part of the reserved matters application, in order to safeguard potential future development.

- 2.1.6 There are no conditions within the outline planning consent that require a shared surface footway/cycleway to be provided through the site, or to connect the 2 points of cycle access. Similarly, there are no obligations within the S106 Agreement that require the provision of such a link.

2.2 Reserved Matters Application

- 2.2.1 Redrow Homes has submitted Reserved Matters Application APP/21/00678 in relation to the layout, appearance, scale and landscaping for a total of 70 dwellings. An extract of the site layout plan submitted with the application is provided at **Image 2.2**.

Image 2.2: Reserved Matters Site Layout Plan



Source: APP/21/00678

- 2.2.2 Comments have been received from HCC in response to the consultation. As part of this response, HCC have stated that:

"The internal layout does not provide any connections into the new shared use provision to the east and west of the site along Bartons Road. Dedicated cycle facilities must be provided from the emergency access, through the site to connect into the site access."

A 3m wide shared use path should be considered inline with the committed cycle improvements along Bartons Road. The 3m cycleway in the centre of the site will also need to be connected into any proposed provision."

SECTION 3 Need for Cycle Infrastructure

3.1 Planning Condition/Obligation

- 3.1.1 While a cycle link was identified as part of the HCC response to the outline planning application, neither an obligation nor planning condition was included as part of the grant of consent.
- 3.1.2 In terms of cycling requirements identified through the planning conditions, the only requirement is for the internal to provide for future access to the north parcel of the site. The proposed layout provides for this at three locations, as identified in **Image 3.1**.

Image 3.1: Future Connectivity



Source: Consultants' annotation

- 3.1.3 It should also be noted that, during resolution of the outline consent, a link adjacent to Bartons Road was not sought by HCC. This would represent the most direct route for cyclists who are continuing a journey along Bartons Road. If the intention was to facilitate cycle journey continuation, it would have been appropriate for this infrastructure to have been sought and secured as part of the outline consent. Given the nature of Barton Road to the east of the site, any cyclists continuing their journey are likely to be experienced cyclists. Bringing such movements into the site, with the presence of significant lengths of direct frontage access, may lead to conflict between users as discussed further, below.

3.1.4 Nevertheless, an obligation requiring the continuation of the cycle route along the frontage of the site would not satisfy the CIL Regulation 122 tests that govern the use of planning obligations. In order for an obligation to be used to secure such infrastructure, it must be demonstrated that:

- The obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- Be directly related to the development; and
- Be proportional in scale.

3.1.5 In this instance, a connection along the frontage of the site would not satisfy these tests. Cyclists generated by the site require access to and from the site and will not require a continuation of the cycle route along the frontage of the site to achieve this; therefore, an obligation would not be 'directly related to the development'. Further, HBC have deemed development to be acceptable without the inclusion of such an obligation; therefore it would not be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms'.

3.2 Design Guidance

3.2.1 Since the submission of comments in response to the outline planning consent, previous cycle design guidance has been superseded by Local Transport Note 01/20 which replaces both LTN 02/08: Cycle Infrastructure Design and LTN 1/12: Share Use Routes for Pedestrians and Cyclists.

3.2.2 The core principles of LTN 1/20 include:

- Cycles must be treated as vehicles and not as pedestrians. On urban streets, cyclist must be physically separated from pedestrians and not share space with pedestrians.
- Cyclists must be physically separated and protected from high volume motor traffic, both at junctions and on the stretches of road between them.

3.2.3 Figure 4.1 of LTN 1/20 sets out the appropriate protection from motor traffic on highways, and an extract of this figure is provided at **Image 3.2**.

Image 3.2: Cycle Infrastructure Thresholds

Figure 4.1: Appropriate protection from motor traffic on highways

Speed Limit ¹	Motor Traffic Flow (pcu/24 hour) ²	Protected Space for Cycling			Cycle Lane (mandatory/ advisory)	Mixed Traffic
		Fully Kerbed Cycle Track	Stepped Cycle Track	Light Segregation		
20 mph ³	0					
	2000					
	4000					
	6000+					
30 mph	0					
	2000					
	4000					
	6000+					
40 mph	Any					
50+ mph	Any					

Provision suitable for most people
 Provision not suitable for all people and will exclude some potential users and/or have safety concerns
 Provision suitable for few people and will exclude most potential users and/or have safety concerns

Notes:
 1. If the 85th percentile speed is more than 10% above the speed limit the next highest speed limit should be applied
 2. The recommended provision assumes that the peak hour motor traffic flow is no more than 10% of the 24 hour flow
 3. In rural areas achieving speeds of 20mph may be difficult, and so shared routes with speeds of up to 30mph will be generally acceptable with motor vehicle flows of up to 1,000 pcu per day

Source: LTN 1/20

3.2.4 LTN 1/20 identifies that where vehicular speeds are low and a link is lightly trafficked, that 'mixed traffic' is appropriate, and that no form of protected space for cycling is required for the provision to be suitable for most people.

3.2.5 This is consistent with the components of cycle networks identified in Section 3.4 of LTN 1/20, which recognises the role that "quiet mixed traffic streets" has to play. Section 7 of LTN 1/20 goes into greater detail on quiet mixed traffic streets and lanes. In paragraph 7.1.1 it states that:

Where motor traffic flows are light and speeds are low, cyclists are likely to be able to cycle on-carriageway in mixed traffic. Most people, especially with younger children, will not feel comfortable on-carriageways with more than 2,500 vehicles per day and speeds of more than 20mph. These values should be regarded as desirable upper limits for inclusive cycling within the carriageway."

3.2.6 In paragraph 7.1.4 it continues:

"Most cycling on these types of streets and lanes takes place without any special infrastructure for cycling."

- 3.2.7 On the assumption that the northern parcel of the development site may be developed in the future to provide for approximately 70 new homes, in addition to the 70 homes provided on the southern parcel of the site, the internal roads will serve a total of approximately 140 homes.
- 3.2.8 Taking a robust trip rate of 6 vehicles movements per dwelling, per day, this would equate to a maximum of 940 vehicle movements per day occurring on internal roads. The 940 vehicles movements are less than half of the 'desirable upper limit' identified in LTN 01/20 where mixed on-carriageway cycling is appropriate. In practice, this number will only be achieved in the vicinity of the site access with the secondary roads serving smaller pockets of development – the east-west section of road serves circa 60 units, reducing flows to approximately 360 movement per day, or approximately 15% of the 'desirable upper limit'.
- 3.2.9 The design guidance is clear that the provision of an off-carriageway shared use route within the site is not necessary. Indeed, such a link could unnecessarily introduce a potential point of conflict. Paragraph 5.5.3 of LTN 1/20 identifies that where a route is also used by pedestrians, separate facilities should be provided for pedestrian and cycle movements – referencing that shared use may be suitable on roads with few building frontages. As the route requested by HCC would run along property boundaries, any residents leaving their property on foot would step onto a shared use route, and potentially across the path of a cyclist travelling at speed since there would be a relatively light flow of pedestrians given the quantum of development proposed.
- 3.2.10 Paragraph 5.5.3 continues that shared use should only be considered when options that reuse carriageway or other space have been rejected as unworkable. As set out above, the traffic conditions on the carriageway will be such that mixed on-carriageway cycling is appropriate, and therefore a shared-use route through the site, between the two points of connection from the development to the cycle network, should not be considered.

SECTION 4 Summary

- 4.1 Redrow Homes has instructed i-Transport LLP to provide highways and transport advice in relation to the Reserved Matters Application APP/21/00678 for the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of 70 dwellings and associated works on land at Camp Field, Bartons Road, Havant.
- 4.2 County Council (HCC), in its capacity as the local highway authority, has responded to the consultation on the application. A number of comments have been raised and amendment of the layout has been recommended. In particular, HCC has requested the provision of a 3m wide shared cycle footway through the site, extending from cycle infrastructure at both the site and emergency accesses.

-
- 4.3 While the provision of a cycle route from the accesses and into the site was identified in the HCC response to the outline planning application, no planning condition or obligation was placed upon the outline planning consent.
- 4.4 Since the consultation on the outline planning consent was undertaken, LTN 1/20 has been released and replaced existing cycle design guidance. LTN 1/20 is clear that on-carriageway mixed cycling is appropriate, given the lightly trafficked and low speed nature of the internal roads, and that shared use is more suitable on roads where there are few building frontages. The provision of a shared-use route within the site may potentially lead to conflicts with pedestrians leaving their properties.
- 4.5 On this basis, Redrow Homes do not propose to amend the layout of the site to include a 3m wide shared use route through the site, beyond the informal link provided through the open space in the centre of the site forming an alternative connection to potential future development and which is situated away from pedestrian access to properties.