



Head of 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*

Tele: 0845 603 5638 (General Enquiries)
0845 603 5633 (Roads and Transport)
0845 603 5634 (Recycling Waste & Planning)

Textphone 0845 603 5625

Fax 01962 847055

www.hants.gov.uk

<i>Enquiries to</i>	Chris Hirst	<i>My reference</i>	6-3-13-214
<i>Direct Line</i>	0370 779 0563	<i>Your reference</i>	APP/20/01221
<i>Date</i>	14 th January 2021	<i>Email</i>	Chris.Hirst@hants.gov.uk

For the attention of L Oliver

Land to the west of B&Q, Purbrook Way, Havant

Erection of retail foodstore with associated car parking, access, landscaping and engineering works.

Thank you for re-consulting the Highway Authority on the above planning application.

This rebuttal has been provided in response to the note received from simplyplanning dated 13th December 2021.

For ease of reference, this response has been formatted to follow the same headings as those provided within simplyplanning's note.

Background

The background description provided in the letter describes the position following the Highway Authority's latest response dated 24th November 2021.

Matter at Issue (Increased Severance)

The Highway Authority's latest response to the application noted that the scheme presented by the applicant, which featured two-lane entry to the A3(M) J4 eastern roundabout from the northern (B&Q) arm, was required to mitigate the impact of the development. Without the implementation of the scheme, the development would result in a severe level of queueing on the B&Q arm of the roundabout. However, whilst it was agreed that in highway capacity terms the scheme was required, it was also clear that it would result in increased severance for pedestrians and cyclists by introducing an additional lane at the crossing, thereby reducing the attractiveness of the route and making it more difficult to cross in this location. The capacity

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

improvement scheme is therefore contrary to Hampshire County Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and the wider emerging position set out in LTP4 and the recently established LTN 1/20 guidance.

The applicant's note states that this view is entirely subjective, the scheme would have an imperceptible impact upon severance and no regard was given to the pedestrian and cycle improvements at the junction. These points are addressed below:

- 'Entirely Subjective' – The Highway Authority has previously provided justification as to why the two-lane entry will increase pedestrian and cyclist severance along the route. LTN 1/20 Table 10-2 assesses crossing design suitability and identifies that crossing 1 lane of traffic with daily traffic flow between 0 – 4000 PCU's results in 'provision suitable for most people'. When widening the entry to two-lane, the facility is considered 'not suitable for all people and will exclude some potential users and/or have safety concerns'. The note makes reference to the consistency in the new width of the crossing (5.9m) compared to the current crossing distance on the entry onto the B&Q arm from the roundabout (5.4m). However, the crossing distance over the exit features only 1 lane, whereas the proposed scheme implements a second lane of traffic onto the roundabout. As previously identified, the route over the A3(M) roundabouts is utilised by school children who will be required to cross an additional lane to and from school. On this basis, there is evidence, reaffirmed through established policy, that the scheme will increase severance for existing users and is therefore not a subjective view.
- 'Imperceptible impact on severance' and 'no regard is had to the significant improvements to the junction' – As noted above, the note's basis that the increase in severance is minimal comes from an assessment of the increase in crossing distance alone. Whilst the crossing distance is a factor in the assessment, the note fails to take account of the numerous issues outlined in the Highway Authority's previous response concerning the crossing. The Highway Authority also gave due regard to the proposals to implement tactile paving, widen the existing footway/cycleway over a short section, provide visibility in accordance with HCC TG3 and reduce vehicle speeds on the junction approach; however, these improvements were weighted against the increased traffic flow from the proposed development and the severance caused by the two-lane crossing. When taking a holistic view of the proposals, any potential benefits afforded by the aforementioned measures are counteracted by the increase in traffic flow and two-lane crossing which, as identified, is contrary to a number of established and emerging policies by increasing the dominance of vehicular traffic at the junction.

The note goes on to reference the low level of increased pedestrian and cyclist trips across the junction as a result of the development. Whilst the Highway Authority has previously acknowledged this point, it has also been identified that there is a high number of pedestrians and cyclists utilising the

crossing during the AM peak hour, particularly school children, and between 15:00 – 16:00 (72 pedestrians, 47 cyclists and 117 pedestrians and 28 cyclists respectively). The note fails to account for the impact on these existing users of the crossing which remains a key matter for consideration, particularly also given the increased vehicular traffic associated with the development worsening conditions further.

Finally, the note identifies the schemes within the LCWIP which formed the basis for the contribution request. The two identified schemes are costed at a total sum of £400,000, with a £202,000 contribution sought towards these measures. As outlined to the applicant, this has been calculated based on the uplift in traffic flows across the B&Q arm of the roundabout during the local highway network's busiest periods (AM Peak and PM Peak hours). This calculation has not been referred to within the note.

Planning Obligations

As identified within the note, planning obligations must only be sought where the following tests are met:

- a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- b) Directly relates to the development; and
- c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Further clarity is provided below to confirm how each of the tests are met through the contribution request.

- **Necessary** – The improvement scheme at the A3(M) J4 eastern roundabout, required to offset the severe vehicular impact on the B&Q approach to the junction as a result of the development in its absence, which results in increased severance for pedestrians and cyclists, is contrary to the LCWIP, LTP4, LTN 1/20 and wider emerging climate emergency. The contribution is therefore considered to be necessary to deliver the wider pedestrian and cycle improvements along this key route in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms, and mitigate the detrimental impact on sustainable modes.
- **Directly related** – The proposed development would result in an increase in traffic of 43% and 58% across the respective AM and PM peak hours on the B&Q arm of the roundabout, reducing the ability for pedestrians and cyclists to cross, especially when considering the two-lane entry to the junction. Whilst the Highway Authority have acknowledged that the scheme is considered suitable to cater for the forecast vehicular demand, the wider severance and policy issues must be offset by improvements along the route which will directly benefit existing and future users.
- **Fair and Reasonable** – The contribution has been derived by calculating the percentage increase in traffic flow across the busiest periods of the day on the local highway (AM and PM Peak hours) when compared to the existing flow. It is during these time periods that pedestrians and cyclists will be most impacted by the additional traffic flow. The percentage increase across the peaks averages at 52%, resulting in a contribution request of £202,000. The contribution request is therefore

fair and reasonable against the traffic increase as a result of the development.

Recommendation

The information provided within this note demonstrates and evidences the CIL compliance of the Highway Authority's requirement for a £202,000 contribution towards pedestrian and cycle improvements along Purbrook Way.

Should the above not be agreed prior to determination, please contact the Highway Authority for a revised recommendation.

Yours Faithfully,

Gemma McCart – Transport Team Leader