

Subject: APP/20/01221 - Proposed Lidl store, Purbrook Way, Havant - Revised Improvement Scheme Details

Importance: High

Dear Chris,

On the back of your email yesterday, noting that you will not be in a position to agree to the principle of the revised improvement scheme at Monday's meeting as you are awaiting comments back on the latest modelling and further discussions with relevant internal consultees, following discussion with Lidl it is considered best to cancel the call scheduled for Monday.

Lidl have asked that once you are in an appropriate position, following receipt of the relevant modelling review / internal consultee comments, that it would still be preferred that we have a re-arranged MTeams call to discuss your findings in the hope we can get agreement on our proposals (and carry out any further work on our part if required) prior to any further formal comments being logged on the application file. From our discussions, it may be beneficial for additional internal Hampshire consultees to be present on this call for expediency if they have any specific comments to discuss / agree, I will await confirmation / clarification on this from yourselves in due course.

In relation to the modelling review, in case it is of use, the Arcady model is as per previously reviewed and accepted by your modelling team, incorporating requested alterations as appropriate, with the only change being to the B&Q arm geometry for the 'with-development' scenarios. Namely, compared to the modelling provided alongside our Technical Note dated July 2021 and upon which your most recent consultation comments are based, the salient changes are that the B&Q arm effective flare length has reduced from 14m to 13m, entry radius increased from 35m to 40m, and conflict angle increased from 11 to 41 degrees.

To confirm, the attached revised improvement scheme and detailed below has been presented to address the final outstanding issues raised within your consultation response dated 6th October 2021, requiring presentation of a scheme which sufficiently addresses the capacity concerns associated with the development without compromising the safety of vulnerable road users. To that effect I envisage the planning officer will confirm in due course the requirement for a response from Hampshire Highways on this to avoid any further confusion on this point as per our discussion.

I hope the above is clear and I look forward to hearing from you in a timely manner regarding any comments raised and re-arranging a meeting to discuss, but please feel free to contact me if there are any further queries in the meantime.

Best Regards
Richard

Richard Broad BSc MCIHT MILT
Principal Transport Planner, Mayer Brown Limited
T: DDM:
E: W: www.mayerbrown.co.uk
A: Suite 501, CityPoint, Temple Gate, Bristol, BS1 6PL

Mind, Woking Foodbank and Surrey Wildlife Trust are Mayer Brown's chosen charities



Please consider the environment before printing this email. Thank you.

IMPORTANT: This message is private and confidential. If you received this message in error, please notify us and remove it from your system

Mayer Brown Limited is registered in England, number 3531997. Registered office: Lion House, Oriental Road, Woking Surrey, GU22 8AR

This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the intended recipients and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author (rbroad@mayerbrown.co.uk) and do not necessarily represent those of the company.

From: Richard Broad

Sent: 21 October 2021 10:08

To: Hirst, Chris <<C>>; Drury, Holly <>

Cc: DOUGLAS SYMINGTON <>; James Mitchell <>; Alastair Thornton <>; McCart, Gemma <>; Oliver, Lewis <>

Subject: RE: APP/20/01221 - Proposed Lidl store, Purbrook Way, Havant - Revised Improvement Scheme Details
[Filed 21 Oct 2021 10:08]

Morning Chris,

Following on from your call yesterday please find attached associated response / information in relation to your queries.

Junction Modelling Lane Allocation

As mentioned during our call the ARCADY modelling program does not allocate traffic by lane, this is can only be done within the Lane Simulation tool. The lane simulation tool is typically utilised to model effects that may be difficult to model otherwise using the standard program alone, such as; unequal lane usage at roundabouts, blocking back between linked junctions, circulating lanes at roundabouts and partially signalised junctions. You may remember that at HCCs request we utilised the lane simulation tool for the Purbrook Way (W) arm of the eastern A3(M) roundabout due to the modelling team raising potential for unequal lane usage (detailed within our Technical Note dated 22/07/21).

In relation to the B&Q egress, the traffic flows indicate that during the peak periods assessed 46 – 58% of traffic would turn left at the roundabout, with remaining traffic going straight on (accessing the A3(M)) or turning right. Consequently, unequal lane usage is not a particular concern at the B&Q egress and therefore the standard ARCADY modelling is considered appropriate.

Tactile Paving

As requested, tactile paving has been widened from 3 to 4 pavers in width. See updated plan attached but please note that this has no salient impact upon the modelling / visibility details previously provided below.

Crossing Point

In relation to your comment that potential angling of the crossing point to improve visibility further, we have reviewed this and note that if the eastern dropped kerb is moved further south the crossing distance would increase from 5.9m to 6.4m with little (if any) benefit from a cyclist visibility point of view whilst it is not considered suitable to move the eastern dropped kerb further north due to width constraints due to the road restraint barrier / B&Q totem, but nonetheless a review of this option similarly notes that whilst the crossing distance may be reduced slightly further there would be little (if any) benefit in terms of cyclist visibility.

It may be best that you put me directly in touch with your colleague to discuss if you believe there has been miscommunication in terms of what is being suggested.

Vehicle Tracking

As requested, please find attached swept path analysis for the proposed layout, showing available stacking space for cars and tracking path for a HGV.

You will note that an HGV must straddle both lanes when exiting, primarily due to the one lane approach flaring to 2 lanes on entry. It is considered that this is acceptable based upon:

- This occurrence (HGVs straddling both lanes) is commonplace, so much so that it is referenced within Section 187 of the Highway code that road users should watch out for and give plenty of room to when approaching and entering a roundabout for several reasons, including long vehicles (including those towing trailers) which might have to take a different course or straddle lanes because of their length.
- ATC data indicating that large HGVs are infrequent - currently there are on average 5 OGV2 vehicles per day, equivalent to 0.2% of overall traffic. Lidl would add a further 2-3 per day.
- In practice, the HGV driver will follow the vehicles in front without overtaking.
- Vehicles following will be unable to overtake the HGV.

I hope the above / attached provides clarity to your initial queries, but please feel free to come back to me if you need to discuss prior to our meeting on Monday.

Best Regards
Richard

From: Richard Broad
Sent: 14 October 2021 11:19
To: 'Hirst, Chris' <; Drury, Holly <
Cc: 'DOUGLAS SYMINGTON' < James Mitchell < Alastair Thornton < >; McCart, Gemma < 'Oliver, Lewis' < >
Subject: APP/20/01221 - Proposed Lidl store, Purbrook Way, Havant - Revised Improvement Scheme Details

Dear Chris / Holly,

In advance of our meeting on Monday 25th October, please find attached and below details in relation to the proposed revised improvement scheme which has been developed for the above application in light of Hampshire Highways previous consultee comments.

Please feel free to share the attached with your colleagues as appropriate in order that any salient comments can be discussed during our meeting.

Revised Improvement Scheme Overview

In summary, the revised improvement scheme provides a 2-lane approach to the roundabout to address future year capacity constraints, in addition to addressing concerns raised with the existing and previously proposed arrangement in relation to visibility and crossing distance.

- **Footway / cycleway width** – Existing shared footway / cycleway running along Purbrook Way currently narrows to c. 2.2m in the vicinity of the existing eastern dropped kerb crossing point. Revised improvement scheme addresses this current deficiency, providing a 3m footway / cycleway to the new eastern dropped kerb crossing point.
- **Crossing Distance** – Revised improvement scheme results in the B&Q egress arm crossing distance increasing from 4.8m to 5.9m, with the proposed crossing distance fairly consistent with the existing crossing distance for the B&Q arm roundabout egress (5.4m).
- **Pedestrian Stopping Sight Distance (SSD)** – Revised improvement scheme provides 1.5m x 38m SSD visibility splays for pedestrians, in line with existing observed 85th percentile vehicle speeds (28.6mph) and hence consistent with requirements of TG3.
- **Cyclist Stopping Sight Distance** – Revised improvement scheme provides 2.5m x 28m SSD visibility splays for cyclists, in line with 22.5mph 85th percentile vehicle speeds (c. 6mph reduction compared to existing observed).

Consequently, as part of the revised improvement scheme it is proposed that a full width road hump would be positioned c. 26m from the crossing point to reduce approach vehicle speeds accordingly. LTN 1/07 'Traffic Calming' indicates that for 75mm or 100mm road humps 29-30mph 85th percentile speeds would be reduced to 19 – 22mph for hump spacing of 20 – 60m, although it is noted that based upon the B&Q access road

being private (unadopted highway) more severe traffic calming measures could be provided if necessary, such as Thumps which potentially would reduce vehicles speeds by 9mph or more and were previously accepted by Hampshire at Lidl Blackwater in order to reduce vehicle speeds on approach to the site access crossing point.

Based upon the flexibility afforded to traffic calming measures to be implemented, due to the access road being private it is considered that that a suitable measure is viable to provide a 6mph speed reduction and ensure proposals are consistent with TG3 requirements and hence a departure from standard is not considered necessary.

- **Road Restraint Barrier** - Revised improvement scheme has no impact upon the existing highway authority or private road restraint barrier in the vicinity of the B&Q totem.
- **Tactile Paving** – It is proposed that as part of the improvement scheme that tactile paving would be provided at both the B&Q access road entry and egress dropped kerb crossing points. Clarification is sought from Hampshire highways in terms of whether this would be acceptable based upon the crossing points linking to a shared footway / cycleway and no tactiles being provided currently.
- **Signage** – Currently, on approach to the crossing point along the B&Q access road there is no speed limit / warning signs, with only a shared footway/cycle sign (Diagram 956) provided c. 19m in advance of the crossing point. If deemed necessary additional warning / speed restriction signage could be provided on approach, such as Diagram 545 (Children going to or from school ahead) or similar.

Junction Modelling

Junction modelling for the revised improvement scheme has been undertaken, with associated updated modelling outputs attached and summarised below - demonstrating that the revised improvement scheme is predicted to allow the B&Q arm to operate within capacity post development (with and without committed Campdown development traffic).

Time Period	2025 Baseline (includes Campdown) No Mitigation	2025 + Lidl (includes Campdown) No Mitigation	2025 + Lidl (includes Campdown) Revised Improvement Scheme
Weekday AM peak	1.20 RFC / 9 veh Q / 306 s delay	1.42 RFC / 19 veh Q / 473 s delay	0.45 RFC / 1 veh Q / 20 s delay
Weekday PM peak	1.05 RFC / 10 veh Q / 191 s delay	1.49 RFC / 43 veh Q / 521 s delay	0.64 RFC / 2 veh Q / 23 s delay
Saturday peak	0.90 RFC / 7 veh Q / 56 s delay	1.09 RFC / 32 veh Q / 187 s delay	0.73 RFC / 3 veh Q / 17 s delay

Time Period	2025 Baseline (excludes Campdown) No Mitigation	2025 + Lidl (excludes Campdown) No Mitigation	2025 + Lidl (excludes Campdown) Revised Improvement Scheme
Weekday AM peak	0.63 RFC / 2 veh Q / 56 s delay	0.82 RFC / 4 veh Q / 91 s delay	0.36 RFC / 1 veh Q / 14 s delay
Weekday PM peak	0.73 RFC / 2 veh Q / 53 s delay	1.07 RFC / 15 veh Q / 189 s delay	0.55 RFC / 1 veh Q / 16 s delay
Saturday peak	0.90 RFC / 7 veh Q / 56 s delay	1.09 RFC / 32 veh Q / 187 s delay	0.73 RFC / 3 veh Q / 17 s delay

I would hope the above / attached is sufficient to enable you undertake an initial review of the revised improvement scheme for discussion at the upcoming meeting, with an aim of obtaining agreement in principle for the mitigation / improvement scheme prior to formal submission.

In the meantime, please feel free to contact me if there is any additional information you believe would be useful to provide prior to our meeting.

Best Regards
Richard

