



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>	6 th October 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.

Further to the Highway Authority's responses dated 8th March 2021 and 27th May 2021, the applicant has supplied a further Technical Note (TN) to address the comments raised within the latest response. The outstanding points are as follows:

- Pedestrian/cycle count at the A3(M) J4 eastern roundabout;
- RSA1 for the A3(M) J4 eastern roundabout pedestrian/cyclist crossing;
- Clarification on how the Highway Authority will be consulted on changes to the Road Restraint System;
- Provision of speed survey data for the site access road and SSD shown to the roundabout;
- Updates to the junction modelling; and
- Updates to the Travel Plan.

Following conversations with the Highway Authority, the applicant has provided further information regarding a revised speed reduction scheme, improvement scheme at the A3(M) roundabout and associated modelling outputs. Following a review of this information, the Highway Authority wish to make the following comments.

Pedestrian and Cycle Link – Purbrook Way

The applicant is proposing a new pedestrian and cycle connection to the Lidl store car park via a ramped link from Purbrook Way. In line with the Highway Authority's comments, the gradient of the link has been revised to 4.45% which is considered acceptable.

Should the proposals progress, barriers will need to be provided at the end of the new link before Purbrook Way given the levels difference when entering/exiting the site. This will reduce speeds of cyclists joining the existing Purbrook Way shared use path. It should also be noted that whilst HCC's OWC team have agreed to the culvert works in principle, detailed design work for the link may require further structural support and an AIP. Discussions should be held with the OWC team to understand their requirements should planning permission be granted.

The works agreed in principle are shown in drawing number AD 110 Rev_C. Should the outstanding highway matters be resolved, the works would be secured as an obligation within the S106 agreement for delivery via a S278 agreement with the Highway Authority. Given the risks to the deliverability of the pedestrian/cycle link to the store, detailed approval through the S278 and OWC process would be required prior to commencement to ensure pedestrian and cycle access can be achieved.

Junction Modelling

Within the Highway Authority's previous response, it was noted that geometric parameters within the A3(M) J4 eastern roundabout were incorrect and needed updating, namely:

- The entry width for B&Q Road is over-estimated i.e. the modelled widths is 5.9 metres whereas the CAD measurement suggests it to be only around 3.9 meters. Effective flare length should also be corrected for the B&Q arm.
- The CAD and google earth measurements at Purbrook Way West arm suggests no local widening at the entry. Hence, the entry width should be reduced to 7.1 meters (identical to approach road half width) from existing modelled value of 8.2 meters. The effective flare length should also be reduced to zero.

The latest TN has updated the parameters, as noted above, resulting in a new set of outputs based on a number of different scenarios. When considering the proposed development scenario flows alongside committed development in the 2025 base scenario, it is noted that the B&Q arm of the roundabout is predicted to operate at a Ratio to Flow Capacity (RFC) of 1.42 in the AM peak hour, 1.49 in the PM peak hour and 1.09 in the Saturday peak. The max vehicle queue observed during the AM peak is 19.4, whilst in the PM peak the queue length would be 42.7 PCUs, equating to a delay of 521 seconds. The modelled level of queuing is likely to tail back towards the B&Q car park, impacting on their car parking arrangements and business requirements. The B&Q approach is therefore forecast to operate over actual design capacity with the addition of development traffic.

It is also noted that the Purbrook Way (W) approach on the eastern roundabout is operating close to design capacity in the AM peak hour with an RFC of 0.95. The same approach to the western roundabout is forecast to operate over design capacity with an RFC of 1.04, also in the AM peak hour. The outputs for this scenario are summarised in Table 4 of the TN.

With the amended junction parameters demonstrating that the B&Q access arm of the roundabout will operate over capacity, the applicant has set out an improvement scheme within the TN to address the capacity concerns. The scheme consists of widening the junction approach to 6m, providing two 3m wide entry lanes to the roundabout with a flare length of 14m. As a result of the widening scheme, the crossing distance for pedestrians and cyclists will increase from 4.8m to 7.3m over two lanes of traffic to reach the splitter island.

To forecast the operation of the junction when factoring in the improvement scheme, the TN sets out a revised set of outputs in Table 6. The RFC in the 2025 AM peak hour reduces to 0.40 and 0.57 in the PM peak hour on the B&Q approach. The Purbrook Way (W) approaches remain close to and over capacity but it is accepted that this is primarily the result of traffic associated with the Campdown development and background traffic, rather than Lidl development flows.

Whilst the proposed improvement scheme would improve the capacity on the B&Q approach to the junction, it would come at the detriment of pedestrian and cyclist safety. These concerns have been raised by the Highway Authority in previous responses and details are provided further within this response.

A3(M) J4 – Pedestrian/Cycle Crossing

At the request of the Highway Authority, the applicant has undertaken a Road Safety Audit of the crossing point which incorporates the widened crossing and substandard visibility afforded by the existing totem pole. The audit brief was agreed with the Highway Authority before the audit was undertaken to ensure that all pertinent matters were picked up by the auditors.

To help inform the safety audit, the applicant undertook speed surveys in accordance with HCC TG3 guidance to understand vehicle speeds on the B&Q access road. Speed measurements were taken 20m and 40m away from the crossing point, with 85th percentile speeds recorded as 28.6mph 40m away and 24.3mph 20m away. The recorded speeds resulted in visibility requirements of 38m and 31m respectively.

Within the audit (contained within Appendix E of the TN) the auditors identify one primary issue relating to the forward visibility obstruction for pedestrians and cyclists as a result of the B&Q totem pole. The recommendation is to clear vegetation surrounding the visibility splay to overcome the identified problem and to ensure compliance with TG3.

Whilst the Highway Authority acknowledge some safety benefit would be afforded by the vegetation being cut back, the requirements of TG3 cannot be met through vegetation clearance alone. It is key in considerations to note

that the totem pole is of a size and width that is not appropriate to be sited within the visibility splay as set out in CD 109. So, whilst the proposals put forward by the applicant meet the requirements set out in the audit report, negating the need for a formal exception to be considered, they do not overcome the requirement with CD 109 for a Departure from Standard.

In an attempt to reduce vehicle speeds on the approach to the junction, the applicant originally proposed traffic calming on the access road in the form of speed cushions. The Highway Authority questioned the appropriateness of the speed cushions given the number of larger vehicles which would access B&Q and Lidl, leading to the traffic calming measures to be amended to full width speed humps. This information was included within the audit brief.

Having further reviewed the revised crossing point, it is considered that the uncontrolled, two-lane crossing presents an additional safety concern with pedestrians and cyclists having to cross a busy arm of the roundabout over two lanes with restricted visibility. The video survey data analysed to undertake the PvM² assessment (addressed further within this response) highlights a high number of school children crossing within the AM peak hour (72 pedestrians, 47 cyclists) and between 15:00 – 16:00 (117 pedestrians, 28 cyclists). The existing shared use path provides a connection between Leigh Park and the schools and colleges located on the western side of the A3(M). On a strategic level, the shared use path connects Havant to Waterlooville and therefore represents an important link for vulnerable road users which has been recently extended through other developer led works from Waterlooville MDA.

Whilst the traffic calming is likely to reduce speeds on the approach to the roundabout, there is no guarantee that the speed humps would reduce speeds sufficiently to achieve the 24m SSD for pedestrians and 21m SSD for cyclists, equivalent to 18mph 85th percentile speeds. A reduction in speeds to this level would be required to achieve the maximum available visibility when taking account of the totem pole in its current location. Unless the traffic calming measures were implemented ahead of planning permission and the speeds observed to confirm that the 85th percentiles have reduced to 18mph, there is no guarantee that the visibility splays would be suitable, further justifying the requirement for a formal departure.

As identified within Transport Assessment Addendum 1 (TAA1), two accidents have been highlighted within the accident data over the past 5 years, both of which involved pedestrians attempting to cross via the existing facilities. Increasing the crossing distance could exacerbate the accident rate observed and will decrease the safety of the crossing movements for the high level of observed school children utilising the facilities.

The widened crossing point coupled with the restricted visibility therefore presents a safety concern to the Highway Authority which has not been satisfactorily addressed. LTN 1/20 Table 10-2 identifies that widening the entry to two lanes would result in “provision not suitable for all people and will exclude some potential users and/or have safety concerns” for cyclists. Given the high level of school children crossing and the existing accidents, the policy

guidance here is pertinent and confirms that the alternation to the facilities could lead increased safety risks for cyclists.

As identified above, an improvement scheme is required to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on the B&Q arm of the roundabout. The two-lane entry comes at the detriment of pedestrian and cyclist safety which is considered unacceptable by the Highway Authority. Therefore, on the basis that the proposed mitigation is unacceptable, the development would result in a severe level of queuing back from the roundabout which impacts on the site access, car park management and 3rd party operations.

Controlled Crossing Assessment

To understand whether the crossing point on the B&Q access arm of the roundabout would qualify for controlled crossing facilities based on the pedestrian, cycle and vehicular flows, the applicant was requested to understand a PvM² assessment.

Within the latest TN, the applicant has undertaken a PV² assessment which calculated values of 0.15×10^8 and 0.16×10^8 . Following discussions with the Highway Authority, an updated assessment for PvM² was subsequently undertaken by the applicant which derived values of 0.21×10^8 both inbound and outbound. The observed values fall under the requirements for a controlled crossing at this location.

Framework Travel Plan

Further discussions have taken place between the Highway Authority and the applicant to agree the outstanding points in relation to the Travel Plan.

The document is now agreed and would be secured within the S106 agreement should the outstanding highway matters be overcome, alongside the associated fees.

Recommendation

On the basis that the applicant has not presented a scheme which sufficiently addresses the capacity concerns associated with the development without compromising the safety of vulnerable road users, should the application be determined at this time, the Highway Authority would recommend refusal based on the current information for the following reasons:

The applicant has failed to provide a mitigation scheme which would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. In the absence of an acceptable mitigation scheme, the proposed development would be contrary to NPPF Paragraph 111 in that it would result in a severe impact on the local road network.

Reason: In the interest of Highway Safety

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

Yours Sincerely,

Gemma McCart – Transport Team Leader.