

From: Simon McFarlane [<mailto:Simon.McFarlane@planningissues.co.uk>]
Sent: 29 October 2015 17:26
To: Sally Smith DC
Subject: FW: APP/15/00950 - 108-110 Elm Grove, Hayling Island - Review of Viability Report

Sally,

I have read the Highway comments and have the following points in response.

There is provision for buggies;



We can provide cycle storage. The Transport Statement states that following surveys of CRL sites in March there is no demand for cycle parking. Please see attached survey results. Therefore I suggest that we could add in two Sheffield stands as a maximum. This could be covered by condition?

Given the limited movements into and out of the site, the electric gates are unlikely to cause congestion. Section 4.3 of the Transport Statement sets out that there will be a significant reduction in transport movements.

4.3 Trip comparison

Comparing data in Table 4.1 and 4.3, the traffic generated will be significantly less than the potential generation of the existing land use. The details of the net difference in flows are provided in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4: Net difference in traffic flows

Total Daily Vehicle Trips		
Arrival	Departure	Total
-106	-103	-210

As presented in Table 4.4, there will be a significant benefit to the local highway network as the proposed development will generate less traffic movements than the existing site use.

The Transport Statement covers the turning of cars and a 3.5t van;

Figure 5.1: Swept paths of car and 3.5t van



Servicing arrangements for larger vehicles are covered at section 5.2 of the Transport Statement. The lodge manager will arrange for refuse bins to be taken to the road side for collection on relevant days. This will negate the need for refuse trucks to enter the site.

A separate footpath is provide for pedestrians, 5.3 Transport Statement;

