



UE5 site, Portsdown Hill, Bedhampton . Application 14/00232/FUL

Cumulative impact with Scratchface Lane site and Havant Retail Park site

9th July 2014

Further information has been requested by Havant BC relating to the likely cumulative impact of the Portsdown Hill site with the previously approved sites at Scratchface Lane (application 12/00612) and the Havant Retail Park (13/00266).

The following is relevant;

A) Havant BC approved the 92 dwellings on the Scratchface Lane site in November 2012. At that time the highway authority (Hampshire CC) set out their position in a response dated 4 October 2012, which stated;

I recognise that the impact of the development on the local road network is a considerable concern to local residents. However the highway authority has carried out detailed investigations and concludes that the road widths and alignment are adequate and that there is sufficient capacity within the local road network to accommodate additional traffic from the development . Similarly whilst there would be an increase in traffic using junctions in the wider network the highway authority considers that there is sufficient capacity to absorb it. A highway objection to the proposal is not justified

B) prior to issuing this response, HCC had raised issues about the adequacy of the junction capacity analysis of the Belmont roundabout undertaken by the applicants consultants. This had included a meeting on site. The consultants issued an Addendum Report in January 2011 to their original Transport Assessment setting out further analysis of the Belmont junction requested by HCC. Therefore when HCC made their response in October 2012 it was based on a thorough and detailed assessment of the Belmont junction and yet HCC still concluded 'an objection would not be justified'.

C) the Transport Assessment submitted with the Havant Retail Park application for 86 dwellings (ref 13/00266) identified that the effect of constructing 86 dwellings in place of the existing bowling alley + DIY would result in a reduction in traffic through Belmont roundabout. The TA identified this as -1 in the AM peak and -139 in the PM peak.

D) these findings, presumably were accepted by Havant BC and their consultees as the Havant Retail Park application was also approved by them in February 2014. This would have been in the full knowledge of the cumulative effect of the previously approved Scratchface Lane site and the potential impact of the proposed 86 dwellings on the former retail park.

E) therefore it is reasonable to assume that in February 2014 the committee concluded that as the impact on the Belmont junction due to the Scratchface Lane development would '*not justify a highway objection*' and that the Transport Assessment for the retail park had shown there would be a reduction in traffic through the junction, they were satisfied that this cumulative impact was either satisfactory or would not justify a highway objection

F) the development on the former retail park is now under construction and so can be regarded as a commitment.

G) the effect of the current proposal on the Portsdown Hill is to add between 7 and 8 vehicles in AM and PM peak respectively to the Belmont roundabout. As advised in previous notes and submissions on this site, this level of increment is not significant and is less than the normal day-to-day variation in traffic flow.

H) the ARCADY junction analysis programme is not sensitive to flow changes of less than 10 vehicles per hour so changing a flow by 7 or 8 vehicles an hour would not show any difference in junction 'capacity'

I) comparing the traffic surveys at Belmont junction submitted with the Scratchface Lane application and the Havant Retail Park application, shows that the traffic flows have reduced slightly between 2010 and 2012, namely the total traffic of 1912 reduces to 1770 (AM peak) and 2207 to 2115 (PM peak). This suggests that flows are, at worst the same as they were when the highway authority came to their conclusion about Belmont junction previously

J) therefore the situation in assessing the cumulative impact of all 3 developments on the Belmont is that;

- i) there was no objection to the cumulative impact on Belmont of Scratchface Lane and the Havant Retail Park
- ii) existing traffic flows are of the order of 1900 vehicles (AM peak) and 2200 vehicles in the PM peak
- iii) the Portsdown Hill site will add between 7 and 8 vehicles per hour to the junction, ie around 0.4% to these flows
- iv) this increment is less than the normal daily variation in flow and less than the analysis program ARCADY can detect
- v) advice from the DfT (Guidance on Transport Assessments March 2007) is that normally only junctions with an increment in traffic from a proposed development of more than 30 vehicles per hour need assessing. This increment is approximately one quarter of this intervention level
- vi) if the highway authority concluded in 2012 that there was '*sufficient capacity to absorb the [Scratchface Lane] traffic*' and the effect of the other development is to REDUCE traffic , then it is reasonable to conclude there is still 'sufficient capacity to absorb the Portsdown Hill traffic. Therefore there will be no justifiable reason for refusing the effect of the Portsdown Hill development that adds a mere 7 or 8 vehicle to the junction

K) The advice in the NPPF at para 32 is that

'development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impact are severe' .

On the basis of the above the residual impact will not be severe.