



Dermot McCaffery MIHE MIRSO
Highways & Transportation Consultant

**127A & 127B, LONDON ROAD,
WATERLOOVILLE,
PO8 7SH**

Maven Plan Ltd

TRANSPORT STATEMENT

JULY 2012

34A West Street, Marlow, Bucks, SL7 2NB

Tel 01628 488444 – 07752 913058

E-mail dermot@highwayplanning.co.uk



1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Dermot McCaffery. I am a highway and transportation consultant. I have 24 years experience in local authority and private consultancies in dealing with the highway development control aspects of development proposals. I am a Member of the Institute of Highway Engineers and the Institute of Road Safety Officers.
- 1.2 I have been appointed by Maven Plan Ltd to provide a transport statement in respect of the proposed redevelopment of 127A and 127B London Road, Waterloooville.
- 1.3 The site has been the subject of previous planning proposals and the responses from the highway authority to those proposals have helped to inform this statement. The recent application (ref: APP/12/00430) resulted in detailed discussions with the highway authority regarding person trip calculations and access arrangements.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 2.1 The site is located on the western side of the roundabout junction between the A3 Maurepas Way/London Road and the B2150 Hulbert Road, immediately adjoining the northern boundary of Waterloooville Town Centre. Specifically, the site comprises 2 detached bungalows with 3 accesses onto the roundabout.
- 2.2 The A3 Maurepas Way is a dual carriageway that forms the northern boundary to the town centre. It is subject to a 40mph speed limit. London Road is a single carriageway section of the A3 which is subject to a 30mph speed limit and which heads north towards Petersfield. The



B2150 Hulbert Road is a dual carriageway that leads eastwards to the A3(M).

- 2.3 The site has 3 vehicular accesses. Two of the accesses emerge onto the roundabout with the third access emerging onto London Road as it exits the roundabout.
- 2.4 The site boundary is contiguous with the defined Town Centre boundary. The shops and facilities within the town centre are less than a 100m walk from the site. The town centre provides a wide range of retail and community facilities and there is a pedestrian subway that passes under the Maurepas Way dual carriageway.
- 2.5 Bus services run on the London Road and there are a number of bus stops within the town centre serving several bus routes.
- 2.6 The proposed development comprises the removal of the existing dwellings and the erection of building containing 26 apartments for occupants of 55 years or older. The 3 existing accesses will be removed and replaced by a new ingress from Maurepas Way which will lead to a parking and turning forecourt containing 6 parking spaces and a new egress onto London Road. Secure cycle parking will be provided to the north of the building as will refuse/recycling stores and space for electric buggies.

3.0 HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1 The earlier planning application (08/72522/001) for the site proposed a similar form and type of development with 26 apartments for elderly residents and 7 car parking spaces. The application was refused and the highway authority raised concerns relating to the level of detail contained in the submitted green travel plan. This concern highlighted that, without a robust green travel plan, the development could result in



additional vehicle movements (including HGV movements) which would be detrimental to road safety at the access onto the roundabout. The application was NOT refused on the level of car parking being proposed.

3.2 The recent application (APP/12/00430) was withdrawn at the request of the Planning Authority. The details of the access and car parking arrangements were agreed in principle with the highway authority however as they required amendments to the positioning of the access point and proposed building footprint, the Council requested that the application be withdrawn and resubmitted.

3.3 The highway and transportation considerations for the current proposals are:

- Car parking requirements
- Traffic movements
- Travel plan

3.4 Clearly, the decisions made on previous applications have a bearing on the approach that the Council should take in considering the current proposals.

Car Parking Requirements

3.5 The adopted car parking standards have been updated since the determination of the last planning application. The Council adopted in March 2010 “*Residential Parking and Cycle Provision*” as a Supplementary Planning Document. Table 3 and paragraph 5.6 within the SPD identify that Waterloooville town centre is *highly accessible*. As the site has a contiguous boundary with the defined town centre and has high quality pedestrian links into the town centre, it is reasonable



to apply any town centre parking policies to the development of the site.

- 3.6 Table 6 of the SPD defines the level of car parking required for sheltered housing developments (including developments that have age restricted occupancy). For sites within Waterloooville town centre the parking requirement is between 0.5 and 1.0 spaces per unit. For the proposed development therefore the parking requirement is between 13 and 26 spaces.
- 3.7 The previous development proposals included 7 parking spaces for 26 units (ratio of 0.27 spaces per unit). The application was NOT refused on parking grounds and the Officer's Report identifies that a lower parking requirement (than the adopted standard) was acceptable due to the location of the site. Similarly, a scheme was approved by the Council on the opposite side of the road (344 London Road - Ref: 10/00599) in 2010 for 39 flats with 16 parking spaces at a ratio of 0.41:1. The current site is better related to the town centre than the site at 344 London Road and a lower parking ratio is justified. It is important to note that the March 2010 "*Residential Parking and Cycle Provision*" was adopted at the time that the decision was made on 344 London Road.
- 3.8 Paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) provides advice to Planning Authorities when setting parking standards. They should take into account:
- The accessibility of the development
 - The type, mix and use of the development
 - The availability of and opportunities for public transport
 - Local car ownership levels
 - An overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles.



-
- 3.9 There is no doubt that the development is highly accessible and is of a type that does not require a high level of parking. Public transport is available to a high degree within a very short walking distance of the development and there is a good opportunity for reducing the use of high emission vehicles. On this basis, the level of car parking proposed is entirely appropriate and justified.

Traffic Movements

- 3.10 The 2 existing dwellings on the site have ample parking areas and do not have any obligations placed upon them in terms of incentives to use sustainable travel modes. Deliveries and servicing movements are generated separately by each dwelling and 127A London Road in particular lacks space within its frontage for larger vehicles to pull off the main carriageway.
- 3.11 Family style dwellings such as the existing typically generate in the order of 6 to 8 traffic movements per day and so the site can be expected to generate a total of 12 to 16 movements per day with probably 2 movements in each peak period.
- 3.12 The traffic generation for the proposed age restricted accommodation has been debated with the Council during previous planning submissions. It is accepted that residential units that can only be occupied by persons over the age of 55 years will have a lower traffic generation rate than general housing and that the traffic profile is different i.e. there is little peak hour traffic. This is highlighted in paragraph 6.4 of the adopted parking standards SPD which states,

“Typically the lifestyle and travel requirements of the occupants will result in less need for multiple vehicle ownership.”



3.13 This is reflected in the traffic generation rate of 0.8 traffic movements per day for each unit and approximately 0.03 movements per peak hour per unit. When this is applied to the proposed development the traffic generation will be 21 movements per day and less than 1 peak hour movement. The comparison with the existing dwellings is very close but there is a clear advantage of reducing peak hour traffic, particularly in close proximity to the roundabout.

3.14 Detailed discussions have taken place with the highway authority in relation to the total number of person trips that will be generated and how this is translated into S106 contributions towards transport infrastructure. The following table has been extracted from data within the TRICS database and shows a comparison with the usual trip rates used by Havant Borough Council.

<i>MODE</i>	<i>Havant - trips</i>	<i>TRICS - trips</i>
<i>Car</i>	<i>75.48</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>Walk</i>	<i>27.03</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Cycle</i>	<i>1.54</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Bus</i>	<i>6.95</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Other</i>	<i>4.19</i>	<i>-</i>

Notes:

TRICS car trips split 46 drivers and 16 passengers

Havant = 4.43 person trips/unit

TRICS = 3.65 person trips/unit.

3.15 The highway authority has agreed that the existing bungalows would generate 14 person trips per day and that the increase in trips from the development will be 81. The financial contribution towards transport infrastructure has been calculated on this basis i.e.

$$81 \text{ trips @ } 3535/\text{trips} = \text{£}43335$$



-
- 3.16 The site layout has been revised following discussions with the highway authority. A concern was raised by Hampshire County Council that the proposed access arrangements could result in confusion and conflict with traffic negotiating the roundabout. An alternative arrangement was discussed with the highway authority where the ingress into the site would be taken from Maurepas Way as a left-in only access. Vehicles would then be able to enter the site and egress via a left-out only access onto London Road. This avoids the need for a turning area within the front of the site and removes all accesses onto the roundabout. This arrangement has been agreed in principle.
- 3.17 Hampshire County Council has requested that the access arrangements should be shown on engineering drawings and approved prior to planning consent being issued. The execution of the access works would be controlled through a S278 agreement.

Travel Plan

- 3.18 The Council has raised concerns on previous development proposals that a travel plan for the proposed development must be robust in order to limit the number of traffic movements onto the roundabout and to protect road safety. Paragraph 36 of the National Planning Policy Framework highlights the important role that travel plans can play in supporting developments that generate “*significant amounts of movements*”.
- 3.19 Core Strategy Policy DM12 – Mitigating the Impacts of Travel requires at criterion 2 that transport assessments and travel plans are required for major developments or for developments that are likely to have significant transport implications. The proposed development is ***unlikely*** to have a ***significant*** transport implication due to the materially different traffic profile and the rationalisation of the 3 existing accesses into 1. However, the requirement for a travel plan has been



stressed by the Council through previous planning applications and the current development proposal is supported by a travel plan.

3.20 The travel plan will introduce a mechanism for influencing travel behaviour and will be a “living document” that is regularly monitored and adjusted to meet the needs of residents. The aims of the travel plan will be:

- To promote awareness of transport issues and the impact of traffic on the local environment,
- To enable all residents and staff to have informed choices about their travel options,
- To show a commitment to mitigating and limiting any traffic impact by reducing the level of single occupancy vehicles coming to the site,
- To ensure the development is accessible to the widest possible range of people, especially those with disabilities.

3.21 The travel plan will set targets for the use of sustainable travel modes and the reduction in single occupancy vehicles. The travel habits of the residents will be surveyed and monitored to provide a regular review of the implementation and success of the travel plan measures. Criterion 4 of Core Strategy Policy DM12 requires a bond to be paid to the Council to mitigate the negative travel impact of the development in the event that the targets in the travel plan are not met.

3.22 On earlier applications for the site the Council has objected to the submitted travel plan on the basis that insufficient detail has been included. This is an unreasonable stance for the Council to take for developments that are “new” i.e. are not extensions to or expansions of existing uses where the existing travel habits can be surveyed and assess prior to the application being submitted. Travel plans are by their nature flexible and constantly evolving. This is why regular



monitoring commitments are included. The Department for Transport's "*Good Practice Guidelines : Delivering Travel Plans through the Planning Process 2009*" highlights how some development proposals are better served by "interim" travel plans, so long as clear timescales are set out for the full implementation of the travel plan measures.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 The development of the site for age restricted accommodation has been considered by the Council through previous planning submissions. The highway authority has previously been concerned that the travel plans lacked adequate information and therefore the development could have resulted in an increase in vehicle movements to the detriment of road safety. Detailed issues such as car parking provision and site layout were accepted.
- 4.2 The current proposals draw upon the details that were not contested previously, including car parking provision, accessibility and traffic generation, and an assessment is made against the up to date policies within the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4.3 The site has a contiguous boundary with the defined town centre for Waterloooville and is less than 100m walk distance from shops, facilities and public transport. Pedestrian access to the town centre is convenient due to the underpass which is located immediately to the west of the site. The very good accessibility justifies a reduction in car parking provision. This approach is echoed in the adopted "*Residential Parking and Cycle Provision*" SPD.
- 4.4 The development will result in the closure of the 3 existing accesses to the London Road roundabout and their replacement with a one-way access scheme which has been designed to accommodate the manoeuvres of service and delivery vehicles. The traffic that will be



generated by the development will be similar, on a day to day basis, to the traffic movements from the existing dwellings. The overall number of person trips will increase and this will be offset by financial contributions towards transport infrastructure.

- 4.5 The development proposals are accompanied and supported by a travel plan which will encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel and reduce the use of single occupancy cars.