

Havant Borough Council  
Civic Offices  
Civic Centre Road  
Havant  
PO9 2AX

Hampshire 2050  
The Castle  
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UL  
Telephone 0300 555 1375  
Fax 01962 847055  
[www.hants.gov.uk](http://www.hants.gov.uk)

|              |                |                |                                                                  |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Enquiries to | Holly Drury    | My reference   | 057401                                                           |
| Direct Line  | N/A            | Your reference | APP/25/00573                                                     |
| Date         | 6 October 2025 | Email          | <a href="mailto:havantdc@hants.gov.uk">havantdc@hants.gov.uk</a> |

**For attention of Ms Wells**

Dear Sirs

**Re: APP/25/00573 At Land west of, Hulbert Road, Havant**

**Reserved matters application for 100 dwellings and improved site access, landscaping, footpaths, SuDS and other associated works. Matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to be considered. The outline application was not an environmental impact assessment application.**

Thank you for your consultation on the above reserved matters planning application. The Highway Authority wish to make the following comments.

**General Layout**

The Highway Authority request that a full geometric plan is provided showing dimensions across the site for carriageways, footways, cycle infrastructure and parking bays.

It is unclear where the shared use footway cycleway ends, and the footway starts at the northern site access and how cyclists are to rejoin the carriageway. Drawings have been provided of the proposed S278 works (drawing A096474-SK03 Rev B and A096474-SK02 Rev C), however, the internal proposals where they meet the offsite works at the northern access do not align. The proposals should clearly connect and cycle access provision onto Hulbert Road should be provided.

It is also noted that the extent of the proposed S278 works shown where it meets Dunsbury roundabout falls short of the secured requirements in that it

*Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Hampshire 2050*  
**Gary Westbrook**

does not upgrade the refuge island crossing point or extend to the highway boundary of Fitzwygram Way as shown and secured through Plan 6 of the S106 and referenced in the Highway Works Definition.

Footway widths throughout the development should be 2.0m and will therefore need to be widened in places. There are a number of paths running east/west across the site which will serve to facilitate access to the main walking routes through the development however these are shown as private access paths. The widths of these paths should be confirmed but can clearly be seen to be less than the required 2m. The access strategy for the site should ensure where footways are to provide wider connectivity rather than simply access to front doors they comply with the design standards for public use, not Building Control parameters.

It is noted that areas of shared space are proposed within the development, which is acceptable in principle, subject to confirmation that the provision accords with HCC TG1 and has a change of materials to support the change in space. It is noted that the current provision is interconnected with wider dedicated access footway provision (which is substandard to support access for all users) across the development which may lead to confusion for drivers and pedestrians. The provision of the shared space design principles are therefore unclear throughout the design.

Vehicle crossovers are provided where possible to maintain pedestrian priority which is noted. Copenhagen style crossings have also been proposed within the site along the cycle route to maintain priority for those users. Specific highway details for this design need to be provided to ensure the arrangements are acceptable. Comments on the visibility requirements are set out further within this response.

No dimensions have been provided and the remaining carriageway width as a result of buildouts needs to be specified to accord with TG10 requirements. Tracking has been provided for a car through the arrangement but not for the delivery vehicle. Tracking for a fire tender is also tight and with the associated tree planting may mean they cannot be navigated. The tracking should be provided for negotiating both features not just one for these larger vehicles at both proposed locations. There is also a build out arrangement on the most southern road running east west. Again, widths through this feature are unclear and forward visibility may be obstructed by landscaping.

The cycle path dimension should be confirmed and annotated onto the drawing.

No pedestrian crossing points with tactile paving and vis splays have been shown and access for example to the central public open space area is poor. These need to be shown as part of any consented design and supported through the provision of visibility splays. They are required now to ensure safe crossing locations can be provided and do not have impacts on the details of the proposed layout or landscaping.

The width of the parking courts should be confirmed. From the tracking provided it would appear that they are too narrow to aid manoeuvring and therefore should be amended to ensure access can be undertaken to the parking provision appropriately and prevent on carriageway parking which could restrict access around the site for larger vehicles (refuse and fire tender).

The details of the road arrangement around plots 42-43 and its interaction with the footway/cycleway is unclear. It is unclear if this is intended to provide vehicular access. Confirmation is required here on whether this area is kerbed, and if so where suitable turning provision is provided for these properties. A detailed drawing of this area is required to support the application. The tracking drawings suggest this is an access point for vehicles, it is unclear who has priority here.

Adoption extents for the development have not been shown, a plan showing the areas to be put forward for adoption including all visibility splays should be provided. There are parking bays allocated which would appear to fall within the adopted highway and these would not be acceptable and conflict with the drainage proposals.

Two routes to the north and the south are shown on the plans referenced boundary access TBC. The Highway Authority question the need and intent for these proposals and whether they accord with the requirements of the outline consent.

### **Visibility**

Car parking courts are reached via road links below buildings in cases such as Plot 93. The heights of these undercofts should be considered, with a minimum height to accommodate a transit vehicle provided accordingly. Confirmation is sought as to whether the visibility from the undercroft parking areas is achievable in practice.

Visibility splays have been shown in part for some junctions on drawing 020.0923-0001 rev P06. However, these are repeatedly obstructed from landscaping and property frontages. In order to address this point consideration was asked for a 15mph design speed. This point is specifically raised in your email dated 28 January 2025, with the request for consideration of reduced forward visibility splays for the site given the quantum of development and the likelihood of a realistic speed of up to 15 mph being achievable. Whilst it is acknowledged that due to the layout of the roads in the south eastern corner of the site, speeds have the potential to be lower than normal (i.e. on bends and with no long straights), it would be debatable as to whether such low speeds are realistically likely for the rest of the site given the straight roads with limited speed reduction features. Speed reducing features should not be implemented wholly to overcome constraints on the visibility. The site layout should on the whole accommodate an appropriate design speed, which on secondary and tertiary streets should be 20mph.

In terms of visibility splays parameters and where shown, these are generally acceptable, mixing 2.4 x 25.0m splays with 2.0 x 25.0m splays depending on the anticipated flows passing through the associated junctions. It is noted however that there are instances where the splays pass across land that could be private, with no control over vertical obstructions that could be placed on such land – i.e. north of plot 6. This scenario would not be acceptable whether the site is put forward for adoption or not. Land required to achieve a visibility splay if the site is to be put forward for adoption by HCC as Highway Authority (as anticipated), as any land located within the splay will need to be dedicated to highway. If the site is to remain private, then these areas would need to be under the control of a management company not under private household ownership.

Forward visibility splays have been provided at both 25m and 18m dimensions around the bends of the site. The principle of where these are shown at these respective distances is agreed. However, they consistently conflict significantly with landscaping, private areas and parking spaces and are not considered acceptable. Forward visibility splays are also required at the chicane features as these appear to be blocked by landscaping and trees.

There are a number of on plot parking spaces which appear to have their visibility obstructed for example plots 84 and 86. The visibility splays should be provided as appropriate including that for pedestrians and cyclists in accordance with TG3.

### **Swept Path Analysis**

The application states that the design has considered the street hierarchies in the Highway Authority's TG1 to be a mix of primary, secondary and tertiary streets however the spine roads are noted to be 5.0m which only accords with a tertiary street. A width of 5.5m required for secondary streets which is considered necessary for quantum of development proposals. Geometric plans provided including the internal tracking arrangements show conflict arising between delivery vehicles and cars especially on the bends, including the first bend into the development which narrows as you navigate the radius. Corner widening in accordance with TG2 may be necessary to ensure that two-way movements are achievable in practice.

Refuse vehicle tracking principles are generally acceptable, with the circulatory design of the site removing the need for turning heads or reversing movements. However, it is noted that the movements are tight in places, and for this reason it would be requested that a combined refuse / car tracking exercise should be completed. This will identify areas where parking should be prohibited in order for refuse collections to be achievable and also demonstrate that adequate space exists across the site generally for such passing movements to take place, especially at longer stay refuse spots, such as adjacent to communal bin stores. In addition, not all tracking movements for a continuous circular route have been provided. For example, the refuse vehicle is to travel south into the site in a clockwise direction, but a right turn

movement has been shown into the loop road by plot 11 from the south to east. The vehicle should be shown tracked continuously around the site and not just at bends.

### **Stage One Road Safety Audit (RSA1)**

No Road Safety Audit has been provided to support the application, and this should be provided ahead of the application being determined. All comments made within this response are subject to additional review on receipt of the RSA1.

### **Parking Provision**

#### *Vehicular:*

Parking Bay measurements have been confirmed to measure 2.5m x 5.0m which exceeds HBC minimum standards. Which is acceptable. There are specific locations where the parking space layout creates conflict between spaces. This occurs due to the overhang of spaces for plot 60 blocking access to number 61's space. The same for plot 59 parking and the visitor space and plot 53 and 54's spaces.

Parallel parking bay dimensions are confirmed to be 2.5m x 5m which falls short of the requirements of HCC TG1/TSRGD. The site layout only has few areas reliant on parallel parking bays and there is scope to increase the length of these bays to accord with the standards and ensure the spaces are accessible for all users.

The narrative provided in relation to the quantum of visitor space provision across the site is a matter for Havant Borough Council as Parking Authority.

Reference is made to an additional 0.3m step out strip being provided for all spaces against hard vertical features or landscaping. Whilst generally this is the case it does not appear to have been accounted for at plot 50. Nor does a suitable area of footway provision or landing area seem to have been provided for the visitor spaces opposite plot 24.

No hardstanding areas has been provided around the parking bays at the northern end of the site opposite plots 68-74 and this should be addressed.

It may be necessary to restrict on carriageway parking across the site through the creation of a controlled parking zone to ensure the spaces which are remote from the plots are utilised and on street parking does not cause an obstruction for larger vehicles.

#### *Cycle*

Cycle parking is to be provided for residents on plot and rear gates have been showing providing access to gardens to facilitate this and access for bin storage.

No visitor cycle parking appears to have been provided on site, and this is set out as being 20% of the long stay standard. Confirmation is required on

where visitor cycle parking is to be accommodated. This should include some covered parking for visitors to the site.

The submission documents reference electric vehicle charging points to be provided in accordance with Building Regulations Part S. However, no EV charging points have been shown on the plans. Given the site is reliant generally on parking courts EV charging is likely to be required to be stand alone units. Confirmation is needed that these will not cause obstruction to highway users or compromise parking space sizes, resulting in overhanging vehicles.

### **Levels and Drainage**

Drainage details have been shown on drawing 020.5923.0506 Rev P01. SUDS features are shown in close proximity to the carriageway/footway and the applicant should confirm that the design accords with the Highway Authority's Technical Guidance requirements for the distance from any highway feature.

The Highway Authority do not support the use of attenuation crates below the adopted highway and therefore where these are present will not be able to be brought forward for adoption.

The parking laybys cannot be adopted if allocated to individual properties. The levels around these bays would not allow highway and private surface water to be drainage separately and therefore need to be reviewed.

The drainage catchment area plan does not show all hard landscaped areas as pink therefore suggesting these have been missed from the assessment.

Details of the drainage are not shown at this stage such as gully locations and therefore aside from the above matters the details would be secured through an appropriate condition on any reserved matters consent.

### **Street Lighting**

Locations of street lighting is not shown on the plans. It is recommended that these are added at this stage to (a) ensure appropriate spaces and locations are available within the proposed layout, and (b) to also assist in informing landscaping for the site, particularly the location of any street trees.

### **Materials**

Granite set paving is shown in sections on the carriageway throughout the site. It is unclear why these are to be provided. It should be noted that they would not be acceptable if the road is brought forward for adoption. The presence of such paving in the carriageway creates maintenance issues and noise, the reason for these should be set out by the applicant.

Reference is made to the use of self-binding gravel. This is not a material specification, and the material should be confirmed. Whilst this is to be used in areas unlikely to be brought forward for adoption it abuts what would be

footways and there is a risk the material migrates onto the highway. The specification should therefore be provided, and it would be preferred if there was a section of hard surfacing or feature strip before a non-bound material is utilised to prevent migration onto the highway.

Landscaping across the development is shown within the bounds of the highway and obstructing visibility splays. At present a detailed review of the landscaping proposals has not been undertaken as the visibility matters must first be addressed.

**Recommendations**

The Highway Authority considers that amendments to the design are required to ensure the layout ties into the consented outline access points and that it can operated in a safe and suitable manner for all users across the site. Should the Planning Authority be minded to determine the application please contact me for my formal recommendation.

Yours faithfully,

Holly Drury  
Principal Transport Planner - Highway Development Planning  
Hampshire 2050