

09 February 2026



Arleta Miszewska
Principal Planning Officer
Development Management
Havant Borough Council

By email

Oliver Woolf MRTPI
E: oliver.woolf@savills.com
DL: 023 8071 3921
M: 07966 739 787
Mountbatten House
1 Grosvenor Square
Southampton SO15 2BZ
savills.com

Dear Arleta,

APP/23/00471 OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 69 DWELLINGS WITH ACCESS FROM LAXTON LEAZE AND EMERGENCY ACCESS FROM ELLISONS CRESCENT AND ALL OTHER MATTERS RESERVED

Following reception of the latest Hampshire Highways comments dated 20 November 2025 please find the following information to accompany this letter.

Document	Author
Legal Opinion	Christopher Boyle KC
Technical Note on Access	Mayer Brown
Technical Note on Emergency Access	Mayer Brown
Technical Note on Modal Filter	Mayer Brown
Technical Note on Southern Access Roundabout	Mayer Brown
Technical Note on Sustainable Transport Target and Travel Plan	Mayer Brown

Drawing	Superseded	Amended
Main Access Drawing	GTWVILLE_BSL/SK02 R	GTWVILLE_BSL/SK/02 T
Emergency Access Drawing	GTWVILLE_BSL/SK03 D	GTWVILLE_BSL/SK03 E
Emergency Access Drawing (reserved option)	-	GTWVILLE_BSL/SK/10
Emergency Access Drawing (including TRO and bollard)	-	GTWVILLE_BSL/SK/15
Main Access Drawing (no segregated facility option)	-	GTWVILLE_BSL/SK/17 A
Vehicle Tracking Drawing	GTWVILLE_BSLVT/01 G	GTWVILLE_BSLVT/01 H
Vehicle Tracking Drawing	-	GTWVILLE_BSLVT/04

The purpose of this letter and these documents are to clearly respond to the outstanding highways matters and to provide you with clear direction toward being able to issue consent for the planning application. The alternative is, in the face of this evidence, that you proceed with issuing refusal. Unless agreement can be reached swiftly it is the intention of the applicant to appeal on the basis of non-determination due to failure to

Offices and associates throughout the Americas, Europe, Asia Pacific, Africa and the Middle East.

Savills (UK) Limited. Chartered Surveyors. Regulated by RICS.
A subsidiary of Savills plc. Registered in England No. 2605138. Registered office: 33 Margaret Street, London, W1G 0JD



agree on the highways matters.

Executive Summary

This letter identifies the outstanding highways matters, references how the objections from Hampshire Highways cannot be justified and proposes solutions that could be easily implemented to enable consent to be granted. These are summarised as:

- We have proposed reasonable contributions toward Hampshire Highways requests for contributions for off-site infrastructure. It has not been demonstrated that the others meet the Regulation 122 tests and our opinion is that they do not.
- The site access drawing has been updated to correct an error and provide an enhancement of the segregated facility. This could be secured by condition.
- Options are presented to resolve the issues around visibility from the emergency access through removing cyclist permeability or reserving land for the access until such time as a TRO is able to be implemented. This could be secured by condition.
- The requirement for a modal filter has been thoroughly disproved through demonstration of the physical configuration at the end of Peasgood Lane, visibility splays that comply with standards and analysis of Hampshire Highways' comments and suggested reason for refusal.
- An option for removal of the segregated facility as an option that would reduce the interaction between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists at the bottom of Peasgood Lane. This could be secured by condition.
- Detail around the sustainable accessibility of local services and facilities is provided in the context of suggested reason for refusal 2.
- Detail on the small number of sustainable trips that a Travel Plan would need to affect to deliver a 10% increase in sustainable trips is provided. A Travel Plan could be secured by condition to complement the outline Travel Plan that supports this outline application with regard to suggested reason for refusal 3.
- The impact on the Ladybridge Roundabout is further considered and detail on the timings of the implementation of the Southern Access Roundabout is provided with the latter significantly pre-dating any occupation of the site.

Requests for contributions toward off-site infrastructure

Further to previous letters dated 28 February and 12 September 2025 we continue to promote to you that the requests for contributions toward off-site infrastructure sought by Hampshire Highways fail to meet the Regulation 122 tests. Hampshire Highways continue to fail to set out why any of the requests are necessary to make this outline proposal for up to 69 dwellings acceptable, how each is directly related to the proposed development and, through not providing a figure for each proportionate contribution request, are not ensuring that their requests are fairly and reasonably related to the development. The six contributions identified are:

1. Widening of and kerbing amendments for the existing connection between Laxton Leaze and Plant Farm Crescent to cater for cyclists
2. Financial contribution towards delivery of the Southern Brambles Link
3. Financial contribution towards delivery of the parallel crossing along Houghton Avenue
4. Financial contribution towards pedestrian and cycle improvements at the Forest End roundabout as identified on the Havant LCWIP
5. Delivery of wayfinding strategy towards key facilities and destinations
6. Provision of RTI information at the Victoria Road bus stops

For absolute clarity in relation these six requests for contributions, item 1 is not on-site works. The application site is distinct from the adjacent Berewood development. That the site is being conflated with Berewood is incorrect and Hampshire Highways should review their consideration in this regard. Nevertheless, Grainger have offered to deliver this link in full and continue to do so.

The only request by Hampshire Highways for on-site works would be provision of item 5 (Wayfinding Strategy). Again, Grainger have offered to contribute towards this.

In respect of items 2, 3, 4 and 6 although Hampshire Highways identify funding shortfalls in their comments dated 20 November 2025 they do not set out how these elements would provide specific mitigation to address the harm or safety issues relating to this outline development of up to 69 dwellings. Within the Sustainable Transport Target and Travel Plan Technical Note, Mayer Brown have sought to predict the number of AM peak, PM peak and daily trips that would use each of items 2, 3, 4 and 6 and finds that the number of trips using each would be very low.

Grainger has sought KC advice on these matters, who has reviewed each request against the predicted number of trips and considers them unreasonable. Havant should undertake their own independent review to inform their decision in the context of the advice they have received from Hampshire Highways as a consultee and respond to us directly.

Site Access

Hampshire Highways have identified that drawing GTWVILLE_BSL/SK02 R identifies the width of the carriageway within the site narrowing from 5.5m at the site access to 4.88m within the site. Within the Technical Note on this subject Mayer Brown have identified that this is a drafting error, which could be resolved through acceptance of the updated drawing included within this pack (GTWVILLE_BSL/SK/02 T).

This drawing also amends the arrangement of the proposed segregated facility to provide a greater width at the point where the segregated facility connects to the carriageway. This would provide for enhanced visibility and a greater landing area.

Emergency Access

Hampshire Highways have identified that the current arrangement of the emergency access, which uses bollards to restrict vehicular access, would allow permeability to cyclists that would require visibility splays. Hampshire Highways are insisting that a TRO would be necessary to control parking within these splays (on third party land) to remove obstruction. The use of the emergency access is considered within the Technical Note on this subject and by KC.

There are a number of simple means to providing suitable visibility until such time as a TRO is delivered or not. Firstly, cyclist permeability could be removed until such time as Ellisons Crescent and Peasgood Lane are adopted and a TRO made. One method to achieve this would be to replace the bollards currently shown with a full width gate and signage for the emergency access to be kept clear at all times as shown on drawing GTWVILLE_BSL/SK03 E. This would remove the requirement for visibility splays altogether and could be secured by condition.

Secondly, the land for a potential future emergency access could be reserved as shown on drawing GTWVILLE_BSL/SK/10. Upon adoption and TRO an emergency access could be implemented in line with drawing GTWVILLE_BSL/SK/15. These drawings could be secured by condition to resolve this matter.

Thirdly, the emergency access could simply be removed from the application as there is no statutory requirement to deliver one.

We promote that any of these options would resolve the identified issues around the emergency access and will be happy to discuss and agree with officers.

Modal Filter

Hampshire Highways' requirement for a modal filter at the bottom of Peasgood Lane by is based off the opinion that Ellisons Crescent and Peasgood Lane have not been designed as a cut through and concern around the interaction between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists should vehicles access the site using this route. The necessity for a modal filter is only generated by Hampshire Highways' requirement for a segregated facility

across the site to LTN 1/20 standard, which we have sought to provide.

The existing physical configuration at the bottom of Peasgood Lane terminates at a crossover whereby vehicles must travel over a change in surface treatment from asphalt to block paving and then over a continuous footway that runs alongside Laxton Leaze. This reinforces that this is not a standard junction and already low vehicles speeds because of the limited width and materials of Laxton Leaze would be further reduced. Vehicles are already required to stop to give priority to more vulnerable users and this would continue. Pedestrians on the footway would continue to have priority over vehicles leaving Peasgood Lane, as would cyclists on the carriageway of Laxton Leaze.

We have previously provided a technical response to the modal filter matter¹ and have demonstrated all required intervisibility and vehicle tracking between the bottom of Peasgood Lane, the access into the site and the segregated cycle facility on drawings – specifically drawings GTWVILLE_BSL/SK/02 T, GTWVILLE_BSLVT/01 H and GTWVILLE_BSLVT/04. The tracking drawings do not include any swept paths which are unachievable or unsafe. Nevertheless, Hampshire Highways have the opinion that the site cannot be “*accessed in a safe a suitable manner for all and does not comply with paragraph 116 of the NPPF.*” The reference to NPPF paragraph 116 is repeated in suggested reason for refusal 1:

1. Access:

In the opinion of the Highway Authority, the proposals involve access arrangement(s) into the site that cannot be reconciled with the National Planning Policy Framework in that the access arrangement into the site would cause highway safety issues contrary to National Planning Policy Framework 116

The relevance of the test within NPPF paragraph 116 is set out in the supporting Technical Note on this subject. NPPF paragraph 116 only identifies that development should be refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or severe impacts on the road network. Nowhere in Hampshire Highways’ responses on the modal filter are the words ‘unacceptable’ or ‘severe’ mentioned. Our transport consultant, Mayer Brown, consider this to be a high bar, well beyond inconvenience or even moderate harm and they consider that this needs to be viewed in the context of the environment, physical configuration in this area, the low vehicle flows involved and that the independent RSA1 did not identify a safety concern in this area. In the context of this information we cannot see how refusal based on NPPF paragraph 116 could be supported by Havant.

The relevant Technical Note also considers the need for a segregated facility across the site to LTN 1/20 standard in the context of removing this would also reduce the interaction between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists identified by Hampshire Highways. As the Technical Note sets out, the provision of a segregated facility is not consistent with cyclist provision throughout the adjacent Berewood development where cyclists largely remain on the carriageway or on shared facilities, is not required by LTN 1/20 or Hampshire guidance where traffic flows and speeds are low and is not recommended by the independent RSA. The removal of the segregated facility is demonstrated on drawing GTWVILLE_BSL/SK/17 A and is presented as an option for approval.

The opinion from KC considers both options. Paragraph 6 advises that the modal filter is neither achievable or necessary with the layout demonstrated on drawing GTWVILLE_BSL/SK/02 T. Paragraph 9 advises that the removal of the segregated facility would resolve the issue as demonstrated on GTWVILLE_BSL/SK/17 A. In this context we seek engagement with officers.

Sustainable Transport Target and Travel Plan

Hampshire Highway’s latest comments accept the 31% target for sustainable transport modes from the site. However, they query how this would be achieved and consider that the submitted outline travel plan is not suitable to support the development to meet the target present. Hampshire Highways suggest two reasons for refusal on this basis:

¹ GTWVILLE_BSL/DOC/02 supplied 28 February 2025

2. Sustainable Transport Opportunities:

In the opinion of the Highway Authority, the proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with the National Planning Policy Framework in that it would result in users of the development being unable to make use of sustainable transport opportunities. This would result in an overreliance on the private car which is contrary to NPPF paragraph(s) 109, 111, 115, 117, and Hampshire County Council's LTP4

3. Travel Plan:

In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with the National Planning Policy Framework in that there is insufficient provision of, or support for, sustainable transport options. This will create a greater number of trips via private car which will create a severe impact on the local transport network and the environment and is contrary to NPPF 109, 111, 115, 117, 118, and Hampshire County Council's emerging Local Transport Plan 4.

The relevant Technical Note addresses these matters. It is noted that although the site is not part of Berewood, the fact that it is adjacent will mean that it will benefit from all future sustainable infrastructure works plus the existing on-site infrastructure and facilities that are programmed and will be delivered as part of the wider Berewood development. This includes two primary schools (already built), community facilities and local centre. It is anticipated that all of these would be in place by the time the site is occupied. The site is also located approximately 100m from the entrance to ASDA and approximately 300m or a 450m walk from the centre of Waterlooville town centre. With reference to suggested reason for refusal 2 it is not clear how in Hampshire Highways' eyes future occupants of the site would not be able to sustainably access these facilities.

The Technical Note also covers the number of trips that would need to be converted from car to sustainable forms to achieve the 10% increase to 31%. It finds that this would be a reduction of 7 vehicle trips in the AM peak and 6 vehicle trips in the PM peak per day over the five year life of a Travel Plan. As emphasised above the application is supported by an Outline Travel Plan which shows the direction that could be taken to achieve the target for sustainable transport modes. We also consider that the targeted number of vehicle trip reductions is not unreasonable over a five year period. We consider that it would be appropriate for a Travel Plan to be conditioned and this would be implemented prior to occupation of the site. This would effectively resolve this matter.

Ladybridge/Southern Access Roundabout

The Hampshire Highways comments appreciate the "*limited impact*" of less than 1% increase in movements around the Ladybridge Roundabout. Nevertheless, Hampshire Highways state that "*given the sensitivities of this junction any additional trips above that assessed as part of the s106 DoV for the Berewood MDA can have severe implications on the operation of the existing layout. The junction was found to be sensitive and any additional trips above that assessed would impede the ability for the junction to operate in a safe and suitable manner.*"

A Technical Note has been prepared on this matter. This references the NPPF paragraph 116 test in relation to an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, being severe. KC advice also considers this matter. Both, in the context of an additional 10 vehicle movements in the AM peak and 9 in the PM peak, consider that there would not be a severe or material impact. As a result we consider that there would be no sound reason in seeking to refuse the application on this basis.

Specifically, the Technical Note assesses the occupation of 1,500 dwellings on the adjacent Berewood development plus the occupation of the site on the existing Ladybridge Roundabout and finds that traffic from the site would not have any material impact on capacity of the existing Ladybridge Roundabout and will not affect the operation of this junction. This scenario is not realistic, as the Technical Note also addresses the construction and operation of the Southern Access Roundabout that will replace the existing Ladybridge Roundabout. Commencement of construction is expected to begin in May 2026 with completion 12 months later in May 2027. Hampshire Highways have previously suggested a condition to ensure the Southern Access Roundabout is in place prior to occupation of the site. In the context of the earliest reasonably expected occupation of the site at the end of 2028 and the level of movements that the site would generate at the existing

Ladybridge Roundabout we suggest that this matter has been suitably resolved and a condition to prevent occupation would not be necessary, reasonable or relevant.

Suggested Reasons for Refusal

Hampshire Highways' suggested reasons for refusal have been replicated previously in this letter but are reproduced here for clarity and ease of reference:

1. Access:

In the opinion of the Highway Authority, the proposals involve access arrangement(s) into the site that cannot be reconciled with the National Planning Policy Framework in that the access arrangement into the site would cause highway safety issues contrary to National Planning Policy Framework 116

Suggested reason for refusal 1 references NPPF paragraph 116 but does not specifically state that there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or identify specifically what about the access arrangements would cause highway safety issues. We consider this to be an unsound reason for refusal that would not hold up at appeal.

2. Sustainable Transport Opportunities:

In the opinion of the Highway Authority, the proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with the National Planning Policy Framework in that it would result in users of the development being unable to make use of sustainable transport opportunities. This would result in an overreliance on the private car which is contrary to NPPF paragraph(s) 109, 111, 115, 117, and Hampshire County Council's LTP4

It has not been made clear within Hampshire Highways comments how future occupants would be unable to make use of sustainable transport opportunities given the site's sustainable location close to Waterlooville town centre. Provision of future sustainable transport opportunities would be secured through a detailed Travel Plan, which could be secured by condition. We note that overreliance on the private car is not the subject of any NPPF paragraph although reducing dependency on the private car is an ambition of the LTP4. We consider the references to NPPF paragraphs 111 and 117 are made in error. Paragraph 111 is relevant to planning policies, not decision making for development proposals. Paragraph 117 is relevant to site layout which is not relevant to this outline planning application.

3. Travel Plan:

In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposal involves development that cannot be reconciled with the National Planning Policy Framework in that there is insufficient provision of, or support for, sustainable transport options. This will create a greater number of trips via private car which will create a severe impact on the local transport network and the environment and is contrary to NPPF 109, 111, 115, 117, 118, and Hampshire County Council's emerging Local Transport Plan 4.

As set out within this letter we do not consider that any of the impacts of the proposed development of up to 69 dwellings clear the bar for them to be considered 'severe' in the context of NPPF paragraph 116 and this is evidenced within the Technical Notes that accompany this letter. We consider reference to NPPF paragraph 111 is in error, as above. With reference to NPPF paragraph 118 an outline Travel Plan supports this application and a detailed Travel Plan could be secured by condition.

Conclusion

This letter and the supporting information clearly respond to the outstanding highways matters and demonstrates how they have been addressed or could be resolved in a way that moves this application forward and provides you with clear direction toward being able to issue consent. Furthermore the submitted information demonstrates how Hampshire Highways' suggested reasons for refusal cannot be supported.

Should you consider that the application should be refused or is not determined in a timely manner you will find that with the support of technical experts and KC advice that we consider our chances of a successful appeal



to be high.

The relevance of the latest comments from the Havant Landscape Architect dated 20 June 2025 have been raised by the Winchester Case Officer. Further to our letter dated 12 September 2025 we understand and promote that comments made by the Landscape Architect have been either resolved or detail can be appropriately conditioned or provided at detailed approval stage via the reserved matters. We seek confirmation of this in writing.

Please let me know if you have any questions and we would very much would like to meet to progress this application.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Oliver Woolf.

Oliver Woolf
Savills Planning