Hampshire County Council

Universal Services
The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD

Telephone 0300 555 1375
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

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

Enquiries to	Louis Aplin-Haynes	My reference	060855
Direct Line	N/A	Your reference	APP/26/00332
Date	24 July 2026	Email	havantdc@hants.gov.uk

For attention of Ms Winch

Dear Madam

Re: APP/26/00332 At Padnell Grange, Padnell Road, Waterlooville, PO8 8ED

Demolition of existing buildings and the erection of 90 residential dwellings with upgraded access to Padnell Road, associated landscaping and other works

Thank you for your consultation on the above full planning application. To support this planning application, the applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment Rev 1.3 dated 29 April 2026 and supporting drawings which the Highway Authority have reviewed wish to make the following comments.

Pre-application Engagement

The applicant engaged in pre-application discussions with the Highway Authority in March 2026. Further information was requested regarding wider sustainable accessibility, site access proposals and off-site traffic impact. These discussions are referred to as appropriate within this response.

Planning History

The TA references the previous planning history for the site (APP/18/00244) which was subsequently withdrawn with several outstanding highway related matters. Whilst given the time in which the application was submitted this would have limited weight when determining this current planning application, comments on the connectivity parameters particularly relating to the PRoW network should be considered as part of this planning application. Reference

to the previous planning application is made where appropriate within this response.

Policy Status

The applicant references that the site is allocated within the adopted Havant Local Plan as site reference W126 for c.84 dwellings. The proposal of 90 dwellings therefore marginally exceeds this policy requirement. Specifically in relation to W126 and the highway matters, the emerging policy requires this site allocation to utilise the existing access point onto Padnell Road. This has been proposed to support this development

The TA provides a summary of the local transport and planning policies notably including the NPPF, Hampshire County Council's LTP4, the Havant LCWIP and Havant Borough Council's Local Plan Policies.

Transport Assessment Methodology

For any new application, and in accordance with the NPPF, the Highway Authority are seeking for a more balanced analysis of the transport proposals within the TA work, aligned with the vision-led approach. This would assess and prioritise opportunities to improve sustainable transport provision for all modes (walking, cycling and public transport) before determining if there are remaining significant residual impacts to safe and efficient highway operation. It is noted that the TA assessment work does not encompass a vision-led approach which is a policy requirement in line with the NPPF considerations. This is discussed further within this response.

Traffic Surveys

As requested at the pre-application stage, ATC surveys have been undertaken along Padnell Road and Cherry Tree Avenue for a 7-day period between 5-14 February 2026 to obtain existing traffic speeds and volumes. The Highway Authority are satisfied that the traffic and speed data was obtained prior to the February half-term holiday period. The recorded speeds and traffic volumes are summarised within the figures 3.5-3.6 of the TA but provided below for ease:

Direction of Travel	85th%ile speed	Daily weekday average Traffic Flow
Padnell Road		
Eastbound	25mph	563
Westbound	27mph	626
Cherry Tree Avenue		
Eastbound	24mph	562
Westbound	26mph	625

The Highway Authority are unable to corroborate the traffic flow numbers provided within the Appendices and further clarity is sought on how the daily weekday average flow has been derived.

Sustainable Access

The Highway Authority acknowledged at the pre-application stage that given the location of the site, there are realistic opportunities for trips to local facilities to be undertaken by walking, wheeling and cycling.

A high-level overview of local facilities and services available to the development is provided within fig 3.2 of the TA. it is requested that that the applicant provides a summary table of the local facilities and the associated walking and cycling distances. These should be measured centrally from the site.

ATE identify that a site should have a sufficient number and range of local facilities and services within an 800m (10-minute walking distance) via an accessible walking route. ATE also reinforce an acceptable 400m walking distance to a bus stop which should be served by a regular bus route. The acceptability of the site regarding walking distances should be assessed against these criteria. Consideration must be given to access to the secondary school and employment opportunities by sustainable transport modes albeit it is considered acceptable for these to be beyond the 800m walking distance more aligned to the CIHT guidance. The catchment primary and secondary school should be confirmed with the Education Authority. Assessing the sustainable credentials of the site is not wholly a matter of distance, but the quality of the routes available to enable sustainable travel as an attractive mode choice over the private car.

The applicant has provided a walking and cycling audit (Appendix B) summarising the existing conditions and deficits in the infrastructure for 3 walking routes towards Padnell Infant and Junior School, Cowplain Town Centre and Cowplain School. The following areas have been identified as requiring improvement:

- Pedestrian infrastructure around the Padnell Road/Cherry Tree Avenue junction including crossing points, tactile paving, footpath widths.
- Improvements to the southern end of footpath 127 including surfacing, lighting, maintenance, and visibility improvements.

The audit does however not identify any improvements to rectify these deficits. This is in conflict with NPPF and LTP4 considerations, nor does it comply with the HCC TG19 small-scale WCHAR requirements as requested as pre-application stage. In accordance with this guidance a Healthy Streets Design check should also be incorporated. Further information on TG19 can be found at the following link: https://documents.hants.gov.uk/transport/TG19-TechnicalGuidanceNote-Walking-Cycling-and-Horseriding-Assessment-Review.pdf

The Highway Authority require the audit to cover the key routes identified by the applicant as well as incorporating the PRoW network where appropriate.

Narrative should be provided on these routes in identifying any barriers and substandard infrastructure as set out within TG10. Improvements to increase the healthy streets score and improve compliance with TG10 and LTN1/20 should be identified through the review process. The WCHAR should also incorporate the ATE assessment tools where appropriate.

Walking & Cycling:

Narrative regarding walking and cycling infrastructure within the vicinity of the site is lacking within the TA. As set out above, narrative on the routes to local facilities sand services and the quality of the infrastructure should be set out within a WCHAR identifying improvements to the surrounding area as appropriate.

Padnell Road and Cherry Tree Avenue benefits from formal footway infrastructure which is of variable quality. In most places the width appears to be TG10 compliant (minimum 2.0m). Notwithstanding this, there are clear instances where the infrastructure is substandard. This is most notably present from the site access point and around the Padnell Road/Cherry Tree Avenue junction where most pedestrian footfall to the site will land. As set out above, the applicant identifies this as an opportunity for improvement however no improvements are proposed. Opportunities to realign and widen this provision utilising the existing grass verge and rectifying the lack of tactile paving should be fully explored through the WCHAR.

Additionally, formal crossing points with tactile paving are lacking across key routes to access facilities available to the development this has not been identified within the audit and should be reviewed as part of the WCHAR.

Regarding cycling, no dedicated cycle provision is present along Padnell Road and Cherry Tree Avenue. It is understood that these roads are identified as part of a signposted cycle network the Havant Local Cycle Map. Cycle demarcations are present along Padnell Road presumably to warn vehicle users that cyclists will be travelling on carriageway in this location. The applicant has stated that this route would be acceptable for cyclists, however, in accordance with Figure 4.1 of LTN 1/20, given the flows obtained (albeit yet to be confirmed), a 30mph mixed traffic road is not suitable for all and will exclude some potential users.

NCN Route 222 runs along the A3 London Road to the west of the proposed development. Route 360.1 on the Havant LCWIP identifies several opportunities for improvements to walking and cycle routes along the A3 London Road which could help to provide realistic opportunities to encourage sustainable travel modes and offsetting existing vehicular trips. Reference is made to the LCWIP however no acknowledgment to the improvements identified has been provided. These improvements should be explored by the applicant. The incorporation of measures within the LCWIP as part of the wider sustainable access strategy should be considered by the applicant through the WCHAR. It is likely that contributions towards the LCWIP would be secured as part of any future planning consent.

Public Rights of Way (PRoW):

A summary of the PRoW network around the site is provided in Paragraph 3.4.2 of the TA.

Bridleway 108/22/1 runs north of the site's existing access road through Padnell Cuts Wood and connects to Footpath 108/127/1, which passes through the centre of the site before continuing south, providing links towards Waterlooville Golf Course and Park Lane.

Bridleway 108/22/1 has recently benefited from surfacing improvements north of the site and is generally in good condition, aside from occasional muddy sections in wet weather. There is potential for the site to connect with active travel improvements proposed as part of the Land East of Horndean and Southern Expansion developments, providing access to future facilities within walking and cycling distance.

Footpath 108/127/1 is of mixed quality. The northern section is adopted highway with street lighting, good surveillance and a hard surface. Further south, users must cross a golf course landing area with poor visibility, after which the route becomes narrow, overgrown, poorly lit and lacks natural surveillance, making it less attractive. Although improvements are possible, the Highway Authority questions the benefit given the limited destinations served. An alternative route is available via the Cherry Tree Avenue footway network.

Integration of the PRoW network into the site is critical. The layout should provide connections for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians to Padnell Road, supported by appropriate signage and a wayfinding strategy to encourage sustainable travel, including links to the signed cycle route on Padnell Road.

Drawing P101 shows an informal diversion of Footpath 108/127/1 along the eastern side of the site to connect with Bridleway 108/22/1. Any PRoW changes should be secured through formal diversion, stopping-up or dedication orders, including upgrading the route to accommodate cyclists via a future S106 agreement.

While the Highway Authority supports diverting Footpath 108/127/1, the currently proposed route along the eastern boundary raises concerns regarding surveillance, lighting and attractiveness, particularly after dark. The preferred approach is to divert the route within the development, where it can provide a safer and more attractive connection. As requested at pre-application stage, the route should be upgraded to bridleway status to accommodate cyclists and connect to Bridleway 108/22/1.

The treatment of Bridleway 108/22/1 and associated crossing points requires clarification. Two crossings are proposed in close proximity, which could create driver confusion. One crossing adjacent to Plot 23 partially leads to a grass verge and is therefore unacceptable. The layout should be refined, with TG3-compliant visibility splays and suitable equestrian crossing facilities, including drop-on/drop-off areas.

The TA contains conflicting information regarding cycling provision. Although proposed PRoW connections appear to be approximately 3.0m wide, Figure 4.2 suggests pedestrian-only use. Upgrading Footpath 108/127/1 to permit cycling is considered essential to improve cycle permeability, route choice and provide an attractive off-road route connecting Cowplain, Waterlooville and Horndean via the PRoW network.

The proposed connection to Cherry Tree Avenue appears sufficiently wide, but it is unclear whether it will accommodate cyclists or pedestrians only. Widths should be confirmed and opportunities explored to widen the adopted section to support cycling and connect with the existing cycle route on Cherry Tree Avenue, as previously requested at pre-application stage.

Drawing P101 also shows the definitive alignment of Footpath 108/127/1 passing through existing properties on Cherry Tree Avenue. Formal stopping-up of this section should be considered alongside the diversion and upgrade proposals. A clear plan identifying routes to be stopped up, upgraded and diverted should be submitted and secured through a future S106 agreement.

As the internal road network is not proposed for adoption, dedicated rights will be required to provide cycle access through the site between Bridleway 108/22/1 and Footpath 108/127/1, with bridleway rights required between Bridleway 108/22/1 and Padnell Road.

Bus

Table 3.3 within the TA lists the hourly frequency and first and last bus times from both Hazleton Way bus stop and Cowplain Shops bus stop.

The closest bus stops to the site, Hazleton Way, are located along Padnell Road. These stops are located approximately 350/400m from the site access, however c. 470m when measured centrally from the development. It is noted that these marginally fall outside of the recommended 400m walking distance by ATE. These bus stops are served by the 37 bus providing connections to Petersfield and Havant which operates approximately once per hour with services available between 06:25-19:40. The bus infrastructure is lacking only benefiting from a flag stop and pole. This could discourage use in periods of wet weather. There would appear limited opportunity to improve the waiting provision due to the limited highway space.

The Cowplain Shops bus stops are located a greater distance from site at approximately 750m from the site access and c.1.0km from the centre of the development. These stops are served by the 8 theSTAR service which runs between Clanfield and Portsmouth as well as the 37. This service is very frequent, with approximately 4 services per hour between the hours of 04:30-00:20. These stops benefit from shelters, seating and RTI information. Whilst the distance is greater than those along Padnell Road, given the frequency and quality of the infrastructure, these may be more utilised by future residents. The northbound service can be accessed using existing signalised crossing provision at the Padnell Road/A3 junction. Access to the bus stops could be supported by the provision of secure and covered cycle

parking in close proximity to the stops to allow interchange between the modes. This should be considered through the WCHAR

Train:

The site is not located within close proximity to a train station, with the closest station, Havant, located roughly 8km away. This station is well served, providing regular services several destinations such as Portsmouth Brighton, London, and Southampton Central. Given the distance of the site to Havant railway station, it is unlikely that any trips will be made via this mode of transport that wouldn't also be reliant on the private car. However, opportunities should be provided to improve the cycling connections to the station to encourage modal shift to reduce this reliance.

Personal Injury Accidents (PIA)

Accident data has been provided for this application within section 3.7 of the TA, however, it is unclear where this data has been sourced from. No raw data has been provided within the Appendices. Furthermore, the scope of this assessment is not considered to be acceptable as it only accounts for a singular route and should be extended to cover Cherry Tree Avenue up to and including the junction with Park Lane and the Hazleton Way/Padnell Road junction. The accident data has therefore not been reviewed in detail at this time. The Highway Authority request that accident data is obtained for the most recent 5-year period using Hampshire Constabulary records. An analysis of the accident data obtained, and the causation factors of such accidents should be presented within the TA.

Stage One Road Safety Audit (RSA1)

The applicant has undertaken an RSA1 with a designer's response provided within section 4.2.5 of the TA for the access arrangement only. An RSA1 should also be provided for the internal layout.

The response to the audit provided within the TA is not GG119 compliant and will need to be updated. The narrative suggests that all RSA1 recommendations have been accepted however the recommendations of the auditor do not appear to have been considered.

Furthermore, the RSA1 has not been undertaken by HCC approved auditors. Subsequently, the applicant will need to provide CVs of the auditors to confirm they are suitably qualified to undertake the RSA1 provide these comments or alternatively the applicant can contact an HCC approved auditor to provide an RSA1.

Regardless, the Highway Authority have reviewed the 8 raised safety concerns and have the following comments to provide. Item 2.1.5 and 2.2.1 relating to drainage and levels matters are matters that can be resolved through the s278 detailed design stage. The Designer's Response should be updated to reflect this.

In the absence of swept path analysis being presented to the auditors, items 2.1.1 and 2.1.3 raises concerns regarding the lack of swept path tracking for large vehicles at the access arrangement and access to plots 1-19 respectively. The suitability of this tracking is discussed further within this response, with both audit items considered to be unaddressed.

Item 2.1.2 highlights the mature trees at the site access which may reduce time to react to the give-way markings and requires suitable forward visibility to be demonstrated. Drawing 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0007 Rev A outlines forward visibility of 25.0m commensurate with a 20mph design speed. The Highway Authority are however unclear as to the impact the existing mature trees and their canopies will have on the achievable visibility. Visibility should be assessed in both the vertical and horizontal plane with visibility drawing overlaid on a topographical plan. Furthermore, measures to warn drivers of the narrowing should be considered.

Item 2.1.4 raises concerns over vehicles parked on the Cherry Tree Avenue junction affecting visibility. In response to this item, the applicant has proposed double yellow lines at the junction which the Highway Authority supports. The extents are yet to be agreed and is discussed further within this response.

Item 2.2.2 raises concerns over vegetation encroaching onto the footways surrounding the site. Whilst it is agreed that this is the responsibility of the Highway Authority this would be necessary to facilitate the development to ensure that the footways of a suitable width to accommodate the required movements. Any vegetation clearance required to maintain the footway width should be annotated on a drawing and secured through the s278 stage.

Item 2.2.3 highlights that the vehicle parked to the rear of property 192 Cherry Tree Avenue is parked over the footway. The applicant has raised that this is the responsibility of the Highway Authority. It is noted that parking over the footway is illegal and enforcement action as appropriate can be undertaken. This could be dealt with at detailed design if required.

Site Access

The access arrangement is presented within drawing 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0004 Rev A. Details on the drawing are limited and should incorporate

This junction radii, and geometries for both the carriageway and footways in accordance with Technical Guidance Note TG2 and TG10.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the TA confirms the widths this should be provided on a drawing for clarity. Initially the carriageway width is to measure 7.0m leading up to the narrowing, before reducing to 3.7m whereby a priority give-way arrangement is proposed. In accordance with TG10, this would not be acceptable, and the remaining carriageway width should not measure between 3.2-3.9m. This should be reviewed by the applicant.

These details should also cover construction details of the raised tables throughout the internal layout. These should comply with HCC Standard details to ensure they are effective at reducing vehicle speeds appropriately.

Internally within the site the main spine road is proposed to measure 5.5m throughout the development. The Highway Authority are content that this road width accords with the guidance for a secondary street as set out in Technical Guidance Note TG2. The street hierarchy for the internal layout is discussed further within this response.

The applicant has also confirmed that width of the pedestrian footway access leading into the development from Padnell Road shall be 1.8m. Footways into the development should be a minimum width of 2.0m in accordance Technical Guidance Note TG10, and therefore this width is substandard. TG10 only allows for a deviation from 2.0m if there are clear constraints however the layout should be designed to accommodate compliant footways where possible.

A 7.0m carriageway upon approach to the development is excessively wide and is likely to lead to higher speeds particularly considering the implementation of parking controls as discussed further within this response. There would therefore be ample opportunity to widen the existing footway on approach to the development to a TG10 compliant 2.0m minimum. As aforementioned, dedicated cycle access and widening to 3.0m at this point should also be considered with a new PRoW formed connecting into the existing.

Continuous footways appear to be provided on both sides of the carriageway however this is unclear on the site access drawing, and the narrative in the TA suggests otherwise. This should be clarified. Footway provision on both sides of the carriageway should be explored to maximise pedestrian permeability within the site. Should a footway on one side only be proposed then suitable crossing would need to be provided supported by TG3 compliant visibility splays. Clarity is sought on this matter.

At the pre-application advice stage, emphasis was placed on the necessity of parking controls at the Padnell Road/Cherry Tree Avenue junction and along Padnell Road within the vicinity of the site due to the high presence of parked vehicles which would interfere with traffic flow and visibility. These were considered necessary in order to provide safe and suitable access given the current parking arrangement would impede on two-way flow when accessing and egressing the site.

Drawing 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0004 Rev A outlines the extent of the additional double yellow lines. The Highway Authority are content with these arrangements with the mechanism for these to be implemented to be secured through a s106 agreement. The current cost for a TRO is £15,000 however increase annually in line with inflation.

It was also requested that a parking survey would be necessary to establish the quantum of displaced cars as a result of the TRO implementation. To

prevent exacerbating this existing parking problem further along Cherry Tree Avenue, suitable parking arrangements will be required internally to accommodate any displaced parking. This has not been undertaken and is required in order to ensure that the parking issues are not exacerbated as a result of the development proposals.

Visibility:

The applicant has provided visibility splays at the Padnell Grange/Cherry Tree Avenue Junction within Drawing 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0005 Rev A of 2.4m x 33.0m have been provided. The Highway Authority have replicated the 85th Percentile Speeds listed alongside their visibility splay requirements from HCC's TG3 stopping sight distance calculator.

Direction of travel	85th Percentile Speed (mph)	Visibility Splay Requirement (SSD Calculator)
Padnell Road		
East	25	2.4m x 33m
West	27	2.4m x 37m

Whilst the splays presented accords with the stopping sight distance calculator outputs for traffic heading eastbound, this is not the case for traffic heading westbound along Padnell Road. The western visibility splay should be 37.0m.

For ease, the extents of the double yellow lines should be overlaid on the visibility drawing to ensure that these extents cover the land required to remain clear to ensure suitable visibility can be achieved. Drawing 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0009 Rev A shows the visibility splays from the driveway of 192 Padnell Road. These have been drawn to 2.0m x 25.0m. These dimensions accord with the guidance set out in Technical Guidance Note TG3 for a 20mph road. It is unclear why the splays have not been drawn in accordance with the recorded speeds given this has been utilised for the junction which is in very close proximity. This should be amended.

Visibility splays should be outlined on a topographical drawing with the highway boundary overlaid to ensure that splays are unobstructed and can be achieved without reliance on any 3rd party land. This would not be acceptable.

No visibility splays have been provided from the substation adjacent to the access. TG3 compliant intervisibility splays between vehicles would need to be demonstrated from this point.

Swept Path Analysis:

Detailed comments will be provided on the swept path analysis below however in general tracking speeds have not been confirmed and should comply with TG2. Furthermore, the dimensions of the fire tender vehicle, large family car, and delivery vehicle, do not comply with HCC TG2 and should be updated.

Notwithstanding this, the Highway Authority have reviewed these drawings and have the following comments to make;

Swept path tracking for a refuse collection vehicle, at the Cherry Tree Avenue Junction has been provided in Drawings 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0016 Rev and 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0017 Rev A. The same is demonstrated for a fire tender/car and delivery vehicle/car within drawings 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0018 Rev A and 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0019 Rev A respectively. The Highway Authority are content that these drawings demonstrate that a refuse collection vehicle can access and egress from the site and that the refuse collection vehicle has been drawn in accordance with the dimensions listed in TG2. However, tracking speeds should be confirmed in future re-consultations.

Drawing 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0010 Rev A and 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0011 Rev A show swept path tracking for a refuse collection vehicle and car passing simultaneously through the site access from or towards plots 1-19. The tracking of the refuse collection vehicle is shown to overhang the road northwest of the junction and conflict with plots 1-19 which is not currently acceptable. The same comments apply to drawing 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0013 Rev A. Tracking should remain within the bounds of the carriageway at all times. This should be reviewed by the applicant who must ensure this area is verge or similar as to ensure the movement is not impeded.

No swept path tracking has been provided showing vehicles accessing or egressing the parking space for the substation. Given the proximity to the priority give way this should be provided. The applicant should also take consideration with relocating the substation access due to this proximity.

Internal Road Network

It is noted that the applicant has stated that the internal roads will not be offered for adoption, a process which is strongly encouraged by the Highway Authority. It was recommended at the pre-application stage that should this be the case, roads and footways should be designed and built in accordance with Hampshire County Council's adoptable design guidance to ensure a safe and suitable street design. The Advance Payment Code (APC) will also apply for privately maintained internal layouts.

Table 4.1 of the TA summarises the proposed street hierarchy and design principles which has been partially based on the requirements as set out within HCC TG1/2. This outlines that the site is to be comprised of secondary and tertiary streets as well as parking courts. For ease a full geometric plan should be provided so it is clear on the proposed dimensions throughout the internal layout as set out within the table.

As previously stated, it has been confirmed within the TA that the road widths shall measure 5.5m throughout the principal route through the site which complies with HCC TG1/2 for a secondary street.

However, the secondary road adjacent to apartment building 2 is an exception to this standard as it has been confirmed to measure 5.0m in width. This would accord with HCC TG1/2 for tertiary street but not the secondary street as proposed. It may be appropriate for this to be a tertiary street, however in the absence of a geometric plan the Highway Authority are unable to confirm whether this will be appropriate or not.

Tertiary streets have been confirmed to measure 4.8m in width and operate as a shared surface arrangement for up to 21 dwellings. This is not HCC TG1/2 compliant. In accordance with TG1 guidance, these streets should measure at least 5.0m wide and be equipped with 2.0m footways. Generally, the Highway Authority would be concerned with extents of shared surface providing access for up to 25 dwellings and the ability for these to operate in a safe and suitable manner for all users, as well as providing that sense of place for vulnerable road users, particularly those with visual impairments. Shared space should generally be limited to areas of less than 10 dwellings in accordance with HCC TG1/TG2 guidance. The TA references that design speed for tertiary streets is 20mph however a 15mph design speed should be applied here.

Reference is made to 1.2m footways providing access to Apartment Block 2. This is substandard and not in accordance with HCC TG10. Footways should be TG10 compliant throughout for all core pedestrian routes through the site. A 1.2m footway in accordance with Building Regulation requirements is only acceptable when providing direct access to dwellings and not on these core routes.

Likewise, the parking courts have been listed as 3.7m wide however the aisle width should be 6.0m to allow for suitable space to manoeuvre in an out of parking spaces in a safe and suitable manner.

In general, there appears to be some confusion with the application of the street hierarchy as set out within HCC Technical Guidance when applying this to the internal layout design. This should be reviewed by the applicant and aided by a geometric plan in order to aid review. The Highway Authority are therefore unable to confirm the suitability of the street hierarchy design at this time.

The footway provision throughout the site should be reviewed by the applicant as there are several matters of refinement identified. Firstly, the parking spaces for plot 25/26 interrupt a desire line travelling from east to west and would require pedestrians to make an awkward manoeuvre to travel around a parked vehicle. These spaces should be relocated to avoid this issue.

The TA confirms that the footway on the main spine road is to measure 1.8m which does not accord with the minimum 2.0m as set out within HCC TG10. As aforementioned, footways should measure 2.0m unless there are clear constraints which impede delivery of wider footway. This should be reviewed by the applicant.

Several of the footways are poorly connected and should be refined by the applicant. For example, no continuous footway is provided between plots 39-

41 and plots 42-44. It is unclear how residents would be intended to access their dwellings without needing to travel against desire lines. This could be refined by switching the footway and the parking spaces around in this location to provide continuous footway provision. This should be reviewed by the applicant.

The footway adjacent to plot 42 does not extend to plot 45 with soft landscaping proposed between the two properties. This removes dedicated pedestrian access into plot 45 and should be reviewed.

The interaction of the car parking spaces and the footway to the south of plot 62 should be reviewed. The tie in with the carriageway should be more central with the cul-de-sac to prevent conflicts between manoeuvring vehicles and those using the pathway. This should also be widened to 3.0m to cater for cycling, in fact all pedestrian connections throughout the site should be widened to accommodate cyclists.

There appears to be an existing tree located in the footway leading to the rear of plots 53 and 54. The footway arrangement should be refined here to ensure that the tree does not obstruct the effective width of the footway.

There is no path leading to the gate of plot 61 with residents currently required to walk through a landscape area, This should be reviewed by the applicant with the existing pathway to the front door extended as appropriate.

Finally, there is no access gate to the rear of plot 77. Subsequently, it would be expected for cyclists or pedestrians that seek to enter plots 76-80 via a route which does not follow desire lines Highway Authority suggest that the fence which runs along the northern boundary of plot 77 is provided with a gate. This would allow for pedestrians to access the gardens to the rear of these properties when coming from the north.

No pedestrian crossing points have been provided throughout the layout and these should be provided in suitable locations supported by dropped kerbs and tactile paving to maximise pedestrian permeability and provide access to footways on the opposite side of the carriageway on desire lines. This should be reviewed by the applicant.

Comments have been provided above on the extents of shared surface throughout the site which is to be reviewed by the applicant. Where shared surface is proposed, a change in materials should be provided to define a change in environment and make it clear vehicle users are entering a shared area. Block paving has been found to be effective at reducing speeds and should be considered here. The use of materials should be confirmed by the applicant.

Swept Path Tracking

As stated previously, the dimensions of the fire tender vehicle, delivery vehicle, and large family car are not compliant with the dimensions listed in

TG2 and should be refined. Tracking speeds for all vehicles internally should be confirmed and be appropriate for the design speed.

The swept path tracking for a fire tender in drawing 250595-CON-XX-XX-DRC-6001 Rev P2 frequently sees the vehicle drive over the centre of the road. There are instances however where the vehicle appears to be poorly tracked and should be reviewed by the applicant. The lack of passing opportunities raises concerns over where another vehicle would be able to wait should the fire tender vehicle meet another vehicle. The same is true for the refuse tracking within drawing 250595-CON-XX-XX-DR-C-6000 Rev P2.

In accordance with HCC TG2, the tracking should be updated to outline opportunities where a car can pass throughout the development. Where these vehicles cannot pass at bends and junctions' suitable forward visibility and/or intervisibility should be demonstrated.

There are several instances where the vehicle is shown to overhang the carriageway which is not acceptable. In addition to this in drawing 250595-CON-XX-XX-DR-C-6000 Rev P2, the fire tender tracking is shown to slightly overhang the parallel parking bay to the south of building 2. This is not acceptable and the swept path tracking amended.

The Planning Authority should confirm that the refuse vehicle and fire tender is able to access dwellings in line with Manual for Streets/Building Regulation requirements.

No swept path tracking for two cars has been demonstrated within the site. Nor has swept path tracking showing a delivery vehicle and car passing simultaneously. Suitable tracking in accordance with TG2 guidance should be demonstrated to confirm there would be sufficient space internally to enable s traffic flow for these more regular movements

Visibility:

No visibility splays have been provided internally within the site beyond the junction to plots 1-19, as shown in drawing 250595-CON-XX-XX-SK-C-0006 Rev A. It is noted that this drawing does not outline where the location of any trees is located which raises concerns regarding the achievability of these splays. This should be refined and provided on a topographical plan.

Additionally, internal junction visibility splays, should be demonstrated. Furthermore, no forward visibility splays have been demonstrated within the site. Both should be provided in accordance with HCC TG3 commensurate with the internal design speed

Pedestrian intervisibility splays should also be provided at vehicle crossover arrangements in accordance with HCC TG3. Pedestrian and cycle visibility splays in accordance with HCC TG3 and LTN1/20 should be provided where appropriate at crossing points within the development once provided.

Parking Provision

The applicant has confirmed that in total there are proposed to be 49 allocated parking spaces, 104.8 unallocated parking spaces, totalling to 153 parking spaces, on top of a proposed 31 visitor parking spaces. It is unclear whether the parking proposed (including visitor) accords with Havant Borough Council's Parking SPD and this should be confirmed by the applicant. The quantum of allocated parking for dwellings of each quantum type should also be confirmed.

It does not appear that the dimensions of any parking spaces on site have been confirmed. The applicant should provide the dimensions of any parking space types on site, for example, standard, parallel, and disabled. Guidance on this can be found within Technical Guidance Note TG1, at the following link: https://documents.hants.gov.uk/transport/TG1-HighwayCrossSections.pdf and the HBC Parking SPD.

The applicant justifies the use of the parking mix by utilising car ownership census data stating that the area indicates approximately 1.4 cars per household, creating a requirement of 126 parking spaces.

Whilst ultimately the parking quantum is to be agreed with Havant Borough Council in their capacity as the Local Parking Authority, the Highway Authority expressed concern at the pre-application stage regarding the use of unallocated parking given this may contribute to the existing parking stress observed along Padnell Road and Cherry Tree Avenue., Furthermore, the use of unallocated parking could encourage other local residents to park within the development due to the parking issues present throughout the area. This could lead to an overall shortfall in parking for the development itself which would not be acceptable. Joint engagement with the LPA is recommended on this matter to agree a suitable parking quantum for the proposed site.

No hardstanding has been provided for several parking bays throughout the proposal to the rear or the sides. This is likely to lead to several spaces where pedestrians access or egress their vehicles off of the hardstanding. The Highway Authority suggests that suitable hardstanding is provided to provide suitable space for safe and suitable operation, particularly for the parallel parking bays.

Cycle parking:

The allocation of cycle parking has been based upon HBC parking standards. These require 1 cycle parking space for 1-bedroom dwellings and 2 cycle parking spaces for 2-bedroom dwellings or above. An additional 20% of the long-term cycle parking spaces have been provided as short-stay visitor parking. In total this has created 173 long-term cycle parking spaces within dwelling and communal stores for the 2 apartment buildings. The applicant should confirm that the cycle parking is secure and covered for both long-term and short-stay provision to encourage sustainable travel via bicycle.

The applicant has stated that apartment building 1 will contain 19 cycle parking spaces and apartment building 2 will contain 14 cycle parking spaces. The quantum of apartments within each building has not been confirmed.

Subsequently it is unclear whether this is sufficient. The Planning Authority should confirm whether this is appropriate for the quantum.

Several properties feature gates to the rear of parking spaces which the Highway Authority are concerned would be inaccessible for cyclists as parking spaces appear to largely block passages through to the gates. For example, the gate to the rear of the parking spaces at plot 22, 24, 25, 22, 55, 72. This may discourage cycling as a form of transport due to difficulty getting in/out of the gardens. The applicant should consider relocating or redesigning several of the parking spaces to ensure that cyclists would have simple and accessible route to reach their gardens to encourage use of the bicycle as a sustainable transport mode.

Trip Generation

The applicant has provided TRICS multi-modal trip generation data using land use 03-A (Privately owned houses). This is considered a robust criteria given the mix of private/affordable housing cannot be confirmed at this stage. The Highway Authority are content that the search parameters used for this data are suitably reflective of the site. The results have been recreated below:

Time period	Arrival trip rate	No. of arrivals	Departure trip rate	No. of departures	Total trip rate	Total movements
Total Person						
8am–9am	0.207	19	0.825	74	1.032	93
5pm–6pm	0.622	56	0.277	25	0.899	81
7am–7pm	3.850	347	3.875	349	7.725	695
Pedestrians						
8am–9am	0.048	4	0.156	14	0.204	18
5pm–6pm	0.073	7	0.061	5	0.134	12
7am–7pm	0.673	61	0.716	64	1.389	125
Cyclists						
8am–9am	0.001	0	0.014	1	0.015	1
5pm–6pm	0.007	1	0.001	0	0.008	1
7am–7pm	0.046	4	0.045	4	0.091	8
Public transport users						
8am–9am	0.001	0	0.062	6	0.063	6
5pm–6pm	0.041	4	0.002	0	0.043	4
7am–7pm	0.163	15	0.177	16	0.340	31
Vehicles						
8am–9am	0.133	12	0.384	35	0.517	47
5pm–6pm	0.371	33	0.164	15	0.535	48
7am–7pm	2.202	198	2.169	195	4.371	393

Upon review of the TRICS outputs the Highway Authority note that the total person trip rates and the trip rates associated with pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and vehicles do not add up. It is unclear why this is the case.

The narrative within the TA is therefore not considered an accurate reflection of the current modal share.

The current outputs would suggest 56% of trips to be undertaken via the private car with 24% undertaken via sustainable transport modes, therefore leading to 20% of unaccounted trips. It is assumed that the current modal share of 24% is likely with 76% of trips undertaken via a private vehicle. This should however be reviewed by the applicant before any agreement can be sought on the trip rates presented.

No reference has been made to a vision-led approach to trip generation. This is necessary to ensure the site is assessed in accordance with the NPPF. A suitable target using the TRICS database as a baseline should be established for sustainable mode share. This should be in line with targets by ATE for 50% of all trips to be undertaken via sustainable modes by 2030. Any vision led approach should be supported by a suitable package of sustainable transport measures to ensure these are realistic and achievable.

Traffic Distribution/Assignment

The vehicular traffic distribution provided within fig 5.2 and table 5.3 of the TA appears reasonable and in line with narrative provided at the pre-applications stage. In summary 39% of trips are proposed to route via Cherry Tree Avenue and 14% via Hazleton Way. Of the remaining 47% routing via Padnell Road, 14% and 33% turn right and left at the Padnell Road/A3 London Road junction respectively.

Distribution should be provided on a ‘stick diagram’ so that the number of vehicular trips through each junction in accordance with the agreed percentage splits is clear and for ease of viewing.

Additionally, non-vehicular distribution has also been provided in figure 5.1 using assumptions presented within paragraph 5.4.1 of the TA. These assumptions appear to be reasonable. This diagram shows the split of trips during the AM and PM peak hours for a multitude of destinations within close proximity to the site. The Highway Authority are content that this supports a vision-led approach by detailing routing choices for sustainable transport modes.

TEMPro Growth Factors:

The applicant has utilised TEMPro to obtain future year traffic flows (between 2026-2031). The following growth rates utilised are as follows:

- AM Peak – 1.0248
- PM Peak – 1.0252

These growth rates seem reasonable however the MSOA should be confirmed to ensure that this is reflective of the sites location prior to agreement.

Committed Developments:

The Highway Authority requested at the pre-application stage that three committed developments referenced within the TA were included within the modelling work. Given the agreed distribution and the presented trip generation assessment, the applicant has only modelled the Cherry Tree Avenue/Padnell Road junction. The applicant notes that given the location of these developments the development trips are unlikely to interact with this junction and therefore any trips would be appropriately accounted for within TEMPro. The Highway Authority are minded to agree with this position.

Should the revised trip generation assessment lead more than 30 trips travelling through the Padnell Road/Hazleton Way priority junction and Padnell Road/A3 Portsmouth Road signalised junction then these committed developments may need to be accounted for as appropriate given the agreed distribution along the A3 Portsmouth Road.

Junction Assessments

The applicant has undertaken junction modelling for the Cherry Tree Avenue/Padnell Grange junction given the intensification of use proposed as a result of development using PICADY. Given this forms the site access arrangement this has been modelled for a 2031 + development scenario only which is considered acceptable.

The maximum RFC is 0.15 on the Cherry Tree Avenue in the AM peak period outlining that the junction is able to operate well within theoretical and practical design capacity when considering additional trips that will arise as a result of the development. The model also raises no concerns with regard to queuing and delay with the development trips having a negligible impact on the existing junction operation. No concerns are therefore raised by the Highway Authority.

The distribution based on the trip rates presented within the TA would suggest that modelling of the following junctions as suggested at the pre-application stage is not required, once agreed and should development trips exceed 30 through these junctions then additional modelling may be required:

- Padnell Road/Hazelton Way priority junction
- Padnell Road/A3 Portsmouth Road signalised junction.

Recommendations

Further work is requested from the applicant regarding wider sustainable accessibility regarding wider sustainable accessibility, site access proposals and off-site traffic impact. This is critical to ensure that the site can be accommodated on the local highway network in a safe and suitable manner as well as provide realistic opportunities to encourage sustainable transport uptake. This will ensure the site complies with the NPPF and LTP4 requirements.

Yours faithfully,

Louis Aplin-Haynes
Assistant Transport Planner - Highway Development Planning
Universal Services