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	Sophie Osborne	My reference	060853
Direct Line	N/A	Your reference	APP/26/00408
Date	17 August 2026	Email	havantdc@hants.gov.uk

For attention of Ms K Taylor

Dear Kayleigh,

Re: APP/26/00408 At Plot 1 Dunsbury Park, Fitzwygram Way, Havant, PO9 4EE

Outline permission for the erection of a building for employment purposes with associated parking and landscaping. All matters reserved except access, layout parameters and scale parameters.

Thank you for your consultation on the above full planning application. The applicant is seeking consent for 3,251sqm of flexible B2/B8 commercial provision with ancillary office uses. To support this planning application a Transport Assessment (TA) ref 273.0002/TA/3 which the Highway Authority have reviewed and wish to make the following comments.

Planning History
The TA summarises the previous hybrid planning consent for a mixture of commercial and employment uses spread across 12 units (planning ref. APP/12/00338). 7 of these 12 units have received reserved matters consent. The original consent lapsed in February 2024. New planning approvals assessed in line with new planning policy and guidance are therefore required for the remaining 5 units.

Whilst the vehicular impact associated with this application may have been mitigated through the extant consent, the applicant will be required to provide a suitable sustainable mitigation package to support this site and the remaining Dunsbury Park units to comply with current NPPF and LTP4 requirements.

Policy Status
A summary of local and national transport planning policy is provided. No narrative has been provided on the Havant LCWIP, and this should be included. Reference is made to the emerging local plan of which Dunsbury Park is identified as an emerging employment allocation (Allocation 25). This is now at Regulation 19 stage and the emerging policy requirements should be acknowledged by the applicant.

Traffic Surveys
A 7-day ATC was undertaken along Fitzwygram Way between 08-14 July 2025 to obtain baseline traffic flows and speeds. The 5-day weekday average for traffic flows (including HGVs in brackets) has been utilised. This is considered reasonable given the limited data obtained over the weekends. Results are provided within Table 2 of the TA but summarised below for ease:

	AM Peak average (08:00-09:00)	**PM Peak average (17:00-18:00)**	**24-hour daily average**	**85th%ile speeds (mph)**
Eastbound	96 (14)	64 (14)	657 (217)	39.7
Westbound	74 (19)	81 (24)	668 (259)	39.7

Fitzwygram Way is 30mph and not 40mph as the TA suggests. Observed speeds are therefore significantly higher than the posted limit.

Sustainable Access
Table 4 provides a summary of local facilities and services their distances from the site access. Whilst distances would ideally be measured from the unit access point, this is considered to have a negligible impact on the distances presented. Therefore, the distances presented are considered appropriate for assessing the sustainable credentials of the site.

ATE identifies that a site should have a sufficient number and range of local facilities within an 800m (10-minute walking distance) via an accessible walking route. CIHT also identifies a preferred maximum of 1.2km for local facilities and 2.0km for commuting purposes. It is not agreed that there are several facilities within a suitable walking and cycling distance from the site. Only Ramsdale Woods, the One Stop and The Warren Post Office fall within these acceptable walking and cycling distances. It is therefore unlikely that employees will walk and cycle to other identified facilities given the distance from the site. Any assessment on the sites sustainable credentials should consider the location to residential areas and connectivity to public transport opportunities to encourage sustainable transport uptake.

Policy and guidance relating to sustainable accessibility have evolved significantly since the previous consent. Therefore, whilst this remains a material consideration in the determination of this current application, improving sustainable access to the site and addressing deficits in the existing infrastructure are also a core consideration in line with the latest NPPF and LTP4.

Walking and Cycling (incorporating the PRoW network):
The applicant has undertaken a WCHAR on the following routes:

1. Route to the north via Park Lane and Calshot Road bus stops
2. Route to Leigh Park Centre (via Middle Park Way & Dunsbury Way)
3. Route to Asda Supermarket
4. Route to Bedhampton Railway Station – Cycle only

The WCHAR has been undertaken prior to HCC TG19 updates which requires incorporation of a Healthy Streets assessment. This should be updated. The emerging policy requires integration with footpath 14e to be considered and opportunities to upgrade to a bridleway to accommodate all users. This matter should be considered within the WCHAR scope.

Fitzwygram Way benefits from dedicated pedestrian and cycle provision. From the Hulbert Road roundabout 3.0m shared use provision is present extending up to Calshot Road. Within the site this switches onto the northern side of the carriageway (with formal crossing provision) with a 2.0m footway to the south. At the Calshot Road roundabout cyclists are to drop on carriageway once the bus gate is open and operational.

The WCHAR does not refer to new bridleway proposed to run between Fitzwygram Way and Parkhouse Farm Way (planning ref. APP/25/00902) which would provide benefit to future employees. Consent is yet to be granted however the Highway Authority are supportive of the principles of this route. Further afield, reference has been made to the shared use provision to be delivered as part of Land West of Hulbert Road. This ties into the existing infrastructure along Fitzwygram Way and Hulbert Road to the south. Whilst this would provide some benefit to the site, delivery timescales are unknown. The WCHAR does not identify the clear deficit in provision for pedestrians and cyclists over A3(M) J2 and Hulbert Road which would provide access into Waterlooville. Improvements along this route would be critical to improve sustainable connectivity for commuting trips from Waterlooville to the site reducing reliance on the private car.

In line with the Havant LCWIP (item 278.1.7 and 278.1.8), the Highway Authority have identified two studies to improve the pedestrians and cycle infrastructure: one for the A3(M) roundabout and the other for the length of Hulbert Road linking Waterlooville Town Centre to the A3(M) roundabout proposals. Both schemes collectively have an indicative cost in the region of £7-10 million.

£300,000 was secured towards improvements at A3(M)J2 under the extant planning consent, recognising the need for improvements to be sought to connect pedestrians and cyclists from the site to Hulbert Road. The amendments to the NPPF since the original consent Whilst the Highway Authority consider it reasonable that the above contribution is taken into account when assessing this application, any contribution needs to be considered more comprehensively in line with the amendments to the NPPF and Hampshire's LTP4 which places greater weight and emphasis on the

need to provide realistic opportunities to access sites via sustainable transport modes.

Route 1:
The quality of Park Lane (bridleway 108/123) has been identified as generally good and has recently been subject to surfacing improvements, however vegetation maintenance is required to maintain the effective width. The route could be improved by widening the landing area at Grasmere Way, removal of the staggered barriers at the A3(M) bridge and provision of formal street lighting to provide a safe all-weather all-purpose route. These matters have not been identified within the WCHAR, however general reference to the LCWIP is made. This should be explored by the applicant.

An informal route from Park Lane onto Fitzwygram Way has been identified which falls on clear desire lines. These should be formalised to support this planning application to significantly reduce the walking and cycling distances when accessing the site from the bridleway.

The WCHAR identifies connectivity improvements to the landing area at Calshot Road, however it is considered greater benefit to formalise the informal connections into the site, given the extent of improvements that would be required and the additional walking and cycling distance this would create.

Routes 2 and 3:
Footway provision along both routes are found to be variable but generally substandard from a TG10 compliant 2.0m, with tactile paving lacking at core crossing points. No improvements to widen the footway provision has been proposed. Rectifying deficits in tactile paving provision has been identified.

Cyclists are generally required to travel on carriageway with inconsistent shared use provision present. On-carriageway cycling is not considered LTN 1/20 compliant and would exclude some if not all users (table 4.1) given likely flows and is likely to be unattractive given heavily parked up nature of these routes. Woolston Road and Middle Park Way are identified on the Havant LCWIP as a secondary cycle route (policy reference(s) 278.2, 362.2 and 362.3), with reference made within the WCHAR. Key barriers along these routes are identified as lack of coherent routes, obstructed infrastructure and poor crossing families. The schemes generally relate to provision of dedicated off-carriageway cycle infrastructure removing extents of on-carriageway cycling which is not considered suitable for all users. Contributions could be sought towards these LCWIP routes to improve connectivity to residential areas and connect the site with the wider network.

Route 4:
The WCHAR suggests that the route to Bedhampton station is generally suitable for cyclists with no enhancements proposed, despite outlining the extensive need for on-carriageway cycling along busy commuter routes (Park Lane, Hulbert Road and Bedhampton Road). This route is therefore not considered conducive to on-carriageway cycling in compliance with LTN1/20.

Improvements have been identified on the Havant LCWIP to reduce the extents of on-carriageway cycling which has not been acknowledged. Given the distance from the site there is considered limited benefit to improve this route with clear deficits in closer proximity to be rectified.

Buses:
The closest bus stops to the site are located along Fitzwygram Way c.160m to the northeast when measured from the site access. It is expected that the bus gate will be operational in winter 2026, with regular bus services likely to begin operating from the spring 2027 timetable change. Bus infrastructure is yet to be confirmed but likely to comprise of a flagpole and stop. Upgrades to provide shelters/seating and RTI information should be considered.

Alternative bus provision can be sought on Calshot Road c.700m to the east served by route number 22 providing daily regular connections between Leigh Park and Havant Town Centre. The bus stop benefits from a shelter, seating and RTPI information; however, this infrastructure is tired and would benefit from improvement. This was not identified within the WCHAR.

Rail:
Bedhampton and Havant are the two closest stations to the site located 3.6km and 3.7km to the south respectively. Havant benefits from a wider range and more frequent services to Portsmouth, Brighton, Southampton and London. Given the extents of on-carriageway cycling required and distance from the site, it is considered unlikely that many future employees will chose to travel via bicycle from the railway station. Onward sustainable travel via bus could be sought to the site to chain sustainable transport journeys.

Sustainable Access Summary:
The WCHAR identifies several opportunities for improvements within paragraph 8.3. Reference is made to Park Lane/Middle Park Way roundabout LCWIP improvements. Clarity is requested on the intended location of improvements given Park Lane does not meet Middle Park Way.

Generally, it is unclear what the applicant is proposing as appropriate mitigation for the development in line with the revised NPPF and LTP4 requirements. A further discussion is welcomed with the applicant to agree a sustainable access package for this site and wider Dunsbury Park on a strategic scale considering the conclusions of the WCHAR and matters raised above within this response.

Personal Injury Accidents (PIA)
PIA data has been obtained from Hampshire Constabulary for a 5-year period between 01 March 2020-28 February 2025. The study area is contained within fig.6 of the TA and is considered acceptable. The data is over a year out of date and therefore an internal review of the study area has been undertaken. For an updated study year (01 February 2021-31 January 2026) 45 accidents have occurred (7 ‘moderately serious’ and 38 ‘slight’) an increase in 4 ‘slight’ accidents to that presented within the TA.

No accidents have occurred along Fitzwygram Way. Clusters of accidents have however occurred at the A3(M) J3 roundabout to the north and Hulbert Road roundabout to the south. Most causation factors appear to be due to a failure to look properly. The Highway Authority have however reviewed the accident data and are content that these are isolated accidents with no trend that is unlikely to be exacerbated by the proposed development. No further accident analysis therefore needs to be undertaken by the applicant.

Site Access
Plot 100 is to be accessed via the existing roundabout stub along Fitzwygram Way. The indicative masterplan and tie into the access arrangements is shown within drawing UMC-0100-SI-DR-A-0601 Rev P1.4.

A dedicated car park access is provided c. 10m south of the roundabout measuring 6.0m wide with radii of 6.0m and 4.0m. Aside from narrative within the TA, a geometric plan has not been provided and should be submitted for ease.

It is unclear on the extents of the access arrangement being secured through the outline consent, however it would appear that this would be securing the access into the car parking area from the roundabout stub. This should be clarified so appropriate comments can be provided.

To the left of the roundabout stub access arrangement, the shared use provision switches onto the southern side of the Fitzwygram Way. Suitable visibility splays for cyclists should be demonstrated to ensure that as the internal layout develops, the visibility splays cam remain clear.
No dedicated footway provision has been proposed. A TG10 compliant footway should be provided into the site with suitable provision for cyclists to drop on carriageway from the shared use provision to provide safe and suitable pedestrian and cycle access.

Visibility:
Visibility splays of 2.4m x 27.0m for the proposed car park access has been provided within drawing DP-PB-100-GD-DR-Z-1001 Rev P01 in excess of TG3 requirements for a 20mph design speed. This is acceptable. The applicant should also provide the forward SSD to the roundabout in accordance with HCC TG3 3.1.7.

Swept Path Analysis:
Drawings DP-PB-100-GF-DR-Z-1002 Rev P01 and DP-PB-100-GF-DR-Z-1003 Rev P01 outlines swept path analysis for two 4.6t light vans passing simultaneously at the car park access and 2 HGVs passing simultaneously along the access road at 10mph. Fire tender and refuse vehicle access at 10mph is shown within drawings DP-PB-100-GF-DR-Z-1004 and DP-PB-100-GF-DR-Z-1005 Rev P01 respectively. The Highway Authority are content that access for all vehicles can be achieved in a safe and suitable manner. Turning details for the HGV, fire tender and refuse vehicle will be fixed through the reserved matters stage.

Parking Provision
Parking provision will be provided in accordance with the HBC Parking SPD at the reserved matters stage. This is noted.

Trip Generation
Previously agreed trip generation (extant planning consent):
An assessment to establish trip generation should this plot have been built as a hotel under the extant planning application has been undertaken with trip rates as follows:

	AM Peak 08:00-09:00		**PM Peak 17:00-18:00**	
	Arr.	Dept.	Arr.	Dept.
Previously Agreed Trip Rate	0.429	0.580	0.481	0.328
Previously Agreed Trip Generation	24	32	27	18

Proposed trip generation:
Updated trip generation for a B2 and B8 parcel distribution land use using the TRICS 8 database has been provided to undertake a net impact assessment against previously agreed trips. Given parcel distribution is the most intensive B8 use, these trips rates are considered acceptable. The trip rates and subsequent trip generation is as follows:

B2	**AM Peak 08:00-09:00**		**PM Peak 17:00-18:00**	
	Arr.	Dept.	Arr.	Dept.
Updated Trip Rate	0.334	0.036	0.073	0.268
Updated Trip Generation (3,251m^2)	11	1	2	9
Net change	**-13**	**-31**	**-25**	**-9**
B8 Parcel Distribution	**AM Peak 08:00-09:00**		**PM Peak 17:00-18:00**	
	Arr.	Dept.	Arr.	Dept.
Updated Trip Rate	0.478	0.473	0.415	0.645
Updated Trip Generation (3,251m^2)	16	15	13	21
Net change	**-8**	**-17**	**-14**	**+3**

For both outputs, several sites have been included from 2021 and should be removed given this was surveyed during Covid-19 restrictions. Furthermore, the TRICS audit reference number provided presents marginally different trip rates compared to that tabulated within the outputs and the TA. It is unclear why discrepancies are present and clarity is sought. Whilst this is unlikely to alter the conclusions presented, the assessment should be updated.

Whilst the assessment identifies an overall reduction in vehicular trips compared to the extant consent, the B8 parcel distribution use leads to a net increase of 39 in the PM peak period. It is suggested that this increase and subsequent impact have already been accounted for within the extant hybrid consent. Table 18 provides an assessment where all remaining undeveloped units operate as parcel distribution uses against both observed flows for

occupied units and trip generation previously assessed for the fully built out site. The Highway Authority are minded to agree with this conclusion. However, this this would be subject to the remaining plots not coming forward as a B1 business park use, which formed part of the original consent development and was forecast to generally significantly greater peak hour traffic movements than the uses now proposed. The cumulative traffic implications of any future B1 development would need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

HGV trips have not been provided for assessment, and a net impact assessment should also be provided for these slower moving vehicles to establish any impact on the local highway network.

Daily trip rates have also not been presented and are essential to inform a vision le approach. This is discussed further below.

Multi-modal trip generation:
A multi-modal assessment has been undertaken for the B2 land use only using the same parameters as set out above which should be refined. Currently, this outlines a total of 31 sustainable transport users (4 cycle, 15 pedestrian and 12 public transport) over a daily period which may increase. It is unclear why this has not been replicated for B8 parcel distribution given the applicant seeks a flexible consent. This should be provided.

It is unclear on the current modal share over the daily period given daily vehicular trip rates have not been presented.

Vision-led approach:
A revised modal split in line with the vision led requirements has not been provided. The applicant suggests this is not required given the previous hybrid planning consent and the vehicular impact for the plot not considered to have a severe impact on the wider highway network.

Regardless of the previous planning history and net vehicular impact, a vision led approach must be presented for the application to accord with the NPPF and LTP4 considerations. The vision led approach is not just about mitigating highway impact but providing realistic and attractive opportunities to increase attractiveness of sustainable transport modes over the private car.

The provision of the site wide travel plan for a 10% reduction as a minimum is acknowledged, however the vision led approach should seek to further reduce private car reliance in conjunction with additional sustainable transport measures to support the ‘vision’. It is unclear whether the 10% target is currently being met by occupied units within Dunsbury Park and this should be demonstrated. Any modal share above that mandatory 10% would need to be realistic considering the context of the location of the site but being mindful of the 50% modal share target of ATE by 2030.

Traffic Distribution/Assignment
Turning count surveys have been undertaken at the Fitzwygram Way/B2150 Hulbert Road roundabout to inform current distribution patterns for occupied units, rather than utilising the previously agreed distribution from 2012. The observed distribution is as follows:

AM (07:00-10:00)	Arr.	Dept.	PM (16:00-19:00)	Arr.	Dept.
North	79%	81%	North	76%	82%
South	21%	19%	South	24%	18%

The applicant intends to use this trip distribution to inform modelling and capacity assessment which is acceptable.

Narrative has been provided on multi-modal distribution however no diagrams have been provided. Distribution should be based on travel to work census data, rather than the assumptions presented. ATE would require a clear 'stick diagram'; for each mode via journey purpose and this should be provided.

TEMPro and Committed Developments
TEMPro growth rates have been obtained for Havant 006 for 2025-2030. It is unclear which scenario these have been obtained for i.e. core/behavioural. This should be confirmed prior to agreement on the growth rates presented.

Committed Developments:
Any unoccupied/unconsented units at Dunsbury Park at the time of the traffic surveys are to be accounted for as a committed development using the assumed floor areas from the Dunsbury Park website. The floor areas should be confirmed to establish whether these have been appropriately accounted for when future consents for the remaining plots are submitted.
The following additional committed developments should also be included:

1. Land West of Hulbert Road - planning ref. APP/20/00441
2. Lidl, Purbrook Way - planning ref. APP/24/00330
3. Berewood MDA – planning refs. APP/10/00828 and 10/02862/OUT

Junction Assessments
The applicant has undertaken junction modelling for the Fitzwygram Way/B2150 Hulbert Road roundabout using the following scenarios:

1. 2025 baseline
2. 2030 baseline
3. 2030 baseline + committed development
4. 2030 baseline + committed development + development
5. 2030 baseline + committed development (parcel distribution sensitivity test)
6. 2030 baseline + committed development+ development (parcel distribution sensitivity test)

The modelling results suggest that the maximum RFC is 0.60 on the Hulbert Road N arm in PM peak for the baseline 2030 + committed development + development scenario. No concerns are raised with regard to queuing and delay. The RFC increases slightly to 0.61 in the parcel distribution sensitivity

test assessment of this same scenario. This should however be reviewed following the trip generation amendments as discussed above within this response.

A3(M) Junction 3:
As aforementioned, Table 19 outlines an overall net reduction in trips compared to the extant consent when assessing all remaining plots as a B8 parcel distribution centre. The applicant therefore suggests that the current proposals do not generate a material increase in overall traffic demand compared to that previously assessed. The Highway Authority are minded to agree with this approach.

The Highway Authority note the revised distribution technical note dated 06 August 2026 in response to concerns raised by National Highways. Given the position above, it is considered that this can be dealt and agreed with National Highways.

Travel Plan
The Highway Authority acknowledge the extant position of the outline travel plan intended to cover all units. However, given the lapsing of the previous consent and submission of new planning applications, the Framework Travel Plan (FTP) dated May 2026 (ref 273.0001/TP/2) has been assessed in accordance with the latest policy and guidance, including updates to Hampshires Tevel Plan Guidance in 2025. The Highway Authority have reviewed this travel plan and have the following comments to make.

Section 1 – Introduction:
This should include the site reference and the indicative site masterplan.

Section 5 – Targets:
Table 5 should include a column showing the predicted mode shift figures for Year 1. This should be consistent with the vision-led approach presented within the TA.

Section 6 – Measures:
There are some additional measures which should be considered for inclusion within this FTP. This section should also refer to the sustainable mitigations strategy once agreed with the Highway Authority.

Public Transport Vouchers
As the targets have set out a 4% increase in bus use from the baseline, the travel plan required additional incentives for this mode shift to be achieved. With the site having nearby bus stops which are served by a regular service, the travel plan should capitalise on this by including the provision for bus vouchers for staff employed at the proposed unit. The location of the site means that the staff may travel from within Havant or the nearby Stagecoach zones (Portsmouth, Waterlooville and Hayling Island). Therefore, staff should be offered a South Hants 7 Day MegaRider ticket which allows travel from across these areas. As unit occupier, type of business and number of staff are

not known as this time, the travel plan should assume 100 based the number of parking spaces outlined in paragraph 3.3.

Marketing and Promotion
Advertising TP to staff through recruitment, e.g. how to get there for interview and on the website

Section 8 – Monitoring:
This section should include a monitoring timetable as set out within the HCC guidance and measures to ensure that the response rate is met e.g. a voucher for a supermarket or online retailer.

Summary:
The FTP requires further amendments as set out above before it can be considered acceptable for submission in conjunction with the proposed site.

Recommendations
Further refinement is required before the access arrangements and trip generation trip generation (including the vision led approach) can be agreed. Additionally, further discussions are requested on sustainable accessibility matters. This is critical to ensure that this plot and the remaining Dunsbury Park complies with the latest NPPF and LTP4 considerations to ensure realistic opportunities to encourage sustainable uptake to the site are pursued.

I trust that the above is clear but please do not hesitate to contact Sophie Osborne on the above contact details should you require further clarification.

Yours faithfully,

Gemma McCart
Transport Team Leader – Highways Development Planning
Universal Services