
From: Peter Westron
Sent: 07 September 2026 14:48
To: Narinder Lakhan
Subject: Re: Phase 4 RMA

Ref APP/25/00425

Narinder Lakhan,

Thank you for your email with the Applicants answers to our previous comments (14Jul2026) on this application. I will respond to their answers, our objections as previously stated still remain.

1). I believe the relevant part of bridleway Havant120 is within the Red line of the SAR (Southern Access Road), so is part of this reserved matters application. The issue is that the proposed PRow (Public Right of Way) diversion is not fit for purpose. It does not '*protect or enhance*' the PRow network as required, because of the extra 1/2 mile loop explained in our previous comments.

We are happy with the design and location of the proposed 'permissive bridleway crossing point' at the southern end of the SAR. We agree it would solve the problem with the PRow diversion, but only if dedicated as a PRow. If only a permissive path it can be closed at whim and thus cannot be considered as part of a PRow diversion.

For example, there are gates planned at the entrances to the Reservoir access roads. These are apparently to be closed when the Reservoir is closed. The PRow must remain open even if the Reservoir is closed.

There is no design change needed to solve this issue. The crossing is already planned to an appropriate standard. The only change needed is to dedicate it as a PRow.

The extra access into the Reservoir site mentioned, 100m south of the junction of the SAR with Swanmore Road, is to be welcomed. However, I presume it too is intended to

be a permissive path only and thus cannot be considered as part of a PRow diversion. In any case I believe this entrance is intended for pedestrians only, not cyclists or horses as would be needed.

We note that the Applicants response states in several places that '*development will provide clear enhancements to recreational access*'. We do not agree with this statement. Before the Reservoir was started the whole of its area and that of Havant Thicket woodland was designated as 'access land'. The development has reduced the access to this area, not enhanced it. The addition of permissive paths has merely added a welcome easing of this reduction of access.

2). While we accept the need to reduce 'visual clutter' there are, by my count, some fifteen other signs on the SAR. Most of these are there for convenience not safety (eg. the 11 passing places signs). It does not seem sensible to have no marking on the SAR for the crossing places where there is a clear safety issue. Perhaps road markings or coloured tarmac would suffice.

I have been unable to find the various guidance quoted (CD143, TG10, TSRGD). If you could direct me to where I can find them, I can comment further.

3). We have no issue with the use of the '*maintenance track/bridleway*' for access around the reservoir. The issue is with the parking on, and consequent blocking, of the track. The minimum width of a PRow bridleway is 3m. The track width of 4m leaves little space for obstructions. The Applicants state '*occasional vehicle access may be required for activities such as landscape maintenance elsewhere within the reservoir site*'. They say that parking for such activities will be considered in the *Phase 8* application, while this is *Phase 4*. This part of the maintenance track is in *Phase 4* and it is thus perfectly reasonable to add a restriction that it should not be used for parking for expected maintenance (eg. mowing). *Phase 8* must then provide any needed parking to allow for this restriction.

Note: I raised this issue because previously at a 'stakeholder' meeting a suggestion was made that the maintenance track could be combined with the SAR over that part over which they run adjacent and parallel. This was rejected with the stated reason that the maintenance track would be regularly closed for maintenance work, and this could not be allowed for the SAR.

Peter Westron.

=====

On 01/09/2026 13:57, Narinder Lakhan wrote:

LPA REF APP/25/00425

Dear Peter Westron,

Following your consualtion response the Applicant has come back to your queries/comments as follows, could you let me know if you wish to respond.

Point 1 - Diversion of Bridleway 120

The diverted route of Bridleway 120 is in full accordance with the details set out and approved as part of the hybrid planning permission for the development of Havant Thicket Reservoir.

The permissive bridleway crossing point within Phase 4 has been included specifically to address requests raised by stakeholders regarding the routing and connectivity of the diverted bridleway network. The location of this crossing point has been determined by the need to achieve adequate visibility splays for all users, taking account of the alignment of the Southern Access Road in the vicinity of the Swanmore Road junction. The chosen location also enables use of an existing gap within the site boundary planting, avoiding the need for additional tree removal and maintaining the western wildlife corridor.

The designation of this crossing point as a permissive route reflects the fact that it is being provided as an additional access benefit over and above the formal Bridleway 120 diversion. Whilst the route is proposed as a permissive crossing, rather than a dedicated Public Right of Way, its provision represents a clear enhancement to the recreational access available within and around the reservoir site, as with many other permissive routes around the site.

Irrespective of the above, the approved Reservoir Outline Masterplan includes an access to the reservoir site approximately 100m south of the junction of the Southern Access Road with Swanmore Road, connecting directly with the diverted route of Bridleway 120 which completely avoids the loop indicated to be required in the representation from the Ramblers Association to travel from Swanmore Road to Rowlands Castle. This will be brought forward as part the Phase 7 and 8 Reserved Matters Application.

Therefore, taken as a whole, the Havant Thicket Reservoir development will provide clear enhancements to recreational access across the whole of the reservoir site, including providing enhanced connectivity from Swanmore Road to Rowlands Castle.

Point 2 - Bridleway signage

The proposed signage strategy for the Southern Access Road has sought to achieve an appropriate balance between promoting the safe use of the route and minimising visual clutter within the reservoir landscape. Vehicle movements on the Southern Access Road will be limited, as the primary vehicular access to the reservoir site is provided via the Northern Access Road and, as a result, the level of vehicle activity at the bridleway crossing points is expected to be low.

The proposed bridleway crossing provisions and visibility splays for both bridleway users and vehicles have been reviewed by the Highway Authority and Hampshire Countryside Service against their respective guidance, including CD143 for equestrian crossing provision and TG10 for pedestrians and cyclists, with no concerns raised regarding compliance. The proposed signage and road markings have also been designed in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD). The introduction of the suggested 'Give Way' markings at the crossing points would not be consistent with TSRGD requirements and is therefore not considered appropriate.

In this context, the proposed signage and road markings are considered proportionate to the nature and frequency of vehicle movements anticipated on the Southern Access Road, whilst maintaining the character and appearance of the surrounding environment.

Point 3 - Maintenance track operations

The use of vehicles on the shared maintenance track/bridleway will be carefully managed and limited to occasions where access is required for operational or maintenance purposes. The maintenance track/bridleway is also 4m in width to aid in preventing obstructions for users of the bridleway.

From an operational perspective, the shared maintenance track/bridleway adjacent to the Southern Access Road is provided primarily to facilitate authorised access to the Control House. Maintenance vehicles visiting the Control House will park within the secure Control House courtyard (accessed through locked gates) as confirmed through the Phase 5 - Control House Reserved Matters application. While occasional vehicle access may be required for activities such as landscape maintenance elsewhere within the reservoir site, these activities would be infrequent in nature and would not result in the routine obstruction of the maintenance track/bridleway. Provision for maintenance vehicle parking associated with these areas is being considered through the Phase 8 - Remaining Areas of Landscaping Reserved Matters application, as the relevant areas fall outside the Phase 4 Reserved Matters application boundary.

On this basis, the maintenance track/bridleway is not expected to be subject to regular or routine blockage arising from reservoir operation and maintenance activities.

We trust the above addresses the comments made by the Rambler's Association regarding the bridleway crossing provisions to be provided with the Phase 4 Reserved Matters application and connectivity to the wider bridleway network at the reservoir site. If any further information is required, please let us know.

Regards
Narinder Lakhan