

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	061426
Direct Line	N/A	Your reference	APP/26/00453
Date	11 September 2026	Email	havantdc@hants.gov.uk

For attention of Ms K Taylor

Dear Sirs

**Re: APP/26/00453 At Plot 6 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 11,535sqm of flexible B2/B8 commercial provision with ancillary office uses. To support this planning application a Transport Assessment (TA) ref 273.0003b/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.

Director of Universal Services
Patrick Blogg

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.

The new NPPF published in August 2026 will be relevant when determining this application.

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	85thile 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. 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 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.

Several informal routes from Park Lane onto the stub access road to plot 400 and Fitzwygram Way have been identified which fall 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.150m to the southeast 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.600m 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 would benefit from modernisation. 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.

Plot 600 Access and PRow Interaction

Plot 600 is to be accessed via an extension of the existing unnamed link road currently serving Unit 5 in the form of a new junction. The extent of the access road to be delivered to provide access into the site should be outlined and secured as part of this planning consent.

The Highway Authority have significant design concerns with the interaction of the access and the crossing point and its ability to operate in a safe and suitable manner. The proximity of the crossing to the give-way line does not allow enough room for an incoming vehicle to wait in order to give way to bridleway users should they be crossing. A vehicle waiting would also be partially overhanging the main access road, protruding beyond the junction. Likewise, a vehicle exiting would block the crossing when giving way at the junction. The location of the crossing, regardless of the form, is not considered acceptable due to this operational safety issues.

Furthermore, TA57/87 Chapter 11.2.6 is clear that bridleway crossings should be at a right angle to the carriageway, which has not been demonstrated here. This is influenced by the alignment of the proposed access road and the existing alignment of the PRow. This would need to be addressed when considering a revised crossing arrangement as discussed further below. 3.0m shared use footway/cycleways are proposed east of the crossing providing access to plot 600. Whilst these are welcomed, this needs to be consistent and co-ordinated with the existing stub access road. Notwithstanding any comments made under the Plot 400 application, it is considered necessary that the footway on the eastern side of the stub is widened to 3.0m to provide consistent and cohesive cycle infrastructure to connect into Fitzwygram Way to the south.

The access arrangements require crossing of the Park Lane Bridleway. The TA notes that a diversion was considered but discounted due to feedback from the Ramblers. Instead, a Pegasus crossing is proposed as shown within drawing DP-PB-400-GF-DR-Z-1001 Rev P02. Visibility splays and tracking of this crossing are shown within drawing DP-PB-400-GF-DR-Z-1003 Rev P01 and DP-PB-400-GF-DR-Z-1002 Rev P01 respectively.

It is not considered that a Pegasus crossing is necessary and that the design is not suitable. In summary the following operational and highway safety concerns are raised:

- Non-compliant geometry with TA57, HCC TG4-1 and TG4-2

- Insufficient available width to allow for safe and suitable movement of HGVs
- The crossing presented is a Puffin Crossing and not a Pegasus. Regardless, a Pegasus crossing would be physically constrained given existing constraints
- Insufficient crossing demand for controlled infrastructure
- Ongoing maintenance and liability concerns given the crossing would sit partly on highway and private land.

In accordance with Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 6 22.1, TA57/87 chapter 11.2.6, and the flows associated with the development would suggest that uncontrolled crossing provision would be acceptable. A discussion with the applicant is welcomed to discuss and agree an appropriate access and crossing solution.

Stage One Road Safety Audit (RSA1):

Given access into this plot requires alterations to an adopted highway (PRoW) a Stage One Road Safety Audit should be submitted along with a designer's response.

Individual Unit Access Points

Direct access into both units is proposed off this spur road with 4 access points in total. Each unit comprises a separate loading bay and car park access. Geometric details are lacking and should be provided, however narrative on widths has been provided within the TA aside from the width of the north-eastern spur. A separate geometric plan should be provided for ease.

Visibility:

Visibility splays of 2.4m x 27.0m are shown within drawings DP-PB-ZZ-GF-DR-Z-1002 Rev P01 and DP-PB-ZZ-GF-DR-Z-1003 Rev P01 commensurate with TG3 for a 20mph design speed. This is acceptable.

Swept Path Analysis:

Drawings DP-PB-100-GF-DR-Z-1006 Rev P01 and DP-PB-100-GF-DR-Z-1008 Rev P01 outlines swept path analysis for two 4.6t light vans passing simultaneously at both car park accesses and an HGV accessing the loading areas. Drawing DP-PB-ZZ-GF-DR-Z-1010 Rev P01 outlines the ability for two 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-1007 and DP-PB-100-GF-DR-Z-1009 Rev P01 respectively

The Highway Authority are content that access for all vehicles can be accommodated. 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 the size of plot have been built under the extant planning application has been undertaken. The trip rates and associated trip generation agreed under this consent for the most trip intensive use being sought for consent (B2) are as follows:

	AM Peak 08:00-09:00		PM Peak 17:00-18:00	
	Arr.	Dept.	Arr.	Dept.
Previously Agreed Trip Rate	0.679	0.315	0.168	0.526
Previously Agreed Trip Generation (11,535m ²)	78	36	20	61

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:

<u>B2</u>	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 (11,535m ²)	39	4	8	31
Net change	-39	-32	-12	-30
<u>B8 Parcel Distribution</u>	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 (11,535m ²)	55	55	48	74
Net change	-23	+19	+28	+13

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 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 41 trips 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 19 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 led 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 111 sustainable transport users (13 cycle, 44 pedestrian and 54 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 273.0003/FTP/2) must be assessed in accordance with latest policy and guidance, including updates to Hampshire's Travel Plan Guidance in 2025. The Highway Authority have reviewed this travel plan and have the following comments to make.

Section 1 – Introduction:

Reference to Unit 400 should be removed throughout this travel plan and any documents within the Appendices.

Section 4 – Site Audit Existing:

This section should contain reference to the Nearest (or relevant) train station with timetable information provided within an Appendix.

Section 6 – Measures:

There are some additional measures which should be considered for inclusion within this FTP.

- Walking – Promotion of safe local walking groups including provision of a route map
- Cycling – Provision of a cycle route map, formation of a Bicycle Users Group (BUG), assistance to staff in accessing information about safe cycling, appropriate clothing, local cycle routes etc. and bike service stations (staff and visitors)
- Public Transport Vouchers - Staff should be offered a South Hants 7 Day MegaRider ticket which allows travel from across Portsmouth, Havant, Waterlooville and Hayling Island. As unit occupier, type of business and number of staff are not known at this time, the travel plan should assume 250 based the number of parking spaces outlined in paragraph 3.3.
- Marketing and Promotion: This section should include provision of information to all, visitors and staff on how to access the site by means other than the car through a variety of methods, including notice boards. Additionally, information packs for new recruits to be updated

annually, staff feedback sessions and advertising to Advertising TP to staff through recruitment, e.g. how to get there for interview and on the website should be included.

Section 8 – Monitoring:

A monitoring timetable should be provided as laid out within the Travel Plan Guidance. Measures to ensure that this response rate is met e.g. a voucher or a supermarket or online retailer should be provided.

Summary:

The FTP will require 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 (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