

Eastleigh Borough Council
Eastleigh House
Upper Market Street
Eastleigh
SO50 9YN

*Economy, Transport and Environment Department
Elizabeth II Court West, The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD*

Tel: 0300 555 1375 (General Enquiries)
0300 555 1388 (Roads and Transport)
0300 555 1389 (Recycling Waste & Planning)
Textphone 0300 555 1390
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries To Matt Grantham

My reference 046700

Direct Line

Your reference F/22/93160

Date 2 August 2022

Email eastleighdc@hants.gov.uk

Dear Mrs Martin,

Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill, Bursledon, Southampton, SO31 8AU

Mixed use development comprising veterinary surgery and 16no. dwellings with vehicular access off Providence Hill and associated car parking, cycle storage, sustainable drainage system, sub station, hard and soft landscaping, acoustic fencing and pedestrian/ cycle links to Providence Hill.

In regard to application F/22/93160, further to the initial HCC consultation response issued on 13 July 2022, it is noted that a Transport Statement has now been uploaded onto the EBC Planning Portal which covers many of the issues previously raised.

These issues are covered below.

Site Access:

It is proposed that access to the site will be via a simple priority junction onto Providence Hill, which is a replication of that proposed under withdrawn application O/17/80899, which was agreed in principle, subject to verification and approval via the S278 process.

Whilst adequate visibility splays are achievable, and an independent Road Safety Audit raised no issue in this regard, it is noted that no two-way vehicle tracking has been provided to show how two-way movements can be achieved through the access junction particularly for a refuse vehicle and a car accessing and egressing at the same

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

time. Due to the flows on the A27 Providence Hill, it is likely that this will be a requirement of the S278 process, as a passing pause would not be welcomed on highway safety grounds.

Onwards, it is noted that amendments have been made to plans to now incorporate footways into the site, linking up to those already existing on Providence Hill, and tactile paving has been proposed to formulate a safe crossing pedestrian point.

As outlined in the previous HCC Highways consultation comment however, there are plans to provide an off-road cycle link along Providence Hill, which would be fronting the site. As such, depending on the timescales of development (if planning permission is approved), it may be that the cycle scheme has progressed to a level that the access junction needs to be amended during the S278 process. Any amendments would also need to consider how the internal footways will link onto the pedestrian / cycle route potentially with upgrades required.

Trip Impact:

Concerns were previously raised in regard to the potential trip rates associated with the residential and commercial development proposed, and the suitability of the access junction to accommodate the level of vehicle flow without impacting on the A27 Providence Hill.

Relevant information, in the form of a Transport statement, has now been uploaded to the EBC Planning Portal, and this information has been reviewed accordingly.

Utilising the TRICS database of traffic surveys, it has been projected that the residential element of development will generate estimated vehicle movements of 2 arrivals and 6 departures in the AM peak period (08:00-09:00) and 5 arrivals and 3 departures in the PM peak (17:00-18:00) respectively. These figures are considered agreeable.

In terms of vehicle trips generated by the commercial element, the Veterinary Surgery, whilst the TRICS database was reviewed it was ascertained that no comparable site existed. As such, trip rate information was derived from a potential future user of the site.

This projected data has been reviewed, is considered reasonable and robust, and outlines trip data suggesting that 9 Staff will be employed on site at any one time, 3 of which would be vets, and that between 6 and 8 clients would arrive across an average hour. For the peak trip periods, it is therefore suggested that vehicle trip rates would be approximately 13 arrivals and 0 departures in the AM Peak period and 8 arrivals and 9 departures during the PM Peak period.

Combined, this would result in a total development trip rate of:

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

- 15 arrivals and 6 departures across the AM Peak period; and
- 13 arrivals and 12 departures across the PM Peak period.

In terms of potential highway impact, it is the arrivals in to the proposed development site that would be most concerning, given the potential to disrupt vehicle flow on the A27 Providence Hill whilst a vehicle waited to turn right into site across a moving lane.

Having now ascertained projected trip rates in the peak hours however, it is thought unlikely that the additional vehicle movements will have a disruptive impact, certainly not severe. Whilst the peak of arrivals would be 15 in the AM Peak period, the reality is that these trips would be split by arrival direction with a proportion turning unobstructed left into site, whilst the remainder would turn right and potentially stop traffic flows. However, as a worst case scenario, even if all 15 projected vehicle arrivals were to access site with a right hand turn, this would equate to 1 vehicle every 4 minutes across a peak hour which would be acceptable.

Internal Layout:

At the present time, it is unclear whether the roads and footways relating to this application / discharge of condition are being put forward for adoption by the developer. However, an assessment of the submitted drawings has been undertaken accordingly and the following comments are made:

1. Internal visibility splays of 2.4 x 18.0m have been demonstrated on plans, and this is appropriate for an anticipated 15mph vehicle speed. However, for S38 adoption purposes, HCC requires a 20mph vehicle design speed and appropriate visibility splays of 2.4 x 25.0m. Developers may wish to consider this requirement if an adoption request is likely.
2. Vehicle tracking diagrams have been produced for cars, refuse and emergency vehicles, and these have been reviewed. Whilst adequate space exists internally for two cars to pass, no such drawings have been provided to show that there is adequate space for a refuse vehicle and a car to pass each other. These are required to demonstrate that such movements can be achieved without the need to mount footways or similar. A request for such drawings is therefore made.
3. The parking layout of the site appears generally acceptable, with adequately sized bays and 6.0m aisle distances. However, any space against either landscaping or a vertical obstruction should be afforded an additional 0.3m step out strip to ease user movement in and out of the vehicle. Additionally, spaces such as that marked '13' on plans should have a footway edging the non-roadside of the vehicle to enable access for all users.
4. Due to several areas of the site potentially not being directly accessible to refuse vehicles due to the lack of turning head and elongated reversing movement or bin pull,

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

it would be recommended that the Case Officer liaises with the EBC Direct Services Team in regard to the potential for a bin collection point provision around the site to ease collection times.

5. No details of levels have been submitted, so this element has not been reviewed. However, this will need to be fully assessed as part of a future S278 / S38 should a permission be granted.
6. The provision of additional footways internal to the site should be investigated to prevent the need to walk in roads, or in the case of the Veterinary Surgery, through the car park, when simple footways to the rear of parking spaces 9-19 would prevent this.
7. The provision of street lighting has not been shown on plans, and this would of course be required for security and safety reasons.
8. The potential for added permeability for the site should also be investigated, such as a pedestrian / cycle route through to Goslings Turning or Oakley Vale.
9. Parking quantum's have not been assessed as this is a function for EBC as Local Parking Authority. However, it is noted that there is a lack of cycle parking, particularly for the Veterinary Surgery.

However, it should be noted that these 'planning application' consultee comments have been made utilising the plans submitted. Should adoption be required, the S38 process will still need to be undertaken in addition to any planning approval that may be granted by the Local Planning Authority, and the details of this process can be found via the following link - <https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards>. This process will require additional information to that submitted to date, and require formal engineering drawings for assessment which may result in updates to the layout being required. As such, it is recommended that the developer engage with the S38 team at their earliest convenience.

Should adoption not be required, then whilst HCC would not object to the proposals, it would be advisable that the developer ensures that the roads and footways are designed to minimum industry standards and / or Hampshire County Council's best practice as set out in <https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards>. An appropriate Private Management Plan is put in place to deal with any future issues. Developers should also be made aware of the Advanced Payment Code (APC) that will be required by the Highway Authority. Details of this can be found via the following link - <http://documents.hants.gov.uk/transport/APCProcess-Guidancedocumentforwebsitev22018-04-02.pdf>

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

Given the above consultation comments, whilst there would be no objection in principle to the application, it would be requested that the additional vehicle tracking drawings are supplied, and that the Case officer considers other comments such as the additional footway and refuse collection points prior to a positive decision being issued.

Additionally, should a positive decision be forthcoming, the following conditions would be requested:

CONSTRUCTION METHOD STATEMENT REQUIRED

No development shall start on site until a construction method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority, which shall include:

- (a) A programme of and phasing of demolition (if any) and construction work;
- (b) The provision of long term facilities for contractor parking;
- (c) The arrangements for deliveries associated with all construction works;
- (d) Methods and phasing of construction works;
- (e) Access and egress for plant and machinery;
- (f) Protection of pedestrian routes during construction;
- (g) Location of temporary site buildings, compounds, construction material, and plant storage areas;
- (h) Details of the methodology for ensuring dirt is not transferred onto the highway from the site (i.e. wheel washers), and onwards mitigation should this fail, such as the employment of mechanical road sweepers, and the subsequent refresh of street lining (as and when required) should this be damaged during the process.

Demolition and construction work shall only take place in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason - In order that the Planning Authority can properly consider the effect of the works on the amenity of the locality.

PARKING PROVISION

Before use of the development is commenced provision for parking shall have been made within the site in accordance with the approved plans and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason - To ensure adequate on-site car parking provision for the approved development.

Yours sincerely,

Matt Grantham

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI