

Helsdon, Karen

From: McMurray, Alistair <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 13 August 2025 15:00
To: Owen, Jason
Cc: Jones, Emma
Subject: RE: Highway Authority response to Western Avenue

Caution: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

No worries Jason –let me know if you need anything further

Alistair McMurray MSc, BSc, CEng, MCIHT, MCILT
Consultant Development Planner

Highways Development Planning
Hampshire County Council | 2nd Floor Elizabeth II Court West | The Castle | Winchester | SO23 8UD



Hampshire County Council operates a pre-application highway advice service for developers. Hampshire County Council welcomes and encourages discussions before a developer submits a planning application. Please follow this link for further information
[Pre-Application guidance for developers](#)

From: Owen, Jason <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 13 August 2025 10:29
To: McMurray, Alistair <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Jones, Emma <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Highway Authority response to Western Avenue

Caution: This is an external email and could contain malicious content. Do not open any links or attachments if you were not expecting them. If the e-mail looks suspicious, please report via the 'Report Phishing' Button found on your toolbar.

Dear Alistair,

Thank you very much for your prompt reply and confirmation on the various matters.

It is great that we have reached a position of agreement on the various points, and I believe we will be ensuring suitable conditions (and timings) of the replacement taxi ranks. One point of clarification, in relation to the final agreement reached on any conditions pursuant to the planning permission, that

would be with the LPA and not the LHA. Very happy to consult you on those details when they arrive but final approval is with the LPA. That does not, of course, change the status or need for any final approval of the LHA in relation to your own consenting process which will be separate to the conditions on the planning permission.

After I sent my email to you I had a brief exchange with the applicant, and they confirmed that they were about to engage with the taxi representatives and there is a 'plan' for their replacement. I also received an explanation of the issues around the junction into Chantry Street and as a result I am, with your confirmation, content to leave that to post-planning.

Kind regards

Jason Owen MRTPI
Development Manager (North)
Planning & Building

Test Valley Borough Council
Beech Hurst
Weyhill Road
Andover
SP10 3AJ



From: McMurray, Alistair <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 August 2025 18:54
To: Owen, Jason <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Jones, Emma <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Highway Authority response to Western Avenue

Caution: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Jason

Following our email discussion this morning, please see my response to you points in red as follows:

1. **Qualitative assessment (paras 2&3)** –does, at the planning stage, the absence of this information have any bearing on the outcome? I note the overall conclusion that the proposal is acceptable to the LHA and no objections are raised, but is this some thing that you would be content to have delivered at the Technical Approval Stage? I'm just conscious that, and by way of example, the LPA's judgement of acceptability in planning terms isn't based on the degree to which the new scheme mitigates "existing risks" i.e. the planning system isn't there to address current 'challenges'. We do have to base our assessment on whether the proposal is acceptable, or using the NPPF risk-language whether the proposal would, following mitigation, lead to a "severe" impact on highways. I'm just wondering if your concern is that

the proposal falls into that ‘severe’ category such that the information is required now, or could reasonably be better addressed at Technical Approval stage. Your thoughts on this would be appreciated?

The purpose of requesting the qualitative safety review was to ensure that the proposed arrangements clearly demonstrate mitigation of known conflict points for vulnerable road users. This is not because the Highway Authority considers the scheme to result in a “severe” impact in NPPF terms, but because the review would help ensure that design measures are targeted effectively. While this information would strengthen the planning submission, I accept that it could be provided at the technical approval stage without prejudice to the planning decision, given the overall conclusion that the proposals are acceptable in highway terms. My recommendation would therefore be to secure its production ensuring it is carried out prior to technical approval.

2. **Active Travel England (para 4)** –no action required. Noted. Thanks.

Agreed

3. **Re-provision of taxi facility (para 6)** – the LPA would be content with the commitment that alternative provision can be found (as set out in the applicant’s statement) and we were contemplating using a condition for both interim and permanent alternative arrangements. When we consult you on those details in due course would you believe that would represent sufficient comfort for the LHA, or would you be looking for further detail on this prior to the grant of planning permission?

A planning condition securing both interim and permanent arrangements, with details to be agreed with the Highway Authority prior to implementation, would be sufficient to address our concern, provided that:

- The condition wording ensures that interim provision is operational prior to any loss of the existing facility.
- The final location and design of both interim and permanent facilities are agreed with the Highway Authority.

4. **Traffic survey data (para 7, 8 and 9)** – I am not clear what the “concern” is in using the data that has been presented and not, subsequently, having the validation evidence you sought. It would be really helpful if I could understand that point further please. That said, if I have read your final sentence of para 9 where you reference that the applicants have referred to, and gained advice from the “ITS team”, it seems to suggest that you are content (or “accepted”) with the evidence presented. If there is further evidence needed then I’m happy to seek that of the applicant but it made sense to me to check the position first. Could you confirm please?

The original concern was that the survey dates fell close to the Easter period, which can sometimes influence travel patterns. While the applicant has confirmed that the ITS team advised on the timing and that the dates are broadly compliant with national guidance, the Highway Authority’s reference to “validation evidence” was intended to confirm representativeness against neutral conditions. Given the ITS team’s involvement and the professional judgement applied, I am satisfied that the dataset can be accepted for planning purposes without further evidence.

5. Sensitivity testing of Western Avenue / West Street (Para 10) – acceptable. Thanks

Agreed

6. Consistent annotation of flare lengths etc (paras 11 & 12) - can I check my understand with you please that further information is not required at planning stage. Any outstanding matters can be picked up at technical approval stage?

Confirmed –this matter can be addressed at the technical approval stage. It is not essential for the determination of the planning application.

7. Visibility splays (potential obstructions –street furniture etc) (para 13) – this is noted and you have also referenced the need for this to be checked at final technical approval stage too. However in planning terms we are not currently approving the exact layout and disposition of street furniture etc that may cause obstructions so it is not something that I would ask for at this stage of the process. However, the LPA would be putting a condition on any grant of planning permission to enable that detail to be refined. Naturally we will ensure that the LHA will be consulted on those final details. The LHA also, as you state, retain control over the siting and heights of those details at a later stage. Is that sufficient please?

I agree that the detailed review of potential obstructions such as street furniture can be undertaken at technical approval stage, with a planning condition securing submission of the final layout for approval. As stated, the Highway Authority retains control over such features on the adopted network and will ensure compliance with visibility requirements during the technical approval process.

8. Right-in movement to Chantry Street (para 14) – I am not wholly aware of what this issue comprises and will ask the applicant to explain this to me in due course. However, you seem to be content this matter can be resolved at the technical approval stage and land dedication (as necessary), so are you content that this falls outside of the planning process to resolve?

Yes –this can be addressed outside of the planning process, with any necessary land dedication or design adjustments being resolved during technical approval. The matter does not require resolution before determination of the planning application.

Thanks

Ali

Alistair McMurray MSc, BSc, CEng, MCIHT, MCILT
Consultant Development Planner

Highways Development Planning

Hampshire County Council | 2nd Floor Elizabeth II Court West | The Castle | Winchester | SO23 8UD



Hampshire County Council operates a pre-application highway advice service for developers.

Hampshire County Council welcomes and encourages discussions before a developer submits a planning application.

Please follow this link for further information

[Pre-Application guidance for developers](#)

From: Owen, Jason <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 August 2025 10:15
To: McMurray, Alistair <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Jones, Emma <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Highway Authority response to Western Avenue
Importance: High

Caution: This is an external email and could contain malicious content. Do not open any links or attachments if you were not expecting them. If the e-mail looks suspicious, please report via the 'Report Phishing' Button found on your toolbar.

Hello Alistair,

I hope you are well and thanks for your most recent response on the additional information. Emma is now on holiday for three weeks and so in the interests of keeping the project moving Emma and I have been working together.

Can I ask a few questions in relation to the points you have raised so that I can best advise how matters might be resolved:

1. **Qualitative assessment (paras 2&3)** –does, at the planning stage, the absence of this information have any bearing on the outcome? I note the overall conclusion that the proposal is acceptable to the LHA and no objections are raised, but is this some thing that you would be content to have delivered at the Technical Approval Stage? I'm just conscious that, and by way of example, the LPA's judgement of acceptability in planning terms isn't based on the degree to which the new scheme mitigates "existing risks" i.e. the planning system isn't there to address current 'challenges'. We do have to base our assessment on whether the proposal is acceptable, or using the NPPF risk-language whether the proposal would, following mitigation, lead to a "severe" impact on highways. I'm just wondering if your concern is that the proposal falls into that 'severe' category such that the information is required now, or could reasonably be better addressed at Technical Approval stage. Your thoughts on this would be appreciated?
2. **Active Travel England (para 4)** –no action required. Noted. Thanks.
3. **Re-provision of taxi facility (para 6)** – the LPA would be content with the commitment that alternative provision can be found (as set out in the applicant's statement) and we were contemplating using a condition for both interim and permanent alternative arrangements. When we consult you on those details in due course would you believe that would represent sufficient comfort for the LHA, or would you be looking for further detail on this prior to the grant of planning permission?
4. **Traffic survey data (para 7, 8 and 9)** – I am not clear what the "concern" is in using the data that has been presented and not, subsequently, having the validation evidence you sought. It would be really helpful if I could understand that point further please. That said, if I have read your final sentence of para 9 where you reference that the applicants have referred to, and gained advice from the "ITS team", it seems to suggest that you are content (or "accepted")

with the evidence presented. If there is further evidence needed then I'm happy to seek that of the applicant but it made sense to me to check the position first. Could you confirm please?

5. **Sensitivity testing of Western Avenue / West Street (Para 10)** – acceptable. Thanks
6. **Consistent annotation of flare lengths etc ... (paras 11 & 12)** - can I check my understand with you please that further information is not required at planning stage. Any outstanding matters can be picked up at technical approval stage?
7. **Visibility splays (potential obstructions –street furniture etc) (para 13)** – this is noted and you have also referenced the need for this to be checked at final technical approval stage too. However in planning terms we are not currently approving the exact layout and disposition of street furniture etc that may cause obstructions so it is not something that I would ask for at this stage of the process. However, the LPA would be putting a condition on any grant of planning permission to enable that detail to be refined. Naturally we will ensure that the LHA will be consulted on those final details. The LHA also, as you state, retain control over the siting and heights of those details at a later stage. Is that sufficient please?
8. **Right-in movement to Chantry Street (para 14)** – I am not wholly aware of what this issue comprises and will ask the applicant to explain this to me in due course. However, you seem to be content this matter can be resolved at the technical approval stage and land dedication (as necessary), so are you content that this falls outside of the planning process to resolve?

I hope this is helpful Alistair but if you need to have chat please feel free to give me a call. We are starting to pull the final report for a submission to Committee together and your advice on these points would be helpful to enable both the LPA and the applicant to focus our attention to the most pertinent and relevant (to planning) matters.

Best wishes
Jason

Jason Owen MRTPI
Development Manager (North)
Planning & Building
[REDACTED]
Test Valley Borough Council
Beech Hurst
Weyhill Road
Andover
SP10 3AJ



The information in this e-mail is confidential. The content may not be disclosed or used by anyone other than the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the Council's Data Protection Administrator immediately on 01264 368000. Test Valley Borough Council cannot accept any responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of this message as it has been transmitted over a public network. If you suspect that the message may have been intercepted or amended, please call the Data Protection Administrator on the above phone number. The content of this e-mail, whether marked confidential or otherwise, may have to be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. No

employee, Councillor or agent is authorised to conclude by e-mail any binding agreement with another party on behalf of Test Valley Borough Council. The Council does not accept service by e-mail of court proceedings, other processes or formal notices of any kind without specific prior written agreement. The information in this e-mail is confidential. The content may not be disclosed or used by anyone other than the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the Council's Data Protection Administrator immediately on 01264 368000. Test Valley Borough Council cannot accept any responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of this message as it has been transmitted over a public network. If you suspect that the message may have been intercepted or amended, please call the Data Protection Administrator on the above phone number. The content of this e-mail, whether marked confidential or otherwise, may have to be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. No employee, Councillor or agent is authorised to conclude by e-mail any binding agreement with another party on behalf of Test Valley Borough Council. The Council does not accept service by e-mail of court proceedings, other processes or formal notices of any kind without specific prior written agreement.