

## Petersfield Spine Project

### TECHNICAL TRANSPORT STUDY FOR PETERSFIELD TOWN

*Undertaken for Petersfield Town Council by Hampshire County Council Strategic Transport  
July 2018. Document reference: HF16349937. DRAFT v1*

Petersfield Society Highways and Transport Group has examined the Transport Study Draft v1 and its 23 Appendices and make the following initial comments.

- The report is much as we would have expected with few surprises. It is all going in the right direction, but we would appreciate a discussion with HCC to query some issues.

The study appears both extensive and well researched. We particularly appreciated the sections relating to cycling which have surely been written by a cyclist.

- Page 43 Table 2 Summary of recent development applications. Very interesting to see works put against the contributions. Are these confirmed, because they are worth discussion, did the Society know about these?
- Page 51 para 1. There is a "Safety Scheme" planned for 2019/20 on Rams Hill at Hogarth Close. What is it?
- Page 54 Section 9.2 para 4. Restricted parking on Tor Way for up to 3 hours - where is this?
- Parking - Use of PTC car parks off Love Lane and the Avenue for wider use by members of the public. This is not right because functions and events at these locations require their own dedicated parking.
- The report does not favour a deck at the train station car park and concludes that only the Tesco car park should be decked. This is not right as the aim must be to keep railway commuters out of the town centre car parks and encourage them to park at the station. This car park should have spare capacity so as to encourage off peak travellers to use the station car park.
- There is no allowance for increased long term parking due to the increasing size of the population.
- There appears to be confusion in the report over the name of the length of road between Tor Way and the High Street. It is College Street not Dragon Street. Page 65 para 2 line 5.
- Pedestrian Routes Figure 28 page 59. Important crossing points are not shown - the controlled crossing at the south end of Tor Way and the uncontrolled crossing outside The Square Brewery (potentially very dangerous but it is used as a crossing point and has the kerbs etc to indicate).
- Junction capacities Page 73 and 88, "Charles Street and Station Road junction" is mentioned twice in the lists, one of them should be Charles Street and Lavant Street" I suggest. "The Spain / The Spain" could have been described better.
- Cycling page 83. Counting cyclists across all the sites gives a false idea of numbers as the same person can be counted on a number of occasions. This should be mentioned. Apparently 12% of the cyclists were riding on the footway - why is that, in a town centre location page 83 last line.
- The junction of Station Road with the station forecourt is hardly mentioned. This is the end of the spine as shown on page 12 figure 4 and is a very dangerous junction right next to the level crossing. It does need further consideration.
- The junctions between Charles Street, Station Road, Woodcroft Mews (office plus 6 dwellings with 4 more dwellings planned), Station Forecourt and Railway Level Crossing (with more trains per hour planned), Lidl and Majestic Wines Access, Penns Road, Petersfield Social Club entrance (plus dwellings), Methodist and Catholic Churches (with public parking), Tilmore Road and Chapel Street do not appear to have been considered as one extended junction congested at times of level crossing closure by up to 60 vehicles including delivery trucks serving particularly Tesco Express. This is an omission.

- There is no mention of the fact that at certain times of the day (notably around 3pm to 4pm) there are large numbers of school children walking through the town often in the direction of the railway station. Section 4.4. I would question some of the remarks about the bus stops in the centre of town the one outside Oxfam seems particularly badly placed.

- The statement (p29) “National Express operates a coach service between Portsmouth and London, calling at Petersfield several times daily” is misleading – there are only two a day.

- The remarks about the number of taxis outside the railway station are certainly appropriate. We observed on 9th of August considerable congestion as a result of the number of taxis parked.

- There is no reference to the cycleway signs provided by Sustrans and others outside the railway station.

- We question the remarks about traffic on Frenchman’s Road (p 30) which is certainly used to avoid delays caused by the level crossing. However, the junction by the forge is so difficult to turn from that the traffic flow is necessary impeded which could affect the numbers recorded.

- There is no specific reference to the positioning of the controlled pedestrian crossings in the town. We would have thought this was pertinent to the study.

- The references to home working (p39) were taken in the year 2011 and the use of devices that enable homeworking has increased considerably since then.

• The report rightly identifies shop deliveries as a key problem since many shops do not have rear access for deliveries. It is also difficult to see any reasonable solution to this particular problem.

- The reference in the EHDC reports to levelling car parking charges in the town centre with those at the railway station may be difficult to effect in practice as many of the cars parked at the railway station are for people working in London and enjoying the relatively high salaries experienced there. The nature of their parking (all day) is also different. Some consideration might be given to the problems of parking for local workers.

- The reference to the signage needed for the town’s Car Parks is a good one and one that could be affected relatively quickly and at little cost.

- We question some of the statements made about the Festival Hall car park which is difficult to access and not very evident to strangers. Although the adjacent crossing provides good walking access to the town thereafter the pedestrian way is messy whichever route is taken.

- The references to the Love Lane car park make no mention of its use by persons attending events at the Community Centre. The car park at the Community Centre itself does not appear in the study at all so far as we can ascertain.

- Despite the otherwise good cycling notes the report makes no specific reference to electric bicycles and their impact. Only today a retired Doctor told us it is quicker for him to travel from Liss to Steep by electric bicycle than by car.

- The good use of language occasionally slips - Car represents the highest proportion of casualties, followed by cycle, pedestrian and motorcycle. Should presumably read “Car accidents represent the highest proportion of casualties, followed by cyclists, pedestrians and motorcyclists.” However, it might be better if it was made clear whether it is occupants being referred to or all persons affected by an accident involving a car.

## Appendices

### General Comments

The appendices provide a great deal of detailed information backing up the report. Some difficulty experienced in understanding the information they provide.

### Specific comments:

No	Title	Comment
1	Google Traffic	Impressive technology to show traffic flow in town.
2	Level X Down Time	Indicates that down time is around 30% of the total time !
3	Level X High Level	Misleading title – it’s Frenchman’s road traffic flow – and does seem to prove that it is not used as a “rat run” when the gates are down.
4	Pet Soc Letter	Refers to taxis – which are not mentioned in report?
5	Cycling UK Response +Appendix	Excellent detailed response but comparison with Chichester bit doubtful – it is flat – Petersfield area is not
6	2011 Census analysis	Bit dated – 7 years ago
7	Datashine Maps	Didn’t understand these
8	Datashine Commuting Analysis	Not sure what these are telling me
9	Business Survey Template	Makes the point very strongly that day time deliveries will be a major problem for the Plan.
10	Personal Injury Plot	Summary good - Police statistics back up difficult to follow.
11	High St Parking	Lot of illegal parking even when parking space available
12	Town Centre Parking	Good detailed analysis
13	Audit – walking routes	Good but does not draw attention to the lack of paths within car parks. You mix with the motors.
14	Love Lane / Avenue car park surveys	Car parks mostly underused
15	Cycle Parking	Clearly demonstrates ad-hoc nature of cycle parking
16	Motor vehicle counts and realignment	Extensive figures which need careful consideration to establish their significance in realigning traffic.
X 17?	ID Assessment of through traffic	Again, extensive figures which need careful consideration.
18	Pedestrian Count	Easily understood figures.
19	Pedestrian Survey	Standard street survey on people’s transport and reason for visit to Petersfield centre.
20	Pedestrian Audit	Very comprehensive examination of pedestrian routes
21	Cycle Counts	Straightforward cycle count in different places
X 22?	Cycle Audit	Indicates “Cycling level of Service” – how easy/ safe is it?
23	Audit of Wayfinding	Shows pedestrian signage in town