

Meeting Notes

Petersfield Operational Group (POG)

As part of the Place-Making Governance for Petersfield

Date	Tuesday 19 th January 2021
Time	01.30 – 03.00pm
Venue	Conference call via Microsoft Teams
Attendees	EHDC – Danielle Friedman-Brown (<i>Chair</i>) EHDC – Sarah-Jane Bellis (<i>Meeting notes</i>) EHDC – Julie McLatch EHDC – Lucy Whittle EHDC – Emma Baxter EHDC – Matthew Fisk EHDC – Alison Mills HCC – Brandon Breen HCC – Claire Whitehouse HCC - Debs McManus HCC – Karen Wright HCC – Nicola Waight HCC – Olu Ashiru PTC – Neil Hitch PTC Walking & Cycling Working Group - Gethin Morgan–Owen PS - Keith Hopper SDNPA – Chris Paterson SDNPA – Gill Welsman
Apologies	EHDC - Sarah Hobbs EHDC – Michelle Day PTC – Steve Field HCC – Simon Cramp EHDC – Lewis Ford

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Item</i>
1.	<p>Introductions and apologies</p> <p>Danielle welcomed the group and introductions / apologies were made see above.</p>
2.	<p>Meeting notes and actions from the last meeting</p> <p>The meeting notes from the last meeting were discussed and no comments were received. A revised action log has been provided as part of these meeting notes (see below).</p>
3.	<p>Petersfield Strategy Group (PSG) Update</p> <p>It was raised that the group needs to co-ordinate and consider an overall strategy and gives us an overall aim / focus.</p> <p>There followed a discussion on this and it might be more like a framework, guided by core objectives that can help prioritise work between varying types of schemes.</p> <p>This could be done by the group itself, or by consultants.</p>
4.	<p>Update on Covid Active Travel Emergency Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tranche 1 <p>Review completed. Safety audit has no issues, just not 100% compliance on bus gate. Problems known and acknowledged. Looking to overcome them in tranche 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tranche 2 <p>Active Travel Funding for Bus Gate in Town Centre. The key is making the bus gate a more permanent aspect with the aim to reduce traffic through the town centre. There is an issue of enforcement, there will be no camera. However, there will be more signage and it will be monitored. The gate will be formalised by signing and perhaps something more robust like planters. Will need to consult with the police and emergency services, who would prefer something self-enforcing and consider maintenance and public good will. It is a tricky balancing act.</p> <p>It was raised that HGV access needs to be considered to the town centre for the premises within the gate. In response the gate prohibits any vehicle except buses & emergency services. Delivery vehicles will have access via alternative routes. As of yet there have been no reports of complaints.</p> <p>What are the timescales? In response it was said that the designs are to be drafted, then consult initially with stakeholders, then after consultation re look at the design. Timescales are tight, like to start mid-February for consultation. Then onto the end of March to order the schemes. The aim is to consult imminently. It's an extended temporary scheme.</p> <p>HCC would like to do rigorous consultation. They will need a list of stakeholders.</p>

Ref.	Item
	<p>It was remarked that it would be useful to include the Royal Mail, HSBC and Lloyds Bank and that they need to consider people with no internet access.</p> <p>It was also suggested that HCC use existing resident groups for those hard to access info online. The group could help with adding contacts to consultation list.</p> <p>It would be an idea to put notice up at vaccination centres and perhaps radio advertisements? Notices could also be put up in the Library and Festival Hall when reopen, and possibly pubs when they re-open and if it fits in the time frame for the consultation.</p> <p>ACTION: SJ to send around the stakeholder list to the POG group and PTC to add/amend details.</p>
5.	<p>Mapping of Petersfield Projects</p> <p>Mat Fisk updated the group on the mapping work he is currently doing. For the LCWIP, including bikability study to be transcribed into mapping system, onto a mapping website, where it will be access for all, public website, hosted by EHDC.</p> <p>A similar map for Petersfield projects – seems like a good idea, if it can be interactive, pin comments?</p> <p>There was a discussion on interactive mapping examples; Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan used Lithograph, although there is probably more advanced software now. This was done by a consultant and cost a bit of money but was well received.</p> <p>HCC could do it using Common Place as they have a licence for a year.</p> <p>The maps shown (Where I live example) could be just right for the strategy work. GIS information would be very useful from a S106 projects perspective.</p> <p>Gethin: Frustrated with lack of maps. He has drawn up his own maps on cycle routes. Perhaps for ongoing discussion these maps would be useful. Current maps are not completely accurate and need to be further refined. Requested Jpeg of bikability map from Mat Fisk.</p> <p>The discussion was concluded as something the group will come back to. We need to refine what we want and need them for, which can be discussed at future meetings.</p> <p>ACTION: Mat Fisk to share Jpeg of Bikability Study map with Gethin.</p>
6.	<p>Petersfield Projects Master Spreadsheet Priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next steps to present to PSG <p>There was a discussion on the priorities spreadsheet circulated prior to the meeting and how we move forward, now there are some projects that the Strategy Group wanted officers to pursue. The initial work would be to assess the identified priorities and considerations to take them forward, including available funding and contribution to wider aims for movement around the town.</p> <p>The resource to take forward that work, and how it could be commissioned was discussed. The work on all the projects identified can be done in parallel before further prioritisation. Should also include public consultation in the work.</p> <p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities:

Ref.	Item
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EHDC and HCC (Olu) to draft a brief. HCC Traded Services to then advise on the timing and availability for the work. • Aim to get the work going as soon as possible. Need to schedule a meeting to agree the scope of the work. Once the scope of the work is agreed HCC suggest a workshop on each junction to refine the brief. Also suggested a joint working arrangement best option for commission. • EHDC as the client role and the lead place making authority on this. However, it is important to give opportunity for others to be involved. <p>ACTION: HCC to advise on timing and availability of scoping the work.</p> <p>ACTION: HCC (Olu) to assist EHDC on writing brief.</p> <p>ACTION: Brief to be drafted as soon as possible.</p> <p>ACTION: Work scoping meeting to be scheduled.</p>
7.	<p>Petersfield Partner Updates</p> <p>SDNPA: Good progress being made with map boards and heritage projects coming forward.</p> <p>PTC: Doing an extension to the project on map boards and finger posts. Festival Hall project not moved further forward, still investigating ways to improve the lighting rigging using the allocated S106 funds. Toilet block on the Heath to be taken forward later this year, starting with a feasibility study.</p> <p>HCC: No updates.</p> <p>EHDC: No updates.</p>
8.	<p>AOB</p> <p>No other business was raised.</p>

Action Log:

Action	Who	Red, Amber or Green	Progress
ADMIN			
Organise a central repository of important documents.	HCC, EHDC & PTC Officers	A	Ongoing
COMMUNICATIONS			
Develop a Petersfield Place-Making webpage.	PTC Officer	A	To be set up once the Petersfield Stakeholder Group (PShG) has been established.
Develop a Petersfield Place-Making logo.	PTC Officer	A	To be developed once the Petersfield Stakeholder Group (PShG) has been established.
Finalise Petersfield Place-Making Report.	EHDC Officer	A	In progress.
Explore development of an interactive neighbourhood plan / place-making map with EHDC Data & Intelligence Team.	EHDC, SDNPA & PTC Officers	A	Ongoing
TRANSPORT, MOVEMENT & ACCESS			
Share information on costs and funding available.	HCC Officer	A	Ongoing
Keep group updated on GIS layers.	EHDC Officer	A	Ongoing
Jpeg of Bikability map to be sent to Gethin.	EHDC Officer	A	Ongoing
Send to POG group stakeholder contacts list for review, for HCC tranche 2 public engagement	EHDC Officer	A	Ongoing
PETERSFIELD PLACE-MAKING MASTER SPREADSHEET			
Inform LF/SJB which s106 contributions need to be spent first to avoid clawback.	SDNPA Officer	A	Ongoing

Action	Who	Red, Amber or Green	Progress
Send LF/SJB the 2019 accident data and google map links to project locations.	HCC Officer	A	Ongoing
Inception meeting to be scheduled	HCC / EHDC Officer	A	Ongoing
Asist in writing framework brief	HCC / EHDC Officer	A	Ongoing

Meeting Notes

Petersfield Strategy Group (PSG)

As part of the Place-Making Governance for Petersfield

Date	Friday 29 th January 2021
Time	12.30pm – 14.00pm
Venue	Conference Call via Microsoft Teams
Attendees	EHDC – Cllr Robert Mocatta (<i>Chair</i>) EHDC – Cllr Ben Bentley EHDC – Cllr Julie Butler EHDC – Cllr David McKinney EHDC – Cllr Matthew Gass EHDC - Danielle Friedman-Brown (<i>Deputy Chair</i>) EHDC – Lewis Ford (<i>Meeting Notes</i>) EHDC – Sarah-Jane Bellis EHDC – Georgia Loud EHDC – Emma Baxter EHDC – Kirsty Cope HCC – Cllr Russell Oppenheimer HCC – Simon Cramp HCC – Olu Ashiru HCC – Claire Whitehouse PTC – Cllr Peter Bisset PTC – Neil Hitch SDNPA – Cllr Doug Jones SDNPA – Chris Paterson Keith Hopper Gethin Morgan-Owen
Apologies	Damian Hinds MP

Ref.	Item
1.	<p>Introductions and apologies</p> <p>Cllr Mocatta welcomed the group and explained that the aim for 2021 was to start delivering the identified priority projects using Section 106 (s106) developer contributions.</p>
2.	<p>Notes from last meeting, actions and feedback</p> <p>The meeting notes from the last meeting were discussed and no comments were received.</p> <p>The actions from the last meeting were discussed and updates provided; a revised action log has been provided as part of these meeting notes (see below).</p>
3.	<p>Petersfield Sports Provision (Love Lane)</p> <p>The EHDC Open Space, Sports & Recreation Study was published in 2018 and includes the following strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EHDC Open Space Strategy; • EHDC Sports Facilities Strategy; and • EHDC Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS). <p>The Study can be found on EHDC's website here: https://www.easthants.gov.uk/open-space-sports-and-recreation-study</p> <p>The EHDC Local Football Facilities Plan (LFFP) was produced in collaboration with the Football Association (FA) and all local football clubs with 10 or more teams. The LFFP took forward the key strategic football priorities in the PPS (2018) and was finalised in late 2020. It can be found here: https://localplans.footballfoundation.org.uk/local-authorities-index/east-hampshire/east-hampshire-local-football-facility-plan/</p> <p>The projects included in the LFFP (2020) are eligible, subject to a formal application, for Football Foundation funding. The PPS (2018) and LFFP (2020) highlight the following football priority projects in Petersfield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade to the pitches at Love Lane; • Upgrade to the pitches, and deliver a pavilion, at Penns Place; and • Upgrade the pitch surface at TPS¹. <p>Petersfield is strategically placed to unlock CIL, s106 and Football Foundation funding. This will require formal applications, feasibility studies, consultation and delivery. EHDC can support but the main drive needs to come from the sports teams / landowner(s).</p> <p>Cllr Bentley added that the cricket pitch and rugby pitches at Penns Place also need to be considered. There may be an opportunity for Petersfield Town Junior FC to pitch share with the cricket club.</p> <p>Cllr Mocatta summarised that planning permission for Penns Field B needs to be obtained first, before then considering all other sporting provision at Penns Place.</p>

¹ This needs to be replaced every 10 years.


Ref.	Item
4.	<p data-bbox="225 217 794 257">Petersfield Place-Making Priority Projects</p> <p data-bbox="225 280 1337 320">Please see circulated PowerPoint presentation entitled “210129 – PSG Priority Projects”.</p> <p data-bbox="225 342 817 383"><u>Step 1: Identify the Petersfield Priority Projects</u></p> <p data-bbox="225 405 957 445">As agreed previously, the Petersfield Priority Projects are:</p> <ol data-bbox="276 472 1428 701" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Crossroads of Dragon Street / The Causeway / Sussex Road / Hylton Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>Opportunity to investigate links to Tesco and onto Alderfield / Meadow Lands etc.</i> 2. Pulens Lane Traffic Calming Improvements. 3. Junction of Charles Street / The Spain / Swan Street. 4. Junction of Chapel Street / Station Road / Tilmore Road. 5. Town Spine. 6. MicroSim Modelling. <p data-bbox="225 728 1436 898">The above priority projects range in terms of improvements for active travel, capacity and safety. The MicroSim modelling will investigate how all the above proposals will interact with each other. The modelling will look at active travel, traffic flow and transport nodes, along with phases of implementation. The modelling will also highlight how all the above projects will impact other junctions in and around the town.</p> <p data-bbox="225 925 724 965"><u>Step 2: Develop a brief for each project</u></p> <p data-bbox="225 987 1430 1090">EHDC will assist HCC in developing briefs for each of the identified priority projects. It has been agreed that EHDC will pay for the modelling and initial feasibility work using its place-making budget – subject to the final brief and confirmed costs. In essence:</p> <ul data-bbox="276 1120 638 1189" style="list-style-type: none"> • EHDC is the “client”; and • HCC is the “contractor”. <p data-bbox="225 1218 1453 1288">District ward councillors expressed an interest in working with Gethin and Keith to prepare briefing notes for all the above priority projects, similar to that of the Station Road Brief (see attached).</p> <p data-bbox="225 1314 1398 1384"><u>ACTION:</u> District ward councillors to liaise with Gethin and Keith about briefing notes for each priority project.</p> <p data-bbox="225 1413 697 1453"><u>Step 3: Detailed Design and Delivery</u></p> <p data-bbox="225 1478 1468 1610">Once all the above is completed, s106 money will be used to deliver the projects. As confirmed by the SDNPA, the oldest s106 contributions will be spent first where possible. For example, the s106 contribution collected from “land south east of the Causeway” is the oldest contribution and will be used to fund the highest priority project; see above.</p> <p data-bbox="225 1639 1015 1680"><u>Central Government £2 billion package for cycling and walking</u></p> <p data-bbox="225 1704 1471 1901">The Government’s fund of £2bn for cycling and walking was announced in Spring 2020 and, so far, only £250m has been released as part of the emergency Active Travel Fund (see Tranche ATF below). EHDC and HCC are working closely together and are ready for when the opportunity to bid for the rest of the funding package becomes available; we need to confirm options and costings (see Step 2 above) to inform any future funding application. All bids will need to be LTN 1/20 compliant and the councils will put in a bid to obtain funding for LCWIP and PSG priorities.</p>

Ref.	Item
	<p><u>"Masterplan"</u></p> <p>The PSG will look to develop a "masterplan" to include a framework, spreadsheet and interactive map. It was discussed that the Town Development Committee (TDC) is looking to appoint consultants to develop a business case; it is important that this work is coordinated with the work of the PSG and POG.</p> <p><u>LCWIP</u></p> <p>EHDC is working in partnership with HCC. The LCWIP mapping layers are being re-drawn so that they can be incorporated into the GIS and published on the council's website. This is a significant piece of work and the Petersfield maps are being prioritised – EHDC is hoping to get the Petersfield maps ready by late-February / early-March 2021.</p>
5.	<p>Petersfield Partners Update</p> <p><u>a) East Hampshire District Council (EHDC)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EHDC has deployed "Covid Marshals" to support trading businesses and ensure health and safety / social distancing is being met on the high street. EHDC is preparing for additional high street businesses to reopen over the coming months as lockdown restrictions start to ease. The PSG was reminded that infringement of social distancing and public gatherings needs to be reported to the Police via the following link: https://www.hampshire.police.uk/tua/tell-us-about/c19/v7/tell-us-about-a-possible-breach-of-coronavirus-covid-19-measures/ <p>ACTION: All to encourage residents and businesses to report infringements of social distancing and public gatherings to the Police via the online link circulated.</p> <p><u>b) Hampshire County Council (HCC)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tranche 2 Active Travel Fund (ATF) Schemes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently drafting proposals to go out to public consultation; to include bus-gate, "parklets", additional cycle racks and planters (to replace existing barriers) Public consultation needs to be completed by 25th March 2021. Public consultation will comprise letter drops, councillor briefing note and (possibility of) virtual public workshops. <p><u>c) Petersfield Town Council (PTC)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The working party for the Neighbourhood Plan review continue to meet. The working party for the Festival refurbishments continue to meet. The Heath Toilets refurbishment; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking to obtain specified Causeway Farm s106 funding; and To consider provision of Changing Places (CP) for disabled users. The Heath Car Park; to be re-opened once lockdown starts to ease.

Ref.	Item
	<p>d) <u>South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The South Downs Dark Skies Festival 2021 will run between 12th and 28th February 2021. Further information and a programme can be found here: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/dark-night-skies/festival/ <p>ACTION: All to promote the South Downs Dark Skies Festival 2021.</p>
6.	<p>Next steps, way forward and date of next meeting</p> <p>The next PSG meeting will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include an agenda item on the LCWIP and walking; and Take place on 12th March 2021 at 1pm. <p>ACTION: Lewis to include "LCWIP and walking" on the next PSG agenda.</p> <p>ACTION: Lewis to rearrange the next PSG meeting from 5th March to 12th March 2021.</p>
7.	<p>Any Other Business (AOB)</p> <p>No other business was raised.</p>

Action Log:

Action	Who	Red, Amber or Green	Progress
ADMIN			
Rearrange the next PSG meeting from 5 th March to 12 th March 2021.	EHDC Officer	G	Meeting re-arranged to 12 th March 2021 at 1pm.
Include "LCWIP and walking" on the next PSG agenda.	EHDC Officer	A	
Incorporate Petersfield Governance Structure into SDNPA Partnership Management Plan (PMP).	SDNPA Officer	A	Included in SDNPA Corporate Plan and in motion to include in PMP.
COVID-19 PANDEMIC			
Encourage residents and businesses to report infringements of social distancing and public gatherings to the Police via the online link circulated	All	A	https://www.hampshire.police.uk/tua/tell-us-about/c19/v7/tell-us-about-a-possible-breach-of-coronavirus-covid-19-measures/
DURFORD ROAD CROSSROADS			
Liaise with EHDC Traffic Team about speed watch along Pullens Lane.	EHDC Officer	A	Monitoring
PETERSFIELD PRIORITY PROJECTS			
District ward councillors to liaise with Gethin and Keith about briefing notes for each priority project.	District Ward Councillors	A	
SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY (SDNPA)			
Inform Chris (at least) one week in advance of any required updates on planning applications.	All	A (Ongoing)	
Promote the South Downs Dark Skies Festival 2021.	All	A	https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/dark-night-skies/festival/



Petersfield Strategy Group – 29 January 2021

AGENDA ITEM: PETERSFIELD PLACE-MAKING PRIORITY PROJECTS

Petersfield Place-Making Priority Projects

1. Tesco - Dragon Street / The Causeway / Sussex Road / Hylton Road Crossroads and investigate links to Tesco - Alderfield / Meadow Lands / Hylton Road (off-road route behind TPS)
2. Pulens Lane Traffic Calming Improvements
3. The Spain / Swan Street / Charles Street Junction Improvements
4. Station Road / Tilmore Road / Chapel Street Junction Improvements
5. Town Spine
6. Microsim Modelling on Ref 34 & 41

Petersfield Place-Making Priority Projects – Next Steps – HCC Feasibility Approach to Priority Projects



Develop scope for pre-feasibility work for all priority projects identified



Pre-feasibility work – officers to confirm timescales to report back to PSG



Prioritise the priorities to take forward

Expected outcomes: “Masterplan”

- ▶ Masterplan to comprise three parts:
 - ▶ Framework to guide how projects are identified and prioritised – suggest POG leads on drafting this using the evidence and studies already completed and the knowledge and experience of the group
 - ▶ Spreadsheet of identified projects including priority projects
 - ▶ Interactive map as the visual manifestation of the identified projects
- ▶ Possible interactive map examples:
 - ▶ <https://wbct.communitymaps.org.uk/project/whitehill-bordon-interactive-map?layer=3¢er=51.1120:-0.8324:13>
 - ▶ <http://maps.easthants.gov.uk/easthampshire.aspx>

GIS – LCWIP layers



Work in progress – being led
by EHDC Information Team



Expected to take until early
March to complete



Maps to be hosted on
EHDC LCWIP website

Briefing Note - DRAFT

Walking, Cycling and Other Issues in Station Road and at the Junction of Station Road-Tilmore Road-Chapel Street

1 Introduction

The Petersfield Strategy Group have prepared a list of potential schemes which are to be given priority in the context of the Petersfield Place-making Action Plan. This note has been written to support and inform this Action Plan in regard to cycling and walking issues. It describes some of the problems encountered by pedestrians and cycle riders when moving around Petersfield and identifies some potential solutions. The intended readership are the officers and councillors who are contributing to the Petersfield Operational Group (POG) and the Petersfield Strategy Group (PSG), together with transport professionals who will be responsible for the detailed design of the schemes as they move forward to the design phase.

This note was prepared by Keith Hopper and Gethin Morgan-Owen both of whom are residents of Petersfield who take an active interest in transport issues in the Town. It has been produced in haste and provides a preliminary rather than a final view. Hence it is marked "Draft". The authors may refine the contents, depending on the feedback received on this first draft document.

There is much that needs to be done to improve facilities for cyclists and for pedestrians throughout Petersfield (evidence for this can be found in the Place-making Project Spreadsheet which identified 45 locations in need of improvement, while the LCWIP identified 68 locations for cycling alone). The topics covered here have been confined to those placed on the priority list prepared by the PSG¹.

The focus of this note is Station Road, especially the junction of Station Road, Tilmore Road and Chapel Street. The background is described below in vehicle and pedestrian movement terms. This is followed by some sections which describe the problems and explore solutions. The relevant parts of the Neighbourhood Plan are summarised in Section 5. A summary of the relevant parts of some recent transport related reports is provided in Section 6. Section 7 describes the cycling issues at the junction of Station Road, Tilmore Road and Chapel Street in greater detail.

2 Background

Station Road is one of the three east-west routes for traffic through Petersfield. The most heavily used is a dual carriageway link road to the A3 by-pass classified as the A272. Station Road is central and direct but straddles a level crossing adjacent to the railway station, whilst the southern route via Hylton Road, Swan Street and Frenchman's Road passes through a low railway bridge, ruling out its use by larger vehicles. Station Road is therefore an important east-west route but is not heavily trafficked in terms of vehicles alone and copes with the delays from the level crossing, except in peak hours. From a cycling point of view however it is classified as "heavy traffic flow" due to cyclist's different needs and does not encourage the use of cycling as it is now.

The current emphasis on Active Travel puts the spotlight on walking and cycling and there are serious highway deficiencies both at the junction with Tilmore Road and along quite a length of Station Road. Tilmore Road itself is a major access route into town for residents living to the north of the railway line and is therefore an important and well used road.

The traffic volume and speed on some of the relevant roads are quantified in Section 4.

3 Assessment of Problems and Some Solutions

The principal problem with the Junction is the speed of traffic, combined with poor visibility for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers emerging from the side roads, due to the bend in the road and the closeness of boundary walls. There are times when traffic is stationary in both directions, due to the level crossing gates being down (8 trains per hour during the peaks), which clearly assists the movement of pedestrians and cyclists in particular.

¹ See the meeting notes for the PSG meeting on 18th December 2020.

The speed of traffic in Station Road has been measured as 29.4mph (85th percentile) and is clearly instrumental in giving a very low quality of life for people walking (with sub-standard narrow footways) or cycling along and across Station Road. This is the case both at the junction and along the road for hundreds of metres to the east and west. Further to the east there are pelican crossings in place to assist pedestrians near Sandringham Road and at the junction with Rams Hill / Tor Way, but commuters and schoolchildren in particular have great difficulty in crossing Station Road near to the Station and regularly use the footway on the south side of Station Road which is only 0.5m wide and clearly very dangerous.

The location of the Station is such that there is a lot of activity in the area by pedestrians, cyclists, buses and taxis and they all require special consideration. At the root of it all comes the need to reduce the speed of traffic on Station Road and ideally to start to change the attitudes of drivers. The number one priority therefore is to reduce the speed of traffic, not just at the junction with Tilmore Road but along the length of Station Road affected by Station traffic and customers. This commences at Windsor Road which is 100m to the east of the junction and continues for 400m to a point 300m to the west of Tilmore Road, just beyond the pedestrian crossing point at Lidl / White Rose car showrooms.

The provision of a 20mph zone would enable cyclists to stay in lane and move at the speed of the traffic on Station Road. Any vertical traffic calming features would need to be bus friendly (ie 6m long plus 1:20 ramps) as is a commonly used standard. Carriageway widths can be reduced so as to widen the narrow footways but a formal crossing point on Station Road between Chapel Street and Charles Street is required. Regular traffic calming features are required to support a 20mph zone, which could include the Lidl crossing, the railway level crossing, the proposed crossing near Tilmore Road, the Tilmore junction feature, the bend in Station Road and a possible road narrowing / pinch point.

Tilmore Road and Chapel Street are on the National Cycling Network Route 22 and on the Shipwright's Way. This is therefore an important crossing point on Station Road for cyclists. A reduction in traffic speed will assist them but ideally a central safe area is required in the middle of Station Road. The provision of traffic signals should be considered but footway space for all the hardware is very limited and may not prove feasible.

In considering any changes all roads should be assumed to be retained as two way, although pinch points could be considered in an extreme case. In that event Station Road should retain sufficient width for continuous two way movement of cars but HGV's could possibly have to give way. However this could be detrimental to bus services and should be considered very carefully.

There could be a possible ban on right turns into Station Approach except for buses and bicycles to attempt to prevent vehicles being stationary on the level crossing.

3.1 Key outcomes of the design:

1. A reduction in traffic speeds on Station Road to 20mph.
2. A formal crossing point for pedestrians to the west of Tilmore Road.
3. It should be easier and safer for pedestrians to cross over and move along Station Road.
4. It should be easier and safer for cyclists to come out of Tilmore Road, Chapel Street.
5. Improvements to the quality of life for pedestrians and cyclists using Station Road, thereby encouraging these modes of transport.

3.2 Possible features to achieve the above:

1. A 20mph zone along Station Road, min length 400 m.
2. Traffic calming to support the 20mph zone.
3. A formal pedestrian crossing on Station Road somewhere between Tilmore Road and Charles Street.
4. The reduction in width of the Chapel Street bellmouth to a single lane northbound.
5. A traffic island in the centre of Station Road at the Chapel Street junction.
6. Traffic signals at the Tilmore Road junction.

3.3 Further opportunities within a 20mph zone:

1. Reduction of the carriageway width to benefit pedestrians.
2. Provision of a speed table at the pedestrian crossing point between Lidl and Rose Car Showroom.
3. Widening of the marked footway where it crosses the level crossing.
4. An opportunity to create a walking and cycling route from Station Road to Frenchmans Road via Station car park, see LCWIP Ptr 47.
5. An alternative alignment for NCN22/Shipwright's Way was recommended in the LCWIP, see Ptr13. This should be actively explored if effective improvements cannot be implemented at the Station Road, Tilmore Road and Chapel Street Junction.
6. The railway bridge on Tilmore Road was identified as being dangerous for pedestrians in the Neighbourhood Plan.

4 Traffic Speed and Volume Across the Station Road-Tilmore Road-Chapel Street Junction

In 2018, the traffic speed in Station Road was measured to be 29.4 mph (85th percentile) ². The speed limit is 30 mph. The traffic volumes are shown in Table 1.

Street/road	Vehicles per hour during the AM peak	Vehicles per day (weekdays)
Station Road - between Charles St & Chapel St	840 Source: 2018 Transport Study	10,060 Source: 2018 Transport Study
Chapel St - north end	150 Source: 2020 Junction Feasibility Report	1,500 Estimated
Tilmore Rd - south end	173 Source: 2020 Junction Feasibility Report	1,700 Estimated
Notes The figures indicate bi-directional flows. Where figures are labelled as estimates, the number of vehicles per day was assumed to be 10 times the AM peak figure.		

Table 1: Traffic volumes on Chapel Street, Station Road, and Tilmore Road

This traffic flow along Station Road is categorised as “heavy traffic flow” according to Appendix B of LTN 1/20³. The traffic flow along Chapel Street and Tilmore Road is categorised as “low traffic flow”.

The Community Viewpoint Expressed in the Neighbourhood Plan

The Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan identified a need for traffic improvements at the Station Road-Tilmore Road-Chapel Street Junction, see Table 9 and Map E3. The adjacent railway bridge on Tilmore Road was identified as being dangerous for pedestrians.

Recent Assessments of the Station Road-Tilmore Road-Chapel Street Junction

In 2019, the Petersfield Society's Report on Pedestrian Safety identified this junction as one of the most difficult in Town from the pedestrian perspective. Problems were described with poor sightlines together with missing and narrow footways.

EHDC's LCWIP (Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan) for East Hampshire⁴ did not cover pedestrian issues in urban areas. However this LCWIP identified that this junction was poor for cycle riders crossing in the southbound or northbound direction (see Ptr34). It identified that this junction is on both National Cycling Network Route 22 (NCN22) and on the Shipwright's Way route. The LCWIP recommended that an alternative

² HCC/Hampshire Services, Technical Transport Study for Petersfield Town, August 2018.

³ DFT, Cycle Infrastructure Design, Local Transport Note 1/20, July 2020.

⁴ EHDC LCWIP Technical Report V1.2, August 2020.

route alignment should be found for both routes, see Ptr13. A potential alternative alignment was presented in Figure 5.4 of the LCWIP.

HCC Junction Capacity Report⁵ described missing footways and poor visibility when exiting Tilmore Road, together with substandard footways and a substandard pedestrian refuge. Regarding cycling, it was concluded that *“Whilst this junction is part of the National Cycling Network (NCN), environmental and land constraints prevent improvements specifically for people cycling.”*

5 Summary of Cycling Issues at the Station Road-Tilmore Road-Chapel Street Junction

This assessment focuses on cycle movement across this junction from Tilmore Road to Chapel Street and vice versa because there is little cycle traffic along Station Road, as explained above.

Cycle riders encounter the following conditions when crossing this junction from Tilmore Road to Chapel Street:

- Movement through this junction requires crossing two lanes which have heavy traffic flows (>5,000 motor vehicles per day). At peak times, gaps in traffic only occur occasionally, unless the level crossing gates are down.
- When exiting Tilmore Road, riders have poor visibility along Station Road, especially of traffic coming from the direction of the Station. With the traffic on Station Road moving briskly, riders must quickly mount their bicycles and sprint when they see an adequate gap in the lines of moving vehicles.
- The bend prevents eastbound drivers on Station Road having clear sight of traffic exiting Tilmore Road.
- When crossing this junction from Chapel Street to Tilmore Road, the visibility along Station Road is satisfactory, but cycle riders have to gather speed against a gradient and so additional time is required to cross.

With cycle movement in potential conflict with a heavy flow of motor traffic, the conditions are likely to give rise to the most common collision types, according to LTN 1/20 Appendix B (also see Table 10-2). Any misjudgement of the speed, or intention, of a driver by a cyclist could result in a collision with a motor vehicle moving at about 30 mph, with the potential for a serious injury being caused to a cyclist.

These conditions strongly deter cycling. Inexperienced and timid cyclists will feel uncomfortable, perhaps frightened, and so will not cycle. Even experienced cyclists will be put-off. It is likely that some inexperienced cyclists, who have been directed to this junction by the signs installed by Hampshire County Council /Sustrans /EHDC, will be placed at risk of injury from a collision with a motor vehicle.

⁵ Hampshire County Council, Petersfield Town Centre Junction Capacity Report, 6/8/2020.

Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party

29th January 2021



11

A meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party was held on 29th January 2021

Attended: Cllr Phil Shaw (Chairman), Cllr John Palmer, Cllr James Deane, Steve Field (Projects and Office Manager), Mr Gethin Morgan-Owen (Walking & Cycling Working Party) and Mr Keith Hopper (Walking & Cycling Working Party), Mr Peter Marshall (Petersfield Society)

Apologies: Mr Chris Patterson (SDNPA), Neil Hitch (PTC)

Item	Discussion	Decision
Introduction	Phil welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked members for sending in advanced comments for Chapter 6. He also said that a submission from PeCAN would also be considered as part of this meeting.	None
Minutes of last meeting	Minutes dated 27 th November 2020	Minutes were approved
Actions from last meeting		
4.4.1	BEP 3 List	Petersfield Society have no further additions to make to the list
4.4.1	BEP 5 List	Petersfield Society have no further additions to make to the list
5.1	Further notes received from GMO. KH asked that this section be made into a positive statement. JP pointed out that maintenance is not a planning issue so some of the comments such as 'poor surfaces' and 'muddy puddles' in GMO's note should be removed	GMO to review and provide revised text
5.2	Proposed text received from GMO to be added from "In March..."	Text to be added
Page 35 GAP 2	Proposal received from GMO	Add to aspirations (wish list)
Page 38 sub section b	Paragraph to be added to page 38 under 'Future Consideration' to include covered cycle parking	Amend text
5.3.1 Page 36	Amendment proposed for end of last paragraph relating to LTN 1/20	Amend text
5.3.3 Page 39	Observation provided and new paragraph proposed to 'configuration and arrangements'. New arrangements should ensure priority cycle and pedestrian route is maintained through the area. Other suggestions of wording are... To adapt to and mitigate against..... Reduce emissions in order to....	Amend text

Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party

29th January 2021



	It was noted that all the areas that had been identified from the Local Plan marked in red in the PeCAN submission superseded the PNP in any case, so these areas should be left as they currently are in the PNP so as not to limit ourselves on standards.	
Chapter 6		
6.1	JD to submit revised paragraph to include educational dimension the inclusion of Flora Twort within the museum.	JD to submit new paragraph
6.1	Add Tree Wardens and PeCAN group to list	Add groups to list
6.2	Review wording of TIC and include 'visitors and community' and 'information advances'. Remove reference to Kings Arms and consider use of Festival Hall in light of changes being proposed	Review text
6.3.1	PTC Newsletter	Add text
6.3.1	Include consideration for wellbeing	Add text
6.3.1	Remove Police Station as this is now part of museum	Amend text
6.3.1	Change 'will' to 'should be strongly supported'	Amend text
6.3.1	Review after 2021 census has taken place	Aspirational list
6.3.1 3 rd paragraph	Add text about the emergence of the Town Development Committee after PNP was adopted	JD to provide wording
Other issues		
Publicity	Write article regarding PNP Working Party review for next PTC Newsletter	PS to write article
Next Meeting	26 th February 2021 Chapters 7 & 8	All to submit their thoughts to Steve on chapters 7 & 8 by 19 th February 2021