

Universal Services
The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD

Telephone 0300 555 1375
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

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

Enquiries to	Matt Grantham	My reference	059600
Direct Line	N/A	Your reference	RM/25/100430
Date	4 March 2026	Email	eastleighdc@hants.gov.uk

For attention of Mr Chapman

Dear Sirs

Re: RM/25/100430 At One Horton Heath - Quobleigh Breach, Horton Heath, Fair Oak, Eastleigh

Submission of Reserved Matters relating to Layout, Scale, Appearance, and Landscaping pursuant to Condition 4 (Reserved Matters Submission) of Outline Planning Permission O/20/89498 for the erection of 269 dwellings within Phase 6 (Quobleigh Breach), with associated public open space, landscaping, and cycle and vehicular parking, to include details relevant to the following Outline Planning Permission conditions:

In regard to application RM/25/100430, specifically Condition 4, as outlined above, following on from the previous HCC Highway consultation response dated 18 December 2025, it is noted that additional information has been submitted by the applicants.

This information has been reviewed, and the following comments are made.

CONDITION 4 – RM Requirements

It is noted that a Highways Response Note (HRN dated February 2026) has been submitted in order to discuss the previous HCC comments; to outline the updates that have been made to the site layout plans; and to also provide additional information such as vehicle tracking drawings.

Whilst as outlined within the previous HCC Highways consultation response, it is acknowledged that the site will not be put forward for S38 Highway Adoption by the developers, remaining private and as such outside of the specific HCC

Director of Universal Services
Patrick Blogg

Highway jurisdiction, a review of the information has been undertaken regardless.

As outlined in the HRN, key issues previously raised by HCC as Local Highway Authority were:

1. Accesses to be widened to ensure that unrestricted two-way vehicle movements are achievable at accesses to the parking courts for Block A and Block B;
2. Confirmation that the turning head adjacent to Plots 3 and 4 will remain free of parking and not be used as an extension of the driveways and that the landscaping opposite Plots 3 and 4 will be kept clear of vertical planting to ensure vehicle movements are achievable;
3. Junction to be widened to ensure that unrestricted two-way vehicle movements are achievable at junction by Plots 115 and 116;
4. Junction to be widened to ensure that unrestricted two-way vehicle movements are achievable at junction south of Plot 165;
5. Footway to be provided on the northern side of access south of plot 254;
6. Pedestrian crossings/footways by Plots 239 – 254 and 245 – 247 to be lined up better;
7. Parking restrictions to be put in place by site management company to ensure no overspill parking on the internal road network and on The Avenue;
8. Demonstration that a 4.6t light van can turn at the ends of roads/car parking areas to ensure no excessive reversing manoeuvres are required; and
9. It was requested that the CTMP remain a live document to ensure that updates can be made during the build process.

These issues have either been addressed through updated plans, such as the widening of junctions and re-alignment of footways; or have been discussed within the HRN, outlining why the applicants believe the issue to be acceptable with justifications or alternative solutions given, which is acceptable to HCC as Local Highway Authority for this private site.

Whilst some elements have not been discussed, such as visibility splays crossing car parking areas or landscaping, as outlined in the previous HCC Highway consultation response, in terms of the landscaping this can be covered by appropriate covenants; and with the visibility splays crossing parking areas these are noted to be in relatively slow vehicle speed and movement areas of the site.

The Case Officer may however wish to request a Road Safety Audit (RSA) to fully assess this issue however prior to construction, and this could be via an appropriately worded condition. There is of course potential for this to result in

a further reduction in parking on-site, albeit by a low number, if the RSA recommends the removal of affected parking spaces.

Additionally, the introduction of the 0.3m step out strips adjacent to parking spaces which abut either landscaping or vertical hard surfaces would have been beneficial for the future residents, but not a point of highway objection.

ACCESS JUNCTIONS ONTO THE AVENUE (LINK ROAD)

Four vehicle access junctions are proposed from the private development site onto The Avenue (Link Road), and whilst it is understood that the internal site roads will not be put forward for a S38 adoption by HCC, The Avenue (Link Road) is to be put forward for adoption.

Given that it is understood that The Avenue (Link Road) has already been implemented, and as such has come forward prior to residential development, the four access junctions will need to conform to HCC Standards as and when they come forward in order to facilitate future S38 adoption, and the developer should be made aware that there is potential for changes to be required to designs as shown, to facilitate this.

If the four access junctions come forward for implementation post S38 adoption of The Avenue (Link Road), then these will need to be implemented via a S278, and again the developer should be made aware that there is potential for changes to be required to designs as shown, to facilitate this.

RECOMENDATION

Whilst it would be preferable and indeed recommended from an HCC Highway perspective that the HCC highway standards were fully adhered to, which would enable S38 highway adoption if this were to ever come forward in the future, as outlined above it is noted that adoption is not being applied for in this case and as such the site falls outside of the HCC jurisdiction.

It is likely that an on-site management plan will be able to resolve most issues concerning the site layout should these arise (i.e. private parking restrictions, which would likely be acceptable for a private development), however HCC as Local Highway Authority would not take this on such a plan, and this would prevent adoption, if ever a S38 highway adoption was requested in future years.

Given the above, there would be **no objection to the discharge of Condition 4** from a highway perspective.

Yours faithfully,

Matt Grantham
Principal Transport Planner - Highway Development Planning
Universal Service