

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	059909
Direct Line	N/A	Your reference	RM/25/100614
Date	25 March 2026	Email	eastleighdc@hants.gov.uk

For attention of Ms Altman

Dear Sirs

**Re: RM/25/100614 At Land West of Burnetts Lane, Horton Heath,
Eastleigh, SO30 2HH**

Submission of Reserved Matters relating to Layout, Scale, Appearance, and Landscaping pursuant to Condition 4 (RM Requirements) of Outline Planning Permission O/20/89498 for the erection of 629 dwellings within Phase 17 (The Folds), with associated public open space, landscaping, and cycle and vehicular parking, to include details relevant to the following conditions:

- **Condition 16 (Arb Assessment)**
 - **Condition 21 (Design Code Compliance)**
 - **Condition 25 (Refuse)**
 - **Condition 31 (Higher Access Standards)**
 - **Condition 32 (Internal Space Standards)**
 - **Condition 58 (Flood Mitigation)**
 - **Condition 61 (SUDs)**
 - **Condition 64 (EMMP)**
 - **Condition 71 (BNG)**
 - **Condition 72 (New Forest Protected Sites Mitigation)**
 - **Condition 76 (Nutrient Neutrality)**
- (Outline application subject to Environmental Impact Assessment)
(amended description)**

In regard to application RM/25/100614, specifically Condition 4 (RM Requirements) and Condition 25 (Refuse), as outlined above, following on from the previous HCC Highway consultation response dated 22 January

Director of Universal Services
Patrick Blogg

2026, 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 Technical Note (HTN dated 04 March 2026) has been submitted in order to discuss the previous HCC comments, and to provide clarification and additional information such as vehicle tracking and visibility splay 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 Highway jurisdiction, a review of the information has been undertaken regardless.

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

1. Additional vehicle tracking drawings to demonstrate two-way vehicle tracking for appropriate vehicles anticipated to access the site on a regular basis;
2. Additional visibility splay drawings; and
3. A requirement for a Site Management Plan to deal with elements such as maintenance of the private roads and footways and parking restrictions.

On the whole, these issues have either been addressed within the HTN, through the inclusion of additional and amended vehicle tracking drawings, as well as text rebuttals 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.

The only outstanding key element that was not addressed by the HTN, is that of two-way vehicle movements involving a 3.5T sprinter type delivery vehicle, following the HCC recommendation that vehicle tracking drawings are provided for these.

Whilst it is noted that at point 4.5 of the HTN, the applicants have stated that as a refuse vehicle has been tracked, which is a larger vehicle, that should be sufficient for purpose, this is not entirely agreed with.

Conflicting vehicle movements for a refuse against a car would likely occur very infrequently, once per week on average, and as such the need to stop and give way; make avoidance movements; etc. are acceptable.

However, the movement of delivery vehicles around site would be far more frequent, with the potential for frequency to increase further over future years as home deliveries increase. For this reason, it would be recommended that

the appropriate tracking drawings are submitted to ensure that restrictive areas are identified; parking restrictions of geometrical changes can be made; and there is a reduction in the potential for vehicles to bump up footways (or similar) to avoid vehicle conflict at constrained points.

Onwards, it is understood that elements such as the introduction of the 0.3m step out strips adjacent to parking spaces which abut either landscaping or vertical hard surfaces which would be beneficial for the future residents, will be covered in future detailed design work (point 5.4 of the HTN).

ACCESS JUNCTIONS ONTO The SID

Vehicle access junctions are proposed from the private development site onto The SID via The Holme, and whilst it is understood that the internal site roads will not be put forward for a S38 adoption by HCC, The SID is to be put forward for adoption.

Given that there is potential for The SID and the residential parcels to come forward in combination, it should be noted that the access junctions will need to conform to HCC Standards in order to facilitate future S38 adoption. The developer should therefore be made aware that there is potential for changes to be required to designs as shown, to facilitate this, as the S38 proceeds.

If the access junctions come forward for implementation post S38 adoption of The SID, 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), and such a Management Plan should be secured via an appropriately worded condition.

However, it should be noted that 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.

Onwards, it is recommended that a condition be put in place to ensure that visibility splays (shown on submitted drawings) are protected from visual obstruction in future years.

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

CONDITION 25 – REFUSE

In terms of the Refuse strategy for the site, a drawing demonstrating collection points and bin pull distances is provided at Appendix D of the submitted HTN. These positions and drag distances appear to be acceptable, though the Case Officer may wish to fully confirm this with the EBC Direct Services team, who will ultimately be responsible for collecting the bins.

Additionally, details of the refuse collection strategy are outlined at section 6 of the HTN, where it outlines that:

'To accurately demonstrate collection points with the appropriate capacity, confirmation of the future waste and recycling strategy is required to determine the number and type of containers to be presented at any one time. It is recommended that this matter is addressed at a future detailed design condition discharge'.

Given the above, HCC as Local Highway Authority have **no objection to the discharge of Condition 25**, as there are unlikely to be any impacts upon the local highway network as a result of the refuse collections.

Yours faithfully,

Matt Grantham
Principal Transport Planner - Highway Development Planning
Universal Services