

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

Hampshire 2050
The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD

Telephone: 0300 555 1375
Fax: 01962 847055

www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries To Matt Grantham

My reference 053484

Direct Line

Your reference F/24/97449

Date 12 June 2024

Email eastleighdc@hants.gov.uk

Dear Mr Huckfield,

91 LEIGH ROAD, EASTLEIGH, SO50 9DQ

Change of use from offices (Class E(g)(i)), to 8-bedroom house in multiple occupation (sui generis use), with associated refuse and cycle storage, boundary treatment, and provision of parking to include new dropped kerb on Leigh Road.

Having reviewed the information contained in the application pack, there would be no objection in principle to the proposals from a highway perspective, subject to the following amendments to plans being made, and comments being considered.

ACCESS:

Access for pedestrians is unchanged by the proposals, and this is acceptable with footpath links out onto the public footways into Eastleigh town centre and beyond.

In terms of vehicle access, this remains as the current situation to the rear which is acceptable, though it should be noted that the site layout drawing provided places rear parking in positions that will not work, as there is inadequate turning space, given that aisle widths should be a minimum of 6.0m. The Case Officer may wish to have plans amended to show this, however there is adequate empty space between the rear garden fence and the parking areas which could be utilised.

To the front of the property, it is proposed to implement a vehicle crossover to allow for the parking of one vehicle. This is not acceptable, given the location of the vehicle crossover not only being in close proximity to the junction of Leigh Road / Chamberlayne Road, but also requiring movement through the right turn lane of the

Director of Hampshire 2050
Garry Westbrook

signal controlled junction to the west. The benefit of the additional parking space is not deemed sufficient compared to the increased risk in highway safety, particularly given a reverse in or out of site would likely be required.

As such, it would be requested that plans are updated to remove the proposed front parking and vehicle crossover accordingly.

Additionally, it would be recommended that the cycle parking sheds are relocated to within the rear garden area, hidden from general view, for security reasons. This could allow for the increase in rear garden size, notwithstanding the need to increase the area required for rear vehicle parking as outlined above.

Finally, it should be noted by the applicant that as a 'converted' development, future occupiers of the dwelling will not be entitled to on street parking permits. Given the site sits within a Controlled Parking Zone, the development will therefore essentially need to be car free (for the majority of residents at least). The location of the site would however support such a development.

If plans can be updated to reflect the above, a secondary consultation response can be issued accordingly following a review.

Yours sincerely,

Matt Grantham

Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook