

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

Hampshire 2050
The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UL
Telephone 0300 555 1375
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

Enquiries to	Matt Grantham	My reference	054874
Direct Line	N/A	Your reference	RM/24/98388
Date	11 November 2024	Email	

For attention of Ms Altman

Dear Sirs

Re: RM/24/98388 At Land west of Allbrook Way, Allbrook, SO50 4LZ

Reserved matters relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the proposed development pursuant to outline permission O/19/86980 for the construction of 49.no residential dwellings.

In regard to application RM/24/98388, it is understood that this application purely covers the internal layout of the proposed residential site, with the site access junction having been previously agreed as part of the outline application O/19/86980, which is currently progressing through the S278 process. As such, the site access will not be discussed further within this current planning consultation response.

In terms of the internal site layout, it is understood that the roads and footways relating to this application are not being offered for adoption by the developer, and as such, HCC would not object in principle to the proposals. However, it would be advisable that the developer ensures that the roads and footways are designed to minimum industry standards and / or Hampshire County Council's best practice as set out in <https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards> , and that an appropriate Private Management Plan is put in place to deal with any future issues.

Developers should also be made aware of the Advanced Payment Code (APC) that will be required by the Highway Authority. Details of this can be found via the following link -

<http://documents.hants.gov.uk/transport/APCProcess-Guidancedocumentforwebsitev22018-04-02.pdf>

Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

Having reviewed plans however, the following comments are made:

1. It is noted that the proposed access road comes into close proximity to the highway bank that sits between the site and Allbrook Way. The developers should be made fully aware that any works that either require, or have an impact on the bank will need to be undertaken via a S278 agreement with HCC to ensure the integrity of the bank is not compromised. Details of this process can be found via the following web address:

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/section-278>

2. It is noted that a priority build out close the site entrance is proposed due to a narrowing in available road space due to the boundary of an existing dwelling. As discussed during the pre-app stage, this is acceptable with adequate forward visibility achievable. It is also noted that as requested during pre-app, the layout gives priority for vehicles heading south west (site exit route) which is welcomed as it will keep driveways clear of potential queues.

3. It would however be requested that refuse vehicle tracking diagrams are produced for the build out section of the access drive, given the narrow width of the highway at this point, in order to fully demonstrate that the manoeuvre can be easily undertaken.

4. Indeed given the widths of available highway throughout the development, it would be requested that combined car and refuse vehicle tracking is completed for the whole of the internal site in order to identify any pinch points where the two vehicles are unable to pass each other. Not only would this identify any areas where localised widening may be required, but also identify areas where private parking restrictions may be required to ensure the free flow of the refuse vehicle through the site on collection days.

5. Similarly, the refuse vehicle tracking that has been submitted to date highlights some areas of the site where vehicle body overhang occurs over private boundaries (i.e. plots 24 and 38), and if landscaping such as hedging were to be located here, then there would be issues for refuse vehicle movements. Additionally, the visitor parking bay opposite plot 47 is also partially driven through, and so a vehicle parked in this could again prevent refuse vehicle movement if not parked centrally.

6. In terms of visibility splays around the site, generally these are acceptable, as shown on plans. However there are areas of the site (i.e. outside plots 27 and 28) where the splays cross private land. This would not conform to HCC guidance for adoption, given there would be no highway authority control over the land. However as unadopted road, covenants or similar would need to be placed on such areas of land, stipulating that nothing over 0.6m in height can be placed on it accordingly. Other areas of the site suffer from similar issues (i.e. plots 10 and 47), however due to the anticipated speeds at these specific locations, this would likely be acceptable.

7. Due to the above issues, it would onwards be recommended that a Site Management Plan is put in place, which can manage the private site in terms of parking and landscaping restrictions.

8. In terms of pedestrian movement around site, this appears to be acceptable with a continuous footway around the majority of the site, with onwards links out to the adjacent Public Right of way to the western edge. Additionally, it is noted that all dwellings have rear access available which is welcomed. There will of course onwards need to be an additional level of infrastructure in terms of street lighting and drop kerbs / tactile paving, and the Case Officer may wish to condition this or request additional plans.

9. Vehicle parking has been reviewed in terms of layout, which is in the main acceptable with adequately sized bays and turning aisle widths. One area of concern however is the pergolas associated with plots 43 to 46, given that the vertical supports will need to be designed in a manner which will not block the opening of car doors which could render them unusable. The Case Officer may wish to review designs to ensure this is not the case. In terms of numbers, this has not been fully assessed as it is a function for EBC, ensuring that the EBC Parking Standards are fully adhered to. However, it is noted that that plots 4, 5 and 47 appear to have only been afforded 1 vehicle space per dwelling which may be below required standards.

10. Cycle parking has also been considered by the applicants, where cycle sheds are proposed for each dwelling lacking a garage. This is acceptable, however the Case Officer may wish to ensure the provision is fully implemented via a condition, in order to conform to the EBC Parking Standards.

If the additional information outlined above is forthcoming, then a further review can be undertaken by HCC for this unadopted site, with updated comments made accordingly.

Yours faithfully,

Matt Grantham
Principal Transport Planner - Highway Development Planning
Hampshire 2050