

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

<i>Enquiries to</i>	Zara Rogers	<i>My reference</i>	058060
<i>Direct Line</i>	N/A	<i>Your reference</i>	O/25/99534
<i>Date</i>	30 October 2025	<i>Email</i>	eastleighdc@hants.gov.uk

For attention of Mr Osmond

Dear Sirs

Re: O/25/99534 At Land at Denhams Corner, Snakemoor Lane, Eastleigh, SO32 2BW

Outline application for up to 150 dwellings including 40% affordable housing, with vehicle and cycle accesses from Snakemoor Lane, pedestrian/cycle access from Botley Road, sustainable transport hub, public open space and play area, and associated infrastructure and landscaping

Thank you for the re-consultation on the above application. The Highway Authority previously provided a response to this application dating 25th July requesting additional information.

Additional information requested:

- Distances to facilities within the vicinity of the site
- Walking and cycling provision to facilities within the site reviewed via a WCHAR and narrative to the healthy street indicators
- Site access visibility in the primary direction to be shown to the roundabout channel
- Clarification over pink dashed line
- Updated tracking in accordance with HCC TG2 guidance
- Revised footway design on Botley Road to be a minimum of 3m and to include a separation margin of 1.5m
- Applicant to explore the delivery of some LCWIP improvements
- Consideration to the upgrade the existing infrastructure so it is in accordance with both LTN 1/20 and HCC TG10 guidance's
- Consideration to cycle access to the north within Horton Heath

Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Hampshire 2050
Gary Westbrook

- Additional consideration to the proposed puffin crossing along Botley Road
- Stage 1 RSA (Road Safety Audit) for both the site access and any off-site works
- Revisions to the Travel Plan
- Additional Modelling/files for junctions

The applicant has subsequently submitted revised information and drawings following on from the Highway Authority previous comments. Upon review the Highway Authority would like to make the following comments.

Sustainable Travel:

Following on from the Highway Authority previously comments, the applicant has reviewed the sustainable mode infrastructure within the vicinity of the site by assessing these via a WCHAR and Healthy Street indicators. Whilst these provide a general overview of the sustainable infrastructure within the vicinity of the site, it is noted that the routes to key facilities and amenities have not been included within the assessment. It is recommended that in any future submission, specific routes to key facilities within the vicinity of the site, along with the distance to these, are identified and assessed (combining the two current approaches), identifying areas of substandard infrastructure where improvements can be provided in accordance with HCC TG10 guidance's, LTN 1/20 or healthy street indicators.

For example, Botley Road is subject to 40mph. This is the main route to key facilities such as the local shop and schools. However, there is currently only a substandard footway present, which is not street lit and does not currently cater for cyclists off-carriageway. As this is a main route to key facilities in the vicinity of the site, the Highway Authority would expect improvement to this route, providing both pedestrian and cycle connections which will assist in accommodating mode shift away from the private car.

Furthermore, as previously stated, a table should be provided, highlighting the distances to key facilities within the vicinity of the site.

To note, Local amenities may include but not be limited to:

- A food shop which sells fresh fruit and vegetables;
- A park or green space;
- An indoor meeting place (pub, café, community centre, place of worship);
- A primary school;
- A post office or bank; and
- A GP surgery.

Development Proposal:

The proposal is for a residential development of up to 150 dwellings, with a new access off Snakemoor Lane.

Site Access:

Revised plans and information including tracking has been submitted for the site access. However, upon review of the drawing, it is requested that junction markings are included to assess the suitability of the tracking. Furthermore, the refuse '*right in*' movement highlights that there is overhang into the southern vegetation/bank. The drawing should be amended to ensure that no overhang occurs on the southern side of Snakemoor Lane, with all parts of the envelope should be restricted to within the channel lines. Whilst it is stated that the refuse tracking has been undertaken at 10mph, tracking speeds for the other vehicle has not been included. Additionally, it is requested that a 4.6T van passing a large car at the junction is shown.

Plans indicate that Snakemoor Lane has been widened to the west of the access following on from tracking and comments raised by the RSA. However, whilst these appear to adequately address the RSA comments, the applicant should provide the existing and proposed road width of Snakemoor Lane, along with all dimensions of the access. This would help to understand the suitability of the widening especially as this is proposed to only be widened by 0.5m.

Pedestrian and Cycle Access:

Plans have been updated to show a safety margin of 1.5m on the proposed shared use path on northern side of Botley Road which is acceptable to the Highway Authority. Whilst plans have also been updated to highlight a maintenance bay for the proposed crossing and the SSD to the traffic heads, there is still concern regarding the lack of the cycle facilities toward Horton Heath and therefore consideration should be given towards upgrading the crossing to a toucan, with onward cycle facilities provided into Horton Heath.

A separation margin on the southern arm of the roundabout is required in accordance with HCC TG10 for a 40mph/50mph speed limit. Whilst the applicant's response seems reasonable in regard to vehicular speeds being lower at the roundabout, and therefore questioned the requirements for a margin, this is not in accordance with HCC standards and therefore a DfS (Departure from Standard) is required. Furthermore, the design does not consider the levels in the area – the current design abuts a low-level ditch at the hedge line. This is however considerably lower than the proposed carriageway levels. The applicant needs to provide details on how this footway will be retained and any impact on the ditch at the base of the bank.

The refuge island dimensions should be annotated on the drawing to confirm its suitability. This will need to meet TG3 requirements for shared use facilities and be 3m depth minimum. However, it is not clear if the applicant is widening the island from the "dashed red" scheme by others, and therefore confirmation should be provided. Any widening will reduce the exit width from the roundabout. Impact on roundabout geometries and vehicle tracking will need to be confirmed and any potential DfS identified by the applicant. Whilst a 6m exit width is now noted there may be further impact/repercussions on the operation

of this roundabout, and therefore as mentioned above additional tracking and information on the roundabout is required.

Furthermore, the plans indicate that the bus stop hardstanding area does not consider the revised layout, with this entailing a kink in the kerb line. Additional modification here should therefore be considered.

Lastly, there is particular concern where an ADS would need to be pushed behind the shared use which is c.4.5m (3.0m width +1.5m margin) total from the carriageway. The relocation and visibility to this sign should be included for assessment.

RSA (Road Safety Audit):

A stage 1 RSA has been undertaken for the site access and pedestrian/cycle connection. This has raised several concerns regarding the proposal. Whilst these appear to have been adequately addressed, the applicant should provide confirmation from the auditor that their proposed changes deal with the safety concerns raised. On review of the specific problems raised, the Highway Authority make the following comments.

Problem 1.1: Potential pinch points in the proposed NMU facilities could lead to collisions between users

As mentioned above, whilst the applicant has accepted the problem and recommendation and stated there is sufficient space there is no evidence of this shown. Therefore, the applicant should indicate on the drawings where these items are needed for relocation and those impacted. There is particular concern where an ADS would need to be pushed behind the shared use which is c.4.5m (3.0m width +1.5m margin) total from the carriageway.

Problem 1.4: Potential for an increase in collisions involving motorcycles due to mud on the road.

Applicant's response to widen the carriageway seems to address concerns, however applicant should provide the existing (and proposed) road widths along Snakemoor Lane to understand suitability of widening only 0.5m as mentioned within the site access section.

Travel Plan:

A revised Travel plan reference DN/NS/24478-03a has been submitted following on from the Highway Authority's previous comments. Upon review, whilst the majority of comments have been addressed, there are still several areas of uncertainty which require further clarification. Therefore, the Highway Authority require the Travel Plan to be updated to include the following:

Monitoring

- A monitoring timetable (see example below):

	Baseline (Year 1)	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Level of report	To be submitted one year after occupation. This will include the baseline survey results found in the updated Full Travel Plan and a monitoring report.	Monitoring Report	Full Surveys - Monitoring Report	Monitoring Report	Full Surveys - Monitoring Report

This should include the survey types happening in the corresponding years (ATCs/resident surveys etc.)

Targets

The targets outlined in *Table 3* does not equate to a 10% reduction in single-occupancy vehicle trips and missing the column for the Year 1.

Factoring in the measures and actions proposed in the travel plan, the targets section should expand on how the projected mode shift will be achieved.

Action Plan

The action plan should include the subtotal for each measure, a final row which contains the total value of the travel plan.

The costings allocated to the TPC is high compared to similarly sized sites, so we'd suggest reducing this and for the savings to be used for the following measures:

- TRICS SAM Surveys – Under [HCC's 2025 travel plan guidance](#), all developments are expected to carry out TRICS-compliant surveys during their monitoring periods. For this development, these surveys should take place in years 1 and 5 to capture the mode share at or near full occupation and at the end of the travel plan.

These surveys may take the place in place of the proposed ATC surveys and should be included in the costed action plan.

- Biennial resident surveys (in lieu of the proposed ATC surveys)
- Annual or biennial transport bike doctor events
- Increased bus voucher– The value of the bus tickets should be increased to £86 or £80 match the cost of a Bluestar [Southampton Plus Zone](#) month ticket or three 7 days tickets.

Travel Plan Co-ordinator (TPC)

The travel plan should include a breakdown of:

- Time spent on travel plan per week
- Number of weeks per year to be working on the travel plan
- Cost per hour

This should align with the cost allocated for the TPC over the travel plan implementation and monitoring period.

Traffic Impact:

As previously request, additional modelling files for the Bubb Lane B3342 / Chalcroft Way roundabout, and the Bubb Lane / Tollbar Way junction have been provided for review.

Upon review of the Bubb Lane / Tollbar Way junction modelling, the following comments are made;

1. The geometry used is appropriate.
2. The applicant is required to change phase D to E, phase E to F and phase F to D.
3. The demand for the pedestrian crossing is expected to be low. scenarios could be run without the pedestrian crossing and further scenarios either double-cycled or using Bonus Greens to replicate a pedestrian demand every other cycle.
4. With demand for the pedestrian crossing expected to be low, a cycle time of up to 120 seconds can be used. It is suggested that the cycle time optimisation feature within LinSig is used to ensure an appropriate cycle time has been selected. The cycle time can vary from scenario to scenario.
5. Phase D should be run in stage 3.
6. Phase E minimum green time can be reduced to 6 seconds.
7. Stage 1 should become stage 3 so that phases B and D shut down together.
8. Pedestrian phase E leaving intergreens can be reduced to 11 seconds.
9. The right turn from Bubb Lane (north) into Bubb Lane (west) is coded correctly as a give-way approach. However, phase F is shown separately signalled, which should be changed to an indicative arrow.
10. None of the scenarios have been optimised.

The above modifications to the modelling file are required, before the Highway Authority can decide if the impact on this junction by the proposed development is acceptable.

Recommendation:

The Highway Authority require further information at this time as mentioned above before a formal recommendation can be provided. If the LPA are minded determining the application, then please contact the Highway Authority for reasons for refusal.

Yours faithfully,

Zara Rogers
Senior Transport Planner - Highway Development Planning
Hampshire 2050