

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	058151
Direct Line	N/A	Your reference	F/25/100141
Date	13 November 2025	Email	eastleighdc@hants.gov.uk

For attention of Ms Altman

Dear Sirs

Re: F/25/100141 At Land south east of Kings Copse Avenue, Hedge End

Residential development of 192 dwellings comprising houses and apartments, to include access, parking, landscaping and other associated works, along with off-site footway and bridleway improvements.

In regard to application F/25/100141, having reviewed the information contained within the application pack, and available on the EBC Planning portal, the following comments are made.

Proposals

It is understood that the proposals are for a 192 dwelling housing estate, which will be accessed by vehicles from the east side of Kings Copse Avenue, with additional pedestrian and cycle access points across the site adding to permeability and the promotion of sustainable travel. It is also proposed that the development will provide improvements to local footways and bridleways.

Access

VEHICLE ACCESS:

As outlined above, it is understood that vehicle access into the site will be via the eastern side of Kings Copse Avenue, with a bell-mouth junction being provided to enable two way traffic in and out of the site. This junction is dedicated to vehicles only, as foot / cycleways are internalised within the site, with exits at other points along the frontage.

In terms of visibility from this junction onto Kings Copse Avenue, whilst the 'S278 Works – Overall Scheme Plan' drawing (3743.03B) outlines that visibility splays of 2.4 x 119.0m north and 2.4 x 109m south are achievable, the drawing itself does not appear to show the full extent of the splay. It is therefore requested that a plan showing the full visibility splay is submitted for assessment, and also for use in conjunction with a condition of planning to stipulate the area within the visibility envelope is kept clear of visual obstruction.

With regard to the geometry of the proposed access, this appears to be generally acceptable, and tracking drawings have been supplied (numbers ITS19785-GA-016, ITS19785-GA-013 Rev B, and ITS19785-GA-003 Rev E) for the tracking of large cars, fire tender, and refuse vehicles.

It is however noted that the drawings supplied do not show the full range of movements at the access. It is therefore requested that the following are supplied:

- Fire Tender: Right turn in, right turn out, and left turn out;
- Refuse Vehicle: Right turn out and left turn out; and
- Large Car: Two-way vehicle tracking for all moves. At present the tracking is shown for internal movements only.

The tracking should of course be demonstrated to be achievable within designated lanes.

PEDESTRIAN & CYCLE ACCESS:

Pedestrian and cycle access is proposed from the site to the existing highway network via 3 main access points, as shown on Drawing 3743.03B – S278 Works – Overall Scheme Plan, being:

- A. Shared pedestrian / cycle link to the north of the site, linking into the existing footpath that heads west to the underpass and north to Ambleside;
- B. Shared pedestrian / cycle link to the north-west of the site, linking onto a proposed refuge island on Kings Copse Avenue which then joins the existing footway through to Woodstock Close; and
- C. A shared pedestrian / cycle link to the west of the site leading onto the existing provision on Tanhouse Lane.

Both B and C link onto a proposed 2.0m wide footway on the southern side of Kings Copse Avenue, which onwards leads in the direction of the Norman Rodaway playing fields, where it links into the existing shared pedestrian / cycle route that leads to the vehicle access of the playing fields and onwards.

Given the likely use of this link from B and C (above), it would be requested that the width is increased to cater for cycle use, not just that of pedestrians. It

is an obvious route which children in particular would be anticipated to utilise to reach the pavilion and beyond, without the need to cross grass in wet weather, and a 2.0m wide path would not be acceptable for this, and neither would the anticipation that children should be forced to utilise the carriageway in this location. Drawings should be updated accordingly.

Clarity is also required with link A outlined above. Whilst the S278 Works – Overall Scheme Plan (drawing 3743.03B) appears to show this link as approximately 3.0m wide, the ‘Proposed Pedestrian / Cyclist Connections’ drawing (ITS19785-GA-006 Rev H) outlines the link will be 2.0m wide. The alignment is also different between the two drawings. Clarification is therefore sought on both width and alignment.

Given that the catchment school for seniors / secondary education is currently down for Deer Park in the direction of Boorley Green, it would also be requested that further more direct off road cycle route options are investigated, given the potential number of students choosing to make a sustainable cycle journey to school. Conversion of grass verges should be investigated as a minimum up to a point where the Maypole roundabout can be reached, providing a direct and convenient link to a point where existing shared cycle route facilities can be linked into leading up Woodhouse Lane. Alternatively, a cycle route plan to the Deer Park school from the site utilising off road or quiet roads should be supplied for assessment, highlighting any constraints.

Link C provides a link onto Tanhouse Lane, a bridleway with existing uses inclusive of equestrian. To the north, where the bridleway proceeds beyond Kings Copse Avenue, accessed via the proposed refuge, it is proposed to formalise the route to better cater for cyclists, upgrading it with widths between 3.0 and 3.5m as shown on drawing 3743.23 Bridleway Works – Overall Scheme. The improvements to this link are welcomed, and would provide a route to Havendale.

There does however remain no direct improvements for cyclists wishing to access Kings Copse Primary School, and this should be investigated, with any reasons why such improvements cannot be provided discussed in updated information accordingly.

It should however be noted that any works required on the highway, for the development to proceed, inclusive of those outlined above, a S278 will need to be applied for from HCC as Local Highway Authority, and additional information is likely to be required as part of the process. This will deal with elements such as Departures from Standards, the results of which may result in updates to the plans being required. As such, it is recommended that the S278 process is entered into at the earliest convenience. Details of this process can be found via the following web address -

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

Personal Injury Accident Data

Accident data for the period between 2020 to 2024 has been obtained from Hampshire Constabulary, and this indicates that in the local vicinity, 3 ‘slight’

accidents were reported. These have been assessed, and there would appear to be no link to highway inefficiencies that could either be further impacted upon by the development proposals or mitigated against.

Internal vehicle tracking / swept analysis.

It is understood that the internal site roads will not be put forward for adoption by HCC as Local Highway Authority, however formal confirmation of this has not been provided within the application pack.

As such, an initial internal assessment of the proposed internal layout has been undertaken, and the following comments are made.

VEHICLE TRACKING

Vehicle tracking drawings have been supplied (numbers ITS19785-GA-016, ITS19785-GA-013 Rev B, and ITS19785-GA-003 Rev E) for the tracking of large cars, fire tender, and refuse vehicles.

Having reviewed these, it is noted that whilst the refuse vehicle can negotiate the majority of the site, there are points where vehicle body overhang takes place (i.e. to the west of plot 1, west of plot 6, north of plot 10, west of flat block B01, and north of plot 102).

Whilst it is unclear whether the site's internal road layout are to be put forward for adoption, either in part or full, it should be noted that such instances of vehicle overhang would not be acceptable for HCC Highway adoption given there would be no highway control over what could be put on the affected pieces of land, which essentially could be obstructive to the refuse vehicle movements. As such, plans should be updated with localised adjustments made to enable the free movement of the refuse vehicle accordingly.

In terms of the large car tracking drawing, it is understood that this shows snapshots of locations where road space looks tight and there could be an issue, with the drawing demonstrating how the associated movements can be achieved through, for example, the tapering of driveway access points. It would however be requested that tracking is also supplied which demonstrates two-way vehicle flow for large cars across the development as a whole in order to identify any locations that may be overly tight or potentially cause obstruction.

PARKING QUANTUM AND LAYOUT

Whilst the quantum of parking is for EBC to assess, ensuring that their parking standards SPD is fully adhered to, it is noted that section 5.5 of the supporting Transport Assessment outlines that parking adheres to standards. The Case Officer may however wish to ensure that this is the case.

The proposed parking layout has however been assessed, utilising the 'Proposed Site Plan' (drawing 22-148-KCA-MHA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-0003 Rev C01), and this is generally acceptable. Spaces appear adequately sized, though the Case Officer may wish to confirm that they are 2.5 x 5.0m rather

than 2.4 x 4.8m in line with new standards, and aisle widths of 6.0m appear to be provided which will enable easy access and turning in and out of the parking spaces.

It is however noted that there are spaces located adjacent to landscaping, or hard vertical surfaces, and where this is the case, it would be recommended that an additional 0.3m step out strip is provided to ensure ease of door opening and user access. Example plots of this are parking space C15, 51, 87, etc.

Additionally, clarity would be requested into areas such as that adjacent to parking for plots 35 to 42, where the drawing appears to suggest either two footways adjacent to each other, or parking being surrounded by landscaping (grass?) with a footway beyond which can't be reached without walking over the grass, which will likely result in walking in the road.



For the same area, and indeed others across the site such as plots 61 to 64, where a relatively high level of passing traffic can be expected, concern is also raised regarding the need for users to stand in the road when taking items from the boot of their vehicle. Vehicle spaces should be indented further inwards to provide a safe standing position off of the carriageway.

Parallel visitor parking bays should also be provided with a hardstanding area upon which to exit a vehicle, rather than simply have to step onto landscaping – i.e. spaces to the north of plot 76.

A review of the parking layout should be undertaken, with adjustments made as necessary.

INTERNAL VISIBILITY

For the internal roads to be adopted in accordance to HCC Technical Guidance Note 3, internal visibility splays should be 2.4 x 25.0m for a design speed of 20mph, and these should be kept clear of vertical obstruction.

Internal visibility splays are shown on drawing ITS-19785-GA-009-Rev F (Site Layout – Visibility) for some of the junctions within the site, however these are shown at 2.4 x 18.0m which as outlined above is below the standard required for adoption.

Additionally, it is noted that even with these reduced visibility splays, there are instances where the sight line is blocked to some extent by (i.e.) a car in a designated parking space (see parking space number 43, 72 and 95). A parking spaces is a location where you can expect to have a car parked a reasonable amount of time, particularly in the case of an allocated parking space, and so if highway adoption is to be considered, then such instances need to be revised accordingly.

There would also be a requirement for the visibility splay drawing to be updated to include all junctions within the site where multiple cars are expected to access / egress, for example car courts, and drawings should be updated to show these for assessment also.

PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE MOVEMENT

Cycle movement within the proposed site is via on-road utilisation only, bar the 3 links out of site as outlined above. Given the anticipated speeds within the development, this would be acceptable.

Provision for pedestrians is more available, with a level of linked footways running around the site. However there are some areas where links appear to be missing with benefits gained for both convenience and safety if they were to be added to plans.

One such missing link is to the north of the site, linking into the proposed shared pedestrian cycle link in the direction of the underpass. Clearly this is a promoted link, and as such a footway would be anticipated. However footways stop short completely at this area of the site with no provision at all across the frontages of 92 to 99. Whilst vehicle movements could be lower in this area due to the cul-de-sac nature of this section of the site, it is largely replicated around the edge of the site, and so a link path located on the surrounding grassed area, upon which users could move off road, would be beneficial for some user groups.

Clarification of what is private or public paths would also be useful, for example outside of plots 88 to 91, which could provide a continuous footway with adjustments (i.e. to the southern end) if it were a public link.

Trip Generation

Within the submitted Transport Assessment, the additional multi-modal highway trips are outlined, providing information in regard to trip generation that would be attributed to the site should it come forwards.

In terms of highway impact, junction modelling has also been undertaken utilising the following scenarios:

- 2024 base year scenario;
- 2030 future year including existing and committed development; and

- 2030 future year including existing and committed development plus the proposed development.

The following junctions were modelled:

1. Proposed site access;
2. Maypole roundabout;
3. Kings Copse Avenue / Whitebeam roundabout;
4. Kings Copse Avenue / Sovereign Drive roundabout;
5. Kings Copse Avenue / Duke Head roundabout;
6. Kings Copse Avenue / Heath House Lane roundabout;
7. Barnfield Way / Dodwell Lane roundabout; and
8. M27 junction 8 interchange.

Following a review of the model outputs, as a result of the development proposals, only one junction was found to be impacted to a level where a concern would arise, being the M27 junction 8.

However the junction remained just within a theoretical capacity (RFC of 0.9), with a maximum 0.89 reported, and a queue length time increase from a maximum of 20.38 seconds to 24.56 seconds.

Whilst any increase in delay is unfortunate, it is not believed that such a theoretical delay (4.18 seconds) would be significant or have a detrimental affect on the local highway network.

Developer Contributions

There will be a need to implement highway improvements in future years to accommodate additional highway users, and most crucially encourage users of the development to travel sustainably.

As such, developer contributions would be required should the development proposals be granted permission and proceed to construction. The request for these would be £675,000, secured indicatively to:

- Bus infrastructure improvement in the local vicinity;
- Bus service subsidisation in the local vicinity; and
- Pedestrian and cycle improvements in the local vicinity.

However, it is noted that as part of the development proposals, the applicants are proposing to provide infrastructure upgrades and improvements (i.e. bridleway improvements and pedestrian refuge) which would be of benefit to the wider public, not just the future site occupiers. As such, if the developer

can provide justified costs for these, then some offsetting of the overall highway contribution being requested can be calculated accordingly.

Recommendation

Whilst there would not necessarily be any objection to the development proposals at this location from a highway perspective, additional information and drawings are required (as outlined above) before a formal highway recommendation can be issued from HCC as Local Highway Authority.

Yours faithfully,

Gemma McCart
Team Leader - Highway Development Planning
Hampshire 2050