

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	058622
Direct Line	N/A	Your reference	RM/25/100430
Date	18 December 2025	Email	eastleighdc@hants.gov.uk

For attention of Mr Chapman

Dear Sirs

Re: RM/25/100430 At One Horton Heath - Quobleigh Breach, Horton Heath, Fair Oak, Eastleigh

Submission of Reserved Matters relating to Layout, Scale, Appearance, and Landscaping pursuant to Condition 4 (Reserved Matters Submission) of Outline Planning Permission O/20/89498 for the erection of 269 dwellings within Phase 6 (Quobleigh Breach), with associated public open space, landscaping, and cycle and vehicular parking, to include details relevant to the following Outline Planning Permission conditions:

- **Condition 4 – Reserved Matters Submission;**
- **Condition 6 – Phasing Plan;**
- **Condition 13 – Construction Traffic Management Plan;**
- **Condition 16 – Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Survey;**
- **Condition 21 – Design Code Compliance;**
- **Condition 25 – Refuse Collection Strategy;**
- **Condition 31 – Access Standards;**
- **Condition 32 – Internal Space Standards;**
- **Condition 35 – Built Heritage Statement;**
- **Condition 45 – Noise Risk Assessment and Management scheme;**
- **Condition 58 – Flood Risk Mitigation;**
- **Condition 61 – Drainage Scheme**
- **Condition 64 – Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP);**
- **Condition 67 – Full Landscape Details;**
- **Condition 71 – Biodiversity Net Gain;**
- **Condition 72 – New Forest Protected Sites mitigation.**

In regard to highway matters, above conditions that are of relevance are Conditions 4, 13, 25 and 67. These have been reviewed by HCC as Local Highway Authority and comments on each are outlined below.

Condition 4 – Reserved Matters Submission:

It is understood that Quobleigh Breach is located in the northwestern corner of the wider One Horton Heath development and will be served off the new link road between Allington Lane and Burnetts Lane with the link road itself running through the Quobleigh Breach site.

Onwards, it is further understood that the roads and footways relating to this application are not being offered for adoption by the developer. As such, HCC as local highway authority would not specifically object to the proposals given they are to remain private out as such out of the specific jurisdiction of the Local Highway Authority.

It would however 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.

It would also be advisable for EBC to obtain a 'sign-off report' from the developer, whereby a suitably qualified engineer involved with the development issues a formal statement outlining how the development will be in compliance to the above.

Having undertaken an initial review of the submitted plans however, the following comments are made:

ACCESS FROM THE HIGHWAY:

Access into the specific development site will be taken from priority junctions either side of the existing adopted link road that runs through the development area. In total, 4 junctions are proposed with 2 on the eastern side and 2 on the western side.

Whilst no specific visibility splay drawings have been submitted within the associated Transport Assessment (TA), it is clear that the layout of the actual built development will not impact upon the visibility requirements at these access points, being set back sufficiently away from the highway.

Foot and cycle links along the link road, and crossing the 4 access junctions are also already approved and in place, and as such do not form part of this application. It is purely internal elements which are to be assessed.

INTERNAL LAYOUT:

Internally, the site is essentially split into 4 parcels for development, and for ease each parcel will be reviewed separately.

Parcel 1 – Plots 1 to 95 (excluding plot 79)

In terms of vehicle movements, a vehicle tracking drawing has been provided (drawing 131.0010-0003 Rev P04) which demonstrates how a standard family car and a 4.6T light van (delivery vehicle) can move around site in a two-way manner.

This is largely completed without conflict, bar a vehicle access into the parking court area for parking spaces 25 to 70. Given the number of parking spaces and therefore associate vehicle movements utilising the parking court, it would be recommended that the junction is widened to allow for unrestricted two-way vehicle access accordingly.

The drawing also demonstrates that with adequately sized aisle widths (6.0m) enough space is provided to enable the turning of a family car in and out of parking spaces. However, there are areas at the end of roads / parking areas where it is not clear how a delivery vehicle will turn and not be required to perform an excessively long reverse movement before a turn to enable forward gear movement can be achieved. Examples of these areas are outside of plots 1, 16 and 95.

It is recommended that additional vehicle tracking drawings for the 4.6T light van are supplied to demonstrate such turning movements are achievable for road safety reasons.

Refuse vehicle tracking has also been supplied, with both a refuse vehicle moving around site (131.0010-0001 Rev P05) and a refuse vehicle and family car travelling in opposing directions around the site (131.0010-0010 Rev P02).

Whilst the refuse vehicle can travel around the site to complete its collections, it is noted that there are conflict points when confronted with a car, which require one to stop and let the other pass. Given the low level frequency of refuse movements, whilst this may well be accommodated in reality with driver give and take, and is acceptable on a private road, it could cause issues if cars are parked in these same locations – i.e outside of plots 24, 71 and 72.

This could cause issue for the refuse vehicle and result in collections being missed.

Additionally, the refuse vehicle turning head outside of plot 3 and 4 utilises an area that fronts the driveways associated with these 2 dwellings. It will need to be made clear that the turning head must remain free of parking, and it is not to be used as an extension to the driveways. The body of the refuse vehicle also crosses over landscaped areas in this location, so this will need to be kept clear of any vertical planting.

Emergency vehicle access has also been shown in drawing 131.0010-0001 Rev P02, which again shows how all areas of parcel 1 can be reached. However, there is potential for the same issues of conflict if cars are parked in locations where wider areas of carriageway are required to complete turning manoeuvres.

Whilst if the roads were adopted, TRO's could be put in place to prevent this issue, as a private road, the Site Management Plan will need to cover this accordingly.

In terms of pedestrian movements, plans demonstrate good joined up links throughout the parcel, linking up to the footways on the wider highway network. Cycle movements will be on-road until access to the link road is achieved at which point off-road cycling options are provided. Given the quantum of development in the parcel, and anticipated speeds, this is acceptable.

With regard to visibility splays, drawings 131.0010-0007 Rev P03 and 131.0010-0008 Rev P02 have been submitted and assessed for parcel 1 accordingly. These demonstrate that 2.0 x 25.0m visibility splays (required for a 20mph design speed) can be achieved across the parcel, though it is noted that:

1. Visibility splays cut across some garden areas, which would not be allowed if the roads and footways were to be adopted. However, it is noted that covenants are to be put in place to ensure visibility splays are not impeded, and if this is enforced by the site management company, then visibility should remain acceptable; and
2. There are locations where visibility splays cross formal car parking which would not be allowed if the roads and footways were to be adopted without favourable independent road safety comments being provided. However, it is noted that these instances are leading into relatively short cul-de-sac / parking court areas and as such should be accompanied by low speeds.

Parcel 2 – Plots 96 to 160

As outlined above, in terms of vehicle movements a vehicle tracking drawing has been provided (drawing 131.0010-0003 Rev P04) which demonstrates how a standard family car and a 4.6T light van (delivery vehicle) can move around site in a two-way manner.

This is largely completed without conflict, bar entry through access junctions adjacent to plots 116 and 151 where one of the vehicles is required to stop short prior to the opposing vehicle completing their manoeuvre through the junction. It would be recommended that the junction is widened to allow for unrestricted two-way vehicle access accordingly.

The drawing also demonstrates that with adequately sized aisle widths (6.0m) enough space is provided to enable the turning of a family car in and out of parking spaces. However, the space available for the turning of a delivery vehicle outside of plot 160 looks like an excessively long reverse movement before a turn to enable forward gear movement can be achieved, will be required.

It is recommended that additional vehicle tracking drawings for the 4.6T light van are supplied to demonstrate such turning movements are achievable for road safety reasons.

Refuse vehicle tracking drawings supplied, for both a refuse vehicle moving around site (131.0010-0001 Rev P05) and a refuse vehicle and family car travelling in opposing directions around the site (131.0010-0010 Rev P02) have also been assessed for parcel 2.

Again, it is noted that whilst the refuse vehicle can travel around the site to complete its collections, there are conflict points when confronted with a car, which require one to stop and let the other pass. Given the low level frequency of refuse movements, whilst this may well be accommodated in reality with driver give and take, and acceptable on a private road, it could cause issues if cars are parked in these same locations – i.e outside of plots 102, 120, 130 and 154. This could cause issue for the refuse vehicle and result in collections being missed.

Emergency vehicle access has also been shown in drawing 131.0010-0001 Rev P02, which again shows how all areas of parcel 2 can be reached. However, there is potential for the same issues of conflict if cars are parked in locations where wider areas of carriageway are required to complete turning manoeuvres.

Whilst if adopted, TRO's could be put in place to prevent this issue, as a private road, the Site Management Plan will need to cover this accordingly.

In terms of pedestrian movements, plans again demonstrate good joined up links throughout the parcel, linking up to the footways on the wider highway network. Cycle movements will be on-road until access to the link road is achieved at which point off-road cycling options are provided. Given the quantum of development in the parcel, and anticipated speeds, this is acceptable.

With regard to visibility splays, drawings 131.0010-0007 Rev P03 and 131.0010-0008 Rev P02 have been submitted and assessed for parcel 2 accordingly. These demonstrate that 2.0 x 25.0m visibility splays (required for a 20mph design speed) can be achieved across the parcel, though it is noted that:

1. Visibility splays cut across some garden areas, which would not be allowed if the roads and footways were to be adopted. However, it is noted that covenants are to be put in place to ensure visibility splays are not impeded, and if this is enforced by the site management company, then visibility should remain acceptable; and
2. There are locations where visibility splays cross formal car parking which would not be allowed if the roads and footways were to be adopted without favourable independent road safety comments being provided. However, it is noted that these instances are leading into

relatively short cul-de-sac / parking court areas and as such should be accompanied by low speeds.

Parcel 3 – Plots 161 to 216

Again, in terms of vehicle movements a vehicle tracking drawing has been provided (drawing 131.0010-0003 Rev P04) which demonstrates how a standard family car and a 4.6T light van (delivery vehicle) can move around site in a two-way manner.

This is largely completed without conflict, bar entry though access junction to the south of plot 165 leading into the car court area where one of the vehicles is required to stop short prior to the opposing vehicle completing their manoeuvre through the junction. It would be recommended that the junction is widened to allow for unrestricted two-way vehicle access accordingly.

The drawing also demonstrates that with adequately sized aisle widths (6.0m) enough space is provided to enable the turning of a family car in and out of parking spaces. However, the space available for the turning of a delivery vehicle outside of plots 186 and 194 looks like an excessively long reverse movement before a turn to enable forward gear movement can be achieved, will be required.

It is recommended that additional vehicle tracking drawings for the 4.6T light van are supplied to demonstrate such turning movements are achievable for road safety reasons.

Refuse vehicle tracking drawings supplied, for both a refuse vehicle moving around site (131.0010-0001 Rev P05) and a refuse vehicle and family car travelling in opposing directions around the site (131.0010-0010 Rev P02) have again been assessed for parcel 3.

Again, it is noted that whilst the refuse vehicle can travel around the site to complete its collections, there are conflict points when confronted with a car, which require one to stop and let the other pass. However, once again, given the low-level frequency of refuse movements, whilst this may well be accommodated in reality with driver give and take, and acceptable on a private road. It is unlikely that cars will park in these same locations due to the parking layout in this parcel.

Emergency vehicle access has also been shown in drawing 131.0010-0001 Rev P02, which again shows how all areas of parcel 3 can be reached. However, there is potential for the same issues of conflict if cars are parked in locations where wider areas of carriageway are required to complete turning manoeuvres.

The Site Management Plan will need to cover this accordingly.

In terms of pedestrian movements, plans again demonstrate good joined up links throughout the parcel, linking up to the footways on the wider highway network. Cycle movements will be on-road until access to the link road is achieved at which point off-road cycling options are provided. Given the

quantum of development in the parcel, and anticipated speeds, this is acceptable.

With regard to visibility splays, drawings 131.0010-0007 Rev P03 and 131.0010-0008 Rev P02 have been submitted and assessed for parcel 3 accordingly. These demonstrate that 2.0 x 25.0m visibility splays (required for a 20mph design speed) can be achieved across the parcel, though it is noted that there are locations where visibility splays cross formal car parking which would not be allowed if the roads and footways were to be adopted without favourable independent road safety comments being provided.

However, it is noted that these instances are looking into directions where the lead in distance of the road is relatively short (i.e. plot/parking 189) and so speeds and flows would be assumed to be relatively low.

Parcel 4 – Plots 217 to 269 (including plot 79)

Finally, in terms of vehicle movements, again the submitted vehicle tracking drawing provided has been assessed (drawing 131.0010-0003 Rev P04), which demonstrates how a standard family car and a 4.6T light van (delivery vehicle) can move around site in a two-way manner.

This is completed without conflict across the whole parcel of development, and so it would be acceptable.

The drawing also demonstrates that with adequately sized aisle widths (6.0m) enough space is provided to enable the turning of a family car in and out of parking spaces. Space also appears to be provided for the turning of a delivery vehicles (4.6T light van) to enable forward gear movement can be achieved. It would however be recommended that a vehicle tracking drawing is provided to formally demonstrate this.

Refuse vehicle tracking drawings supplied, for both a refuse vehicle moving around site (131.0010-0001 Rev P05) and a refuse vehicle and family car travelling in opposing directions around the site (131.0010-0010 Rev P02) have also been assessed for parcel 4.

Once again it is noted that whilst the refuse vehicle can travel around the site to complete its collections, there are conflict points when confronted with a car, which require one to stop and let the other pass. This may well be accommodated in reality given the low frequency of the movement, with driver give and take, and acceptable on a private road, but it could cause issues if cars are parked in these same locations – i.e. outside of plots 217, 254 and 255. This could cause issue for the refuse vehicle and result in collections being missed.

Emergency vehicle access has also been shown in drawing 131.0010-0001 Rev P02, which again shows how all areas of parcel 4 can be reached. However there is potential for the same issues of conflict if cars are parked in locations where wider areas of carriageway are required to complete turning manoeuvres.

Whilst if adopted, TRO's could be put in place to prevent this issue, as a private road, the Site Management Plan will need to cover this accordingly.

In terms of pedestrian movements, as with the other development parcels, plans again demonstrate good joined up links throughout the parcel, linking up to the footways on the wider highway network.

There do however appear to be some missing links that would be beneficial to the end users, these being a footway provision on the north side of the southern access (south of plot 254). Without a link here, elongated routes around are required, or a walk on the road which wouldn't be welcomed.

The cross road links between plots 239 to 294 and 245 to 247 should also be lined up better.

Cycle movements will be on-road until access to the link road is achieved at which point off-road cycling options are provided. Given the quantum of development in the parcel, and anticipated speeds, this is acceptable.

With regard to visibility splays, drawings 131.0010-0007 Rev P03 and 131.0010-0008 Rev P02 have been submitted and assessed for parcel 1 accordingly. These demonstrate that 2.0 x 25.0m visibility splays (required for a 20mph design speed) can be achieved across the parcel, though it is noted that:

1. Visibility splays cut across some garden areas, which would not be allowed if the roads and footways were to be adopted. However it is noted that covenants are to be put in place to ensure visibility splays are not impeded, and if this is enforced by the site management company, then visibility should remain acceptable; and
2. There are locations where visibility splays cross formal car parking which would not be allowed if the roads and footways were to be adopted without favourable independent road safety comments being provided. Examples of this are where the splay crosses parking spaces 217, 218, 254, 255, 268 and 269.

However, it is noted that these instances will be in locations where traffic crossing the junction area is unlikely due to the layout, with the vast majority of vehicles expected to be turning to egress the site. As such, speeds would be anticipated to be low.

PARKING:

Whilst the quantum of vehicle parking has not been assessed as this is a function for EBC, whereby their Parking Standards should be adhered to, it is noted that only 405 parking spaces are proposed, whilst the EBC Parking Standards have a requirement for 457 spaces – a shortfall of approximately 10%.

The Case Officer may wish to consider this, given that any shortfall is likely to result in either obstructive parking that could block the clear passage of refuse

or emergency vehicles in particular; or result in random parking appearing as people choose to convert gardens to provide additional parking (though potential options for this also look constrained).

Whilst not a specific highway issue, given the site is not being put forward for adoption, it would be recommended that private parking restrictions are put in place by the future site management company to prevent such issues. Traffic Regulation Orders will need to be in place on the adopted link road to prevent parking on the highway.

The parking layout has however been reviewed, and is generally acceptable with adequately sized parking bays and turning areas provided due to the aisle widths as outlined above.

It would also be recommended that where a parking space is located adjacent to a landscaped area, or a vertical obstruction (i.e. a wall) that an additional 0.3m step out strip is provided so that users can actually open car doors sufficiently to enable access and egress into the car itself. Without this, users are likely to bang doors or stepping over the landscaped areas that will become muddy in wet weather periods. Having reviewed the plans however, it would appear that this is already in place which is therefore acceptable.

SERVICING:

A proposed 'Refuse Strategy Plan' has been submitted as part of the application, which essentially shows the positions on site that the refuse vehicle will need to reach in order to collect the bins.

However, as outlined above, whilst vehicle tracking has been provided which shows that a refuse vehicle can physically circulate the site, there are points of conflict and parking in non-designated bays could impact these movements.

Finally, as the site is to remain within private ownership, the 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>

Condition 13 – Construction Traffic Management Plan;

The submitted Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP V1 – October 2025) has been reviewed and there would be **no objection** in principle to the discharge of condition from a highway perspective.

However, as outlined within the document, this will need to remain a 'live document' whereby updates can be made accordingly during the build process, as elements such as compound areas are moved as the site evolves. These updates will need to be submitted accordingly prior to the start of works, and then subsequently as the location changes during each phase,

demonstrating key elements such as storage and delivery areas; turning circles to enable forward gear access and egress for delivery vehicles; and parking areas for contractors.

Key elements of the plan that will however remain constant include elements such as the use of wheel wash facilities to ensure that site vehicles are clean prior to entering the highway network, and the use of road sweepers should this method fail and complaints be received. These measures are welcomed.

Additionally, Construction Traffic Routing is outlined, with proposals being that the majority of construction traffic would access the site from the south via the M27 at Junction 7, Charles Watts Way, Tollbar Way, Bubb Lane, Chalcroft Way to access the link road at the Burnetts Lane roundabout and subsequently access the Quobleigh Breach parcel.

The only occasion in which vehicles may route via Eastleigh and subsequently the B3037 and Allington Lane is if goods are arriving by train. This route would use Tower Lane, Chickenhall Lane, Bishopstoke Road, B3037 and Allington Lane before continuing into the site via the new link road.

Again, these routes are acceptable, avoiding passing through any residential areas as much as possible, or through local constraints such as the rail bridge on Allington Lane.

Finally, it is outlined in section 5.6 of the plan that 'If necessary, a condition survey prior to commencement will be undertaken by the developer and provided to HCC to be agreed. This can then be reassessed once construction works are complete and any damages resulting from the construction traffic movements will be repaired. It would be requested that such a document is provided at the start of each phase of the development.

Condition 25 – Refuse Collection Strategy;

As outlined above, a proposed 'Refuse Strategy Plan' has been submitted as part of the application, which essentially shows the positions on site that the refuse vehicle will need to reach in order to collect the bins.

This has been reviewed, and would appear to be acceptable (**no objection**) with bin collection points (individual and shared) located within a reasonable distance to where the refuse vehicle would be anticipated to reach.

However, again as outlined above, there could be access issues if vehicles are parked in obstructive non-designated parking spaces. The site management plan will need to ensure that private restrictions are in place to prevent this from happening as this could result in missed collections.

Condition 67 – Full Landscape Details;

It is noted that covenants will be put in place to ensure that any dwelling that has a private garden area which sits within the required visibility splay shall be kept clear of obstruction on this private road estate. This is acceptable, noting that the height of any landscaping quoted in the covenant should be that it is retained at 900mm or less.

This is in line with the height of the proposed front garden walls as shown on drawing 30071D-CLA-PRGB-00-PD-A-0001-P4 (Proposed Boundary Treatments). Walls shown on this plan range from 900mm to 1800mm (walls and fences) which are acceptable for the locations as shown.

Whilst it is onwards noted that trees are to be planted, as shown on the various landscaping drawings, it would not be anticipated that the trunk widths of these trees would cause a disruption to visibility splays. The Case Officer may however wish to consider how the canopy could impact the movement of vehicles (particularly refuse vehicles) dependant on the canopy heights which could conflict with vehicle cab heights.

From a highway perspective however, there would be **no objection** to the proposed discharge of condition for landscaping for this private road site, subject to covenants being applied as outlined above.

I trust the above is clear, however should you require any clarification please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Matt Grantham
Principal Transport Planner - Highway Development Planning
Hampshire 2050