

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	058913
Direct Line	N/A	Your reference	RM/25/100575
Date	8 January 2026	Email	eastleighdc@hants.gov.uk

For attention of Mr Chapman

Dear Sirs

Re: RM/25/100575 At ONE HORTON HEATH, UPPER ACRE, HORTON HEATH, FAIR OAK, EASTLEIGH

Submission of Reserved Matters relating to Layout, Scale, Appearance, and Landscaping pursuant to Condition 4 (RM Requirements) of Outline Planning Permission O/20/89498 for the erection of 424 dwellings within Phase 10 (The Upper Acre), with associated public open space, landscaping, and cycle and vehicular parking, to include details relevant to the following Outline Planning Permission conditions:

- **Condition 16 (Arb Assessment)**
- **Condition 21 (Design Code Compliance)**
- **Condition 25 (Refuse)**
- **Condition 31 (Higher Access Standards)**
- **Condition 32 (Internal Space Standards)**
- **Condition 45 (Noise Assessments)**
- **Condition 58 (Flood Mitigation)**
- **Condition 59 (Foul Drainage)**
- **Condition 61 (SUDs)**
- **Condition 64 (EMMP)**
- **Condition 67 (Landscaping)**
- **Condition 71 (BNG)**
- **Condition 72 (New Forest Protected Sites Mitigation)**
- **Condition 76 (Nutrient Neutrality)**

An Environmental Impact Assessment was submitted with the outline application

In regard to highway matters, above conditions that are of relevance are Conditions 4, 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 Upper Acre is located in the southeastern corner of the wider One Horton Heath development and will be served off Foxwood Road, a primary link road through the overall One Horton Heath site, which links onto The Avenue, the main link road through the site, at each of its ends.

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 and 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 maintenance and parking 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 Foxwood Road that runs through the development area. In total, 5 junctions are proposed with 3 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 Foxwood Road, and crossing the 5 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 2 parcels for development, east and west, and for ease each of these parcels will be reviewed separately.

Parcel 1 – Upper Acre Development to the east of Foxwood Road (Flat Blocks 1 and 4, and Plots 31 to 244)

In terms of vehicle movements, vehicle tracking drawings have been provided which show movements for large family cars manoeuvring through the site (drawing 2310092-TK06 Rev P03) and also a 7.5T panel van (delivery vehicle) moving and turning around site (drawing 2310092-TK07 Rev P03 and 2310092-TK08 Rev P03).

For the large family cars, this is largely completed without conflict with two-way movements achievable given the proposed road widths. However, there are a couple of junctions where it appears that two-way tracking is potentially not achievable and as such one car will have to stop prior to a junction whilst another moves through it. Examples of this are the junctions located between plots 6 and 75, and 182 and 199.

Whilst these junctions primarily serve a relatively few number of dwellings, and therefore vehicle movements, it would be recommended that the junctions are widened to allow for unrestricted two-way vehicle access accordingly. The Case officer may wish to request updated vehicle tracking drawings that's fully show two-way movements at all internal site junctions to ensure movements are un-obstructively achievable.

For the 7.5T panel vans, the drawings show the movement around the site and also the turning movements available. Whilst movement around the site is achievable, unfortunately the drawings do not show movement across the whole of the site, or indeed two-way movements with a large family car travelling in the opposite direction, or through all site junctions.

It would be recommended that these are provided for assessment, as the drawings will identify any pinch-points that either require (private) parking restrictions or widening of the carriageway / junction accordingly.

Any updated drawing should also show a full suite of turning movements on site, with areas such as that outside of plot 191 requiring an elongated reversal movement, should the delivery vehicle travel to the specific dwelling not realising there is no turning area at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Refuse vehicle tracking has also been supplied, via drawings 2310092-TK01 Rev P09 and 2310092-TK04 P03. This shows movements around the site, generally linking into the collection arrangements, although clarification as to how the refuse collection point associated with flat block 4 should be given, considering there does not appear to be any hard surface link to it.

It is also noted that no large family car movements are shown on the same tracking. It would be useful if this were shown, in order to identify any pinch-points where (private) parking restrictions are required in order to keep the route clear of obstruction and allow collections to be undertaken unhindered – i.e. potentially outside of plots 97 to 101.

Additionally, it is noted that a 2.23 x 10.36 dimension refuse vehicle is utilised for the tracking, and this should be increased in revised tracking to 2.53 x 11.2m to replicate HCC requirements and also the largest refuse vehicle that is understood to be utilised by EBC currently.

Similarly, whilst Emergency vehicle access has also been shown in drawing 2310092-TK02 Rev P08, an incorrectly sized fire tender has been utilised. The standard dimensions for a Hampshire fire tender are 2.55 x 8.1m, and the tracking drawing utilises one measuring 2.5 x 7.9m. Drawings should be updated accordingly so that a full assessment of movement around site and potential conflict points can be undertaken accordingly.

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.

In terms of pedestrian movements, plans (2310092-02 Rev P03) demonstrate a good level of joined up links throughout the parcel, linking up to the footways on the wider highway network. There are however sections of footway that would be beneficial but are not currently provided on plans. Such a link would be the straight section of road between plots 137 to 167, where footway links just push pedestrians onto the road. Given the straightness of this section, with little natural speed reduction, it would be beneficial for formal footways to be provided here to ensure adequate highway safety is achieved. Certainly, if the road was up for adoption, such links would need to be provided.

There are also other missing sections such as outside of plots 233 to 244, which whilst it is acknowledged that this section is not a through road, could easily provide a linking footway along the edge of the landscaped area opposite.

Drawing 2310092-06 Rev P01 also shows pedestrian links, highlighting proposed drop kerbs. Again these are largely acceptable across the site, but there are missing drop kerbs identifiable such as between plots 200 and 220 (and opposite), to the south of plot 223, and at the ends of parking areas where links would be expected to be provided such as to the south of block 4 parking / north of parking for plot 175. These need to be reviewed and provided in the final built out private development.

Cycle movements will be on-road, bar the circulatory route that runs around the eastern perimeter, until access to Foxwood 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, these are shown on drawings 2310092-05 Rev P01 for pedestrians and 2310092-01 Rev P03 for vehicles.

These demonstrate that 2.4 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 (such as to the west of plots 60, 88 and 133) which would not be allowed if the roads and footways were to be adopted, given that visibility would be blocked by the parked vehicles, particularly vans or higher SUV cars.

The Case Office may wish to consider this, or request that an independent Road Safety Audit is produced which clearly covers such issues with appropriate commentary.

Parcel 2 – Upper Acre Development to the west of Foxwood Road (Flat Blocks 2, 3 and 5 and Plots 276 to 420)

As outlined above, in terms of vehicle movements, a vehicle tracking drawings have been provided which show movements for large family cars manoeuvring through the site (drawing 2310092-TK06 Rev P03) and also a 7.5T panel van (delivery vehicle) moving and turning around site (drawing 2310092-TK07 Rev P03 and 2310092-TK08 Rev P03).

For the large family cars, again this is largely completed without conflict with two-way movements achievable given the proposed road widths. However, there are a couple of junctions where it appears that two-way tracking is potentially not achievable and as such one car will have to stop prior to a junction whilst another moves through it. Examples of this are the junctions located between plots 278 and 322 and to the north of plot 375.

Whilst these junctions theoretically serve a relatively small number of dwellings and therefore vehicle movements, though the junction between 278 and 322 could be used as a circulatory route, it would be recommended that the junctions are widened to allow for unrestricted two-way vehicle access accordingly. The Case officer may wish to request updated vehicle tracking drawings that's fully show two-way movements at all internal site junctions to ensure movements are un-obstructively achievable.

As with the eastern half of the site, for the 7.5T panel vans, the drawings show the movement around the site and also the turning movements available. Whilst movement around the site is achievable, unfortunately the drawings do not show movement across the whole of the site, or indeed two-way movements with a large family car travelling in the opposite direction, or through all site junctions.

It would be recommended that these are provided for assessment, as the drawings will identify any pinch-points that either require (private) parking restrictions or widening of the carriageway / junction accordingly.

Any updated drawing should also show a full suite of turning movements on site, with areas such as that outside of plot 363 requiring an elongated

reversal movement, should the delivery vehicle travel to the specific dwelling not realising there is no turning area at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Refuse vehicle tracking has also been supplied, via drawings 2310092-TK01 Rev P09 and 2310092-TK04 P03. This shows movements around the site, generally linking into the collection arrangements, although clarification as to how the refuse collection points associated with the 3 blocks of flats can be reached should be given, considering these areas look tight and no tracking is provided.

As noted for the eastern half of the site, no large family car movements are shown on the same tracking. It would be useful if this were shown, in order to identify any pinch-points where (private) parking restrictions are required in order to keep the route clear of obstruction and allow collections to be undertaken unhindered, though it is noted that due to the layout and formal parking, such locations will be minimal.

Additionally, it is noted that a 2.23 x 10.36 dimension refuse vehicle is utilised for the tracking, and this should be increased in revised tracking to 2.53 x 11.2m to replicate HCC requirements and also the largest refuse vehicle that is understood to be utilised by EBC currently.

Similarly, whilst Emergency vehicle access has also been shown in drawing 2310092-TK02 Rev P08, an incorrectly sized fire tender has been utilised. The standard dimensions for a Hampshire fire tender are 2.55 x 8.1m, and the tracking drawing utilises one measuring 2.5 x 7.9m. Drawings should be updated accordingly so that a full assessment of movement around site and potential conflict points can be undertaken accordingly.

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.

Pedestrian provision is shown on drawing (2310092-02 Rev P03) and this shows a good level of joined up links throughout the parcel, linking up to the footways on the wider highway network. There are however sections of footway that would be beneficial but are not currently provided on plans. Such a link would be the potential cut through between plots 278 to 286 and adjacent block of flats which also provides movement to and from parking spaces.

Drawing 2310092-06 Rev P01 also shows pedestrian links, highlighting proposed drop kerbs. Again, these are largely acceptable across the site, but there are missing drop kerbs identifiable such as to the west of plot 393 linking across to 491, and access paths linking from parking areas into the blocks of flats.

These need to be reviewed and provided in the final built out private development.

Cycle movements will again be on-road until they head out east where they gain access to Foxwood Road, 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, these are shown on drawings 2310092-05 Rev P01 for pedestrians and 2310092-01 Rev P03 for vehicles.

As with the eastern half of the site, these demonstrate that 2.4 x 25.0m visibility splays (required for a 20mph design speed) can be achieved across the parcel, though it is again 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 spaces (such as 397 and 424) which would not be allowed if the roads and footways were to be adopted, given that visibility would be blocked by the parked vehicles, particularly vans or higher SUV cars.

Again, the Case Office may wish to consider this, or request that an independent Road Safety Audit is produced which clearly covers such issues with appropriate commentary.

PARKING:

For the overall development proposal, 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 635 parking spaces are proposed, whilst the EBC Parking Standards have a requirement for 750 spaces – a shortfall of approximately 15%.

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 (to be) Foxwood 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.

There are however issues with some of the parking which should be resolved, such as:

- A vehicle appears to overhang what looks like a private area and a footway when accessing parking space 217;
- It is not clear how a vehicle actually access parking space 207;
- Parking spaces 137 to 166 are angled oddly, forcing a vehicle into a direction that they may not necessarily wish to travel; and
- Parking for plots 97 to 100 requires a vehicle overhang due to the narrow aisle width. It may be better to take a little space from the landscaping area to provide an easier turn and also prevent blocking by roadside parking.

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. There appears to be quite a few spaces where this would currently be an issue.

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 25 – Refuse Collection Strategy;

In terms of a 'Refuse Strategy', as outlined above, drawings have been submitted to show how a refuse vehicle can travel round the site and collect bins accordingly. Movement of the refuse vehicle is achievable but will likely require parking restrictions at certain locations (to be confirmed by additional vehicle tracking, utilising the correctly sized vehicle and two-way traffic movements) to enable free passage.

Additionally, it is not clear how the blocks of flats are to be serviced, as no tracking diagrams have been produced which definitively demonstrate this, and some additional footway links and drop kerbs are likely to be required.

It is therefore recommended that the Case Officer does not discharge this condition until updated drawings have been received and assessed in consultation with the EBC Direct Services team.

Condition 67 – Full Landscape Details:

Proposed landscaping is shown on drawing 1560-HED-XX-ZZ-DR-L-0101 Rev 04, and it would appear that any vertical obstructions are provided either outside of the required visibility splays, or where they are within the splay

envelope – i.e. a tree, these are likely to have trunk widths that are narrow enough to ensure visibility is essentially retained. Species of trees should however be utilised that would conform to this (i.e. not oaks), whilst also being of a sufficient height that they will not interfere with vehicles travelling below the canopy levels – i.e. refuse trucks.

The Case Officer may wish to consider such issues within their assessment.

From a highway perspective however, there would be **no objection** to the proposed discharge of condition 67 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