

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	058933
Direct Line	N/A	Your reference	F/25/100141
Date	8 January 2026	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, and following on from the previous HCC Highway consultation response issued on 13 November 2025, it is noted that additional information has been submitted by the applicants, most notably a 'Transport Assessment Addendum' (TAA – dated 12/12/2025 on the EBC portal).

This document sets out to respond to highway questions and concerns previously raised by HCC Highway's, and is essentially split into 3 categories as follows:

1. Vehicle Access;
2. Pedestrian and Cycle Access; and
3. Internal Layout.

The TAA has been reviewed, and the following comments are made by HCC as the Local Highway Authority.

1. Vehicle Access

Visibility – It had been previously noted that whilst achievable visibility splays of 2.4 x 119.0m north and 2.4 x 109m south were outlined, the submitted drawing did not appear to show the full extent of the splay. The applicant has submitted an updated drawing (3743.03_RC S278 Works Overall Scheme) which now fully demonstrates the required visibility splay, and is accepted for the purposes of planning, though applicants should be made aware that a S278 will still need to be applied for prior to the access junction being implemented.

This drawing should also be utilised for a planning condition stipulating that nothing above 0.6m in height should be placed within the splay.

Vehicle Tracking – It had been requested that additional vehicle tracking drawings were provided showing all moves through the access junction. These have been provided via drawing Base: 3743.01 / Track: 3743.T01 located at Appendix C of the TAA, and are acceptable. Whilst there is some minor encroachment into an opposing lane for the refuse vehicle, this will obviously be low level (i.e. once per week) and can be adjusted without major concern through drivers giving way in this specific case. The more usual movement of two-way family car traffic is achievable without conflict.

2. Pedestrian and Cycle Access

Link to Norman Rodaway Playing Fields – It had been requested that the proposed 2.0m footway link from the site access to the Norman Rodaway Playing Fields alongside Kings Copse Avenue was widened to allow shared pedestrian use. In response to this, the applicant has outlined that the additional land required for such widening is not within their control and there are arboriculturally issues, and as such this is not achievable. Whilst this is unfortunate, as such a link would likely be well utilised, it is noted that an alternative link into the playing fields is provided from the site, crossing Tanhouse Lane, entering into a side entrance. Whilst this route is not necessarily the best in wet weather conditions, it could be that any secured Highway related developer contributions, or even Open Space contributions could be utilised to provide an all weather route around the edge of the playing field that essentially serves the same purpose.

As such, no objection would be made on this issue, subject to Highway developer contributions being received.

Shared Pedestrian / cycle link into the underpass – Clarification was sought as to the correct drawing that should be assessed for the link, given two differing versions were originally submitted. It has been confirmed that drawing 3743.03_RC S278 Works Overall Scheme is the correct drawing to review. On the drawing, this is confirmed to be a 'Proposed 2m pedestrian footpath from proposed development to existing footpath' rather than providing a formal shared cycle route.

Given the constrained widths of existing adjacent footway infrastructure heading north from this point, the designation of pedestrians only may be appropriate. However, as part of the Minor Works S278 to be submitted to implement the connection, maximum widths of both the underpass and link to Ambleside should be established and the proposed link should be equivalent to this. At this point, it may be found that a formal shared foot / cycle link is achievable, and this should be signposted as such. If constraints indicate the route is insufficient for such purposes, then appropriate signage should be put in place to restrict the route accordingly.

Whilst it remains the case, that the most appropriate cycle route would involve the provision of an off-road cycle route alongside Kings Copse Avenue, and highway developer contributions should be secured to part fund this, it is noted that other not-so-direct routes are available, and these have also been shown in the TAA. These are acceptable, utilising quieter roads to gain access in part to designated cycle routes further along the network.

As such this is acceptable, providing developer contributions are secured to part fund a future provision.

In terms of investigation into further cycle links to Kings Copse Primary School, it is also noted that a link from the 'developer to improve' Tanhouse Lane North Bridleway improvements exists into Woodstock Close exists, and provides an improved route to that previously understood to be available. This is therefore accepted.

Internal Layout

Whilst as previously outlined, it is understood that the internal estate roads and footways are not going to be put forward for adoption, an initial review of the internal layout was undertaken regardless. This identified issues which have been discussed within the TAA.

Elements such as parking outside of plots 35 to 43 continue to be inconvenient to users, and whilst the TAA outlines how the landscaped areas will be of 'features that will not be passable for pedestrians', this does nothing to negate convenience issues – i.e plot 39 could have a 10m walk to their front door from their parking space, but instead will have to walk around the landscaping and then head back on themselves to gain access to their front door, a distance of approximately 45m. Whilst not necessarily an unreasonable additional distance, it seems odd when an easy solution could be found with a link path or two being provided through the landscaping.

Other elements such as step out strips adjacent to end parking bays located adjacent to landscaping or vertical obstruction is however understood to have been implemented, and the step out area behind parking bays for plots 61 to 64 is welcomed, removing the need to stand in the road when accessing car boots.

In terms of internal visibility splays, again this reduction from the standard 2.4 x 25.0m is discussed, and it is noted that the reduced 2.4 x 18.0m splays are

permitted for tertiary streets under TG3. Again, this is accepted, but covenants should be put in place for any private areas of site which the visibility splays cross, to ensure landscaping is kept at 0.9m or less and fences / wall at 1.0m or less.

Additional comments

Additional to the above, and the previous HCC Highway consultation comments, it can also be confirmed that there would be no objection to the proposals in terms of impacts on local Public Right of Ways (PROW). Developer to construct improvements involve the widening and improvement to Tanhouse Lane north, enabling the link to be utilised for both pedestrians and cyclists; and the improvements to the northern end of the southern half of Tanhouse Lane are acceptable, linking it into a footway provision and pedestrian refuge on Kings Copse Avenue.

There is however concern raised in terms of how the future development may interact with Jubilee Woods along the sites southern and eastern boundary, in terms that the sites open space area sits directly adjacent to this. Concerns are that the woods will essentially be encroached upon with people forming unauthorised paths through the woods, utilising it for play and dog walking, in what is essentially a sensitive and managed area.

The developer should therefore implement a 'Deer Fence' or similar along the boundary to prevent such unrestricted movements, in consultation with HCC's Countryside Services who manage the woods and adjacent country parks. This should be a condition of planning as outlined below.

Highway Developer Contributions

As outlined in the previous HCC Highway Consultation response, Highway Developer Contributions totalling £675K are requested, initially being allocated towards:

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

Onwards from this, it was also outlined that HCC as Local Highway Authority would be amenable to the reduction of this figure for the appropriate costs of the PROW improvements on Tanhouse Lane that will benefit the wider local community, with the developer to provide the finalised costs for these works.

This is discussed within the TAA at Section 5.3.5, where the applicant outlines that 'On a without prejudice basis, the applicant is willing to provide a proportionate contribution of £675,000 minus the cost of the enhanced Tanhouse Lane bridleway works which can be used by HCC to either support the delivery of their LCWIP scheme or alternatively towards upgrading local cycling infrastructure which would also benefit existing residents'.

Given the methodology of the calculation, it would be requested that the contribution is received prior to occupation, and will need to be secured as such in a S106 agreement should a planning permission be forthcoming.

It should however be noted, that in addition to the three uses for the funding as outlined above, it is also requested that the following could also benefit from the secured funding, and it is trusted that the applicants would be agreeable to this.

- Bridleway Diversions in the local vicinity to improve user experience, i.e. to pass round the edge of built development rather than through the middle of it on the route between the site and Botley;
- East / West Tanhouse Lane link improvements (near Dodwell Copse) providing better surfaces;
- Footpath to Bridleway upgrades to enable cycling; and
- Bridge improvements on links to the country park from the site.

Recommendation:

Given the above, there would be no objection to the proposals, subject to conditions outlined below being applied; the receipt of developer contributions; and the understanding that the internal site roads and footways are not to be put forward for highway adoption in the future and that a private management plan will be in place to maintain the private roads and footways, and implement any required parking restrictions as necessary.

CONDITIONS:

1. ACCESS CONSTRUCTION PROVISION

No development shall start on site until the access, including the footway and/or verge crossing shall be constructed and lines of sight of 2.4 metres by 109.0 metres (north east) and 2.4 metres by 119.0 metres (south west) are provided in accordance with the approved plans (or those subsequently stipulated by the S278 agreement). The lines of sight splays shown on the approved plans shall be kept free of any obstruction exceeding 0.6 metre in height above the adjacent carriageway and shall be subsequently maintained so thereafter.

Reason - To provide satisfactory access and in the interests of highway safety.

2. OFF-SITE HIGHWAY WORKS

No occupation of the site shall commence until all off-site highway works have been completed, as shown on approved plans.

Reason - To provide satisfactory access and in the interests of highway safety.

3. DEER FENCE

No occupation of the site shall commence until a 'deer fence' or similar boundary treatment has been provided by the developer (in consultation with HCC's Countryside Services) along the southern and eastern edge of the site between Townhouse Lane and Ambleside.

Reason – To protect the adjacent woodland area from damage

4. CONSTRUCTION SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN REQUIRED

No development shall start on site until a construction site management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority, which shall include:

- (a) A programme of and phasing of demolition (if any) and construction work;
- (b) The provision of long term facilities for contractor parking;
- (c) The arrangements for deliveries associated with all construction works;
- (d) Access and egress for plant and machinery;
- (e) Protection of pedestrian routes during construction;
- (f) Location of temporary site buildings, compounds, construction material, and plant storage areas;
- (g) Details of the methodology for ensuring dirt is not transferred onto the highway from the site (i.e. wheel washers), and onwards mitigation should this fail, such as the employment of mechanical road sweepers, and the subsequent refresh of street lining (as and when required) should this be damaged during the process.

Demolition and construction work shall only take place in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason - In order that the Planning Authority can properly consider the effect of the works on the amenity of the locality.

Yours faithfully,

Matt Grantham
Principal Transport Planner - Highway Development Planning
Hampshire 2050