

TECHNICAL NOTE

Job Name: One Horton Heath, The Folds Reserved Matters Application
Job No: 332612639
Note No: STA-ZZ-XX-TN-T-0002
Date: 4th March 2026
Prepared By: Thea Harland
Reviewed By: Joe House
Subject: **Response to Hampshire County Council Highways Comments for RM/25/100614 At Land West of Burnetts Lane (The Folds) dated 22.01.2026**

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Technical Note (TN) has been prepared by Stantec on behalf of Eastleigh Borough Council (One Horton Heath Team), hereby after referred to as the 'Applicant', as a response to the highways comments received by Hampshire County Council (HCC) dated 22 January 2026.
- 1.2. These comments refer to Reserved Matters Application for The Folds residential parcel with The Parkside development area.
- 1.3. The TN has set out additional information for HCC and EBC case officer consideration and has been split into sections to mirror the structure of the HCC highways comments. In addition to providing a written response to the comments, this TN has been prepared as a cover note to signpost the additional and revised drawings that have been prepared off the back of receiving the comments.

2. Condition 4 RM Submission Comments

HCC Comment (pg 2): *"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."*

Stantec Response:

As identified by the road hierarchy strategy, the site layout has been designed to achieve vehicle speeds of 20mph or below and to provide a clear hierarchy of 'Secondary', 'Mews/Parking Courtyards', and 'Tertiary' streets.

The proposed street geometries accord with the principles set out in DfT Manual for Streets guidance, as well as the carriageway widths recommended within HCC Technical Guidance Note TG1 – Highways Cross Section.

The principal north-south streets within The Folds masterplan are classified as Secondary Streets and are proposed with a 5.5m carriageway width (locally widened where perpendicular parking is provided). At junctions with tertiary streets, side road radii are generally set at 4m (exceeding the typical 2m to 3m guidance), with localised carriageway widening to accommodate the turning movements of larger service and emergency vehicles.

Although the streets are intended to remain unadopted, they have been designed in accordance with recognised industry standards and HCC Technical Guidance.

TECHNICAL NOTE

A site management company will be responsible for the future maintenance of the development and will prepare a strategy for managing on-site parking. Full details will be secured through a Site Management Plan, to be conditioned as part of the planning approval.

3. Access from the Highway Comments

- 3.1. **HCC Comment (pg 2):** *"...in terms of visibility splays from the link road through to Burnetts Lane (Fir Tree Avenue), these should be provided to fully demonstrate that appropriate visibility splays can be achieved, given there is adjacent landscaping that may require height conditions, as well as formal car parking bays that require consideration in terms of visual obstruction. It is recommended that the Case Officer requests this, and onwards assesses as part of their decision making process."*

Stantec Response:

Stantec **Drawing 332612639-STA-ZZ-XX-DR-T-5010** 'Visibility Splay Analysis Plan 2 of 4' submitted as part of The Holme and Homestall RMA TA includes the required visibility splays demonstrating 2.4m x 25m. This drawing was not initially included in the plans prepared for The Folds RMA due to the placement the red line boundary for this junction.

For ease of reference, see the below extract illustrating the visibility at the junction Fir Tree Lane junction in question for a 2.4m x 25m visibility splay. As shown the visibility splay looking left stays with the proposed footpath and would not be obstructed by the proposed car parking bays associated with the proposed block of flats to the southeast. Similarly, the visibility splay looking north into The Folds goes through an area of landscaping which would be low level and avoids the proposed car parking spaces.



TECHNICAL NOTE

4. Internal Layout Comments

- 4.1. **HCC Comment (pg 3):** *“The Case Officer may however wish to seek clarification as to what certain areas of the site have proposed in areas of the road where unidentified hatching markings are shown”*

Stantec Response:

The masterplan for The Folds has been designed with various character areas which have distinctive building styles and landscape to create identity and character, in addition to avoiding monotonous built form across the parcel. The area identified by the HCC highways officer on p.3 of the comments is one of the two ‘arrival plaza and central drive’ character areas which has been designed with features to create an attractive, welcoming space.

The carriageway consists of a shared surface with distinctive enhanced block paving with a pattern that defines parking areas and contributes to the legibility and quality of the gateway space. Visual representations of this area can be found on pages 41 and 59 of the ‘Design and Access Statement’ submitted for the RMA.

- 4.2. **HCC Comment (pg 4):** *“Whilst the refuse vehicle tracking...are largely acceptable...it is noted that no two-way movements also showing a family vehicle have been provided. It would be recommended that the Case Officer requests this so that any pinch-points for two-way refuse against car movements can be identified. This may onwards either require a private parking restriction or a localised widening of the road to ensure that refuse collections can be undertaken without obstructive incident.”*

Stantec Response:

Supplementary drawings demonstrating swept path analysis of a refuse vehicle and a large car travelling in the opposite direction across The Folds masterplan have been provided in **Appendix A**. These highlight a significant number of locations across the site where a large refuse and large family car can pass each other.

- Drawing ref. 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-**5013-P01** to **5016-P01**

- 4.3. **HCC Comment (pg 4):** *“Whilst the majority of the site appears to be easily serviced, there are areas where this is unclear, such as plots 1.01, 1.02 and 1.03 where no refuse turning head is provide, or any bin collection point. Similarly, plots 13.02 to 13.08 and 14.04 to 14.07 have bin collection points nearby, but these don’t look to be sufficient in size to cater for all plots that may utilise them and this should be checked.”*

Stantec Response:

A proposed refuse strategy plan (ref. RFT-17-XX-DR-A-1001_S2_P0) has been prepared and contained in **Appendix D** of this TN.

The refuse strategy plan illustrates the proposed refuse collection points for residents, along with the corresponding walking distances. In addition, the strategy plan indicates the refuse vehicle positions, which aligns with the submitted refuse tracking data. This demonstrates that all collection points are accessible and located within the recommended walking distances.

In reference to the specific plots highlighted by HCC:

- Plots 1.01-1.03 will be serviced to the rear of the houses where a collection point is provided and so the new streets has not been designed to facilitate large HGV access.

TECHNICAL NOTE

- Plots 13.02-14.05 will be serviced from the tertiary street/parking courtyards which have been designed to allow for a refuse vehicle the drive through with several refuse collection points located to the rear of the houses.
- Plots 14.06 and 14.07 refuse collection will take place from outside the property's frontage with the refuse vehicle turning around with the junction bellmouth the east.

- 4.4. **HCC Comment (pg 4):** "Emergency vehicle tracking drawings have also been provided for a fire tender...Unfortunately the standard Hampshire fire tender is 2.55 x 8.10 metres"

Stantec Response:

The fire tender swept path drawing submitted as part of the TA have been revised utilising the correct fire tender vehicle and provide in **Appendix B**. Revised drawings as follows:

- 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5005-P02
- 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5006-P02
- 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5007-P02
- 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5008-P02

- 4.5. **HCC Comment (pg 4):** "...it is noted that no vehicle tracking has been provided to demonstrate how two-way vehicle traffic for family sized vehicles will be able to travel around the site, or for delivery vehicles (3.5T sprinter vans and transit types)."

Stantec Response:

The following drawings have been prepared and provided in **Appendix C** to show two-way movement of a large family car passing throughout the development parcel:

- 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5017-P01
- 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5018-P01
- 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5019-P01
- 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5020-P01

We note the comment regarding the absence of vehicle tracking for two-way movements by family-sized vehicles and delivery vans (e.g. 3.5T Sprinter or Transit types).

Swept path analysis has now been provided as part of this response demonstrating two-way passing arrangements for a refuse vehicle (HGV) and car. The refuse vehicle represents a significantly larger design vehicle than a typical light goods vehicle. The tracking confirms that suitable passing places are distributed throughout the site and that opposing movements can be safely accommodated.

Given that the internal layout has been demonstrated to accommodate two-way movements involving an HGV, it follows that smaller delivery vans will be able to manoeuvre and pass with even greater ease across the masterplan. On this basis, the submitted tracking is considered proportionate to demonstrate the functionality of the proposed internal road network.

- 4.6. **HCC Comment (pg 5):** "...it is noted that in places there is the potential for these [visibility] splays to be interrupted...which would be unlikely to be permitted if the roads were being put forward for highway adoption....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."

TECHNICAL NOTE

Stantec Response:

The internal road layout operates at a low speed and within a controlled residential environment, where visibility requirements are proportionate to the nature and function of the streets. Parking is a typical and expected feature of such environments and is commonly accommodated within visibility envelopes without adverse safety implications. An independent Road Safety Audit could be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm compliance and provide further assurance, if required.

It is noted that the RSA undertaken for the Upper Acre parcel, also within the One Horton Heath site, did not raise any concerns with side road visibility where parking is within the visibility splays.

- 4.7. **HCC Comment (pg 6):** *"The layout of the development is however essentially in 'blocks'...within these blocks, formal footways are replaced by shared surface streets...There are however some sections where due to layouts this may not work so well, such as the straight stretch of road between plots 08.02 and 08.10 which may benefit from some traffic calming measures to further encourage slow vehicle speeds. Similarly, the cross site links between the two halves of the main access / egress road could also benefit from traffic calming measures, for example the sections between 02.01 to 02.10 and 02.03 to 02.09."*

Stantec Response:

The identified streets will benefit from appropriate signage to inform drivers of private access only to reduce speeds. In tandem with this, these mews / tertiary areas have been designed as shared use streets which a change to the carriageway surfacing to which will encourage drivers to slow down and deter rat-running.

Road narrowing's could be introduced at detailed design stage, through enhancing the landscape build outs to narrow the road for short sections but locations are constrained by parking, driveways, and vehicle access requirements.

5. Parking Comments

- 5.1. **HCC Comment (pg 6):** *"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 SID to prevent parking on the highway."*

Stantec Response:

Private parking restrictions will be considered in the future in regards to obstructive parking. For consistency with the wider OHH build out, any parking restrictions to be put in place will be informed by the site management company to ensure no overspill parking on the internal road network and prevent parking in such locations that could block access.

Parking restrictions, likely in the form of double yellow lining will be implemented at the turning areas and outside of plots where required, however, as the site is to remain private and not be adopted this would be implemented and enforced by a management company. The applicant is seeking that the details will be included within a site management plan which will be conditioned.

- 5.2. **HCC Comment (pg 6/7):** *"There are however a couple of areas of layout where parking would not normally be permitted if the site were to become adopted highway, and the Case Officer may wish to consider this."*

1. *Parking spaces located within the visibility splays as outlined above; and*

TECHNICAL NOTE

2. *Parking spaces located within 10.0m of a junction, where movements in and out of the space may result in a vehicle having to wait on one road at the junction leading into the parking space road (i.e. the space to the south of plot 01.06)”*

Stantec Response:

Please see previous response (**para. 4.6**) regarding visibility splays and on street parking.

- 5.3. **HCC Comment (pg 7):** *“it is noted that rear parking courts are utilised extensively across the development, and it should be noted that at times these can suffer from underutilisation, with resident preferring to park to the front of their home as it is normally a closer distance from car to door, and so more convenient. Private parking restrictions will need to be put in place to prevent this from occurring, as without this, roads could become obstructed, particularly if parking occurs on both sides of the road; or it could be that footway parking becomes common as vehicles park on the road but try to leave sufficient width for others to pass. Neither of these options should be acceptable – i.e. outside of plots 11.07 to 11.16, 12.08 to 12.11 and 14.02 to 14.13.”*

Stantec Response:

Please see previous response (**para. 5.1**) regarding parking management.

- 5.4. **HCC Comment (pg 7):** *“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...”*

Stantec Response:

The recommendation for additional step out space is noted and can be considered at detail design. It should be noted that the perpendicular spaces along the main north-south roads are 2.7m in width and therefore already provide more width for access than traditional spaces. Notwithstanding this, the adjacent landscaping area will be clear of horizontal obstructions, i.e. bushes, and where appropriate hard landscaping can be introduced.

6. Condition 25 – Refuse Collection Strategy Comments

- 6.1. **HCC Comment (pg 7):**

“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, as outlined above, it is not clear where all bins will be collected from, and it is debatable whether the natural location indicated by the nearest bin collection point will actually have capacity for all the bins being positioned within it.”

Stantec Response:

Paragraph 4.6 of this TN sets out the proposed refuse strategy to services The Folds development. This confirms the refuse storage locations for residents on collection days, associated carry distances, and vehicle collection points (plan contained in **Appendix D**)

Additional two-way swept path drawings have been provided (see **Appendix A**), demonstrating a series of passing points that allow a refuse vehicle to safely pass an opposing car movement. This will be supported by the site management plan that will restrict parking in certain locations to prevent obstruction.

TECHNICAL NOTE

The size and distribution of the proposed collection points have been considered at a high level as part of the masterplan development. The collection points will generally serve between four and six dwellings, with some slightly larger locations accommodating up to seven dwellings.

To accurately demonstrate collection points with the appropriate capacity, confirmation of the future waste and recycling strategy is required to determine the number and type of containers to be presented at any one time. It is recommended that this matter is addressed at a future detailed design condition discharge.

This does not present a risk to the long-term refuse strategy, as areas of hard surfacing can be increased if necessary to provide additional space. Alternatively, integrated street furniture (such as benches designed to double as shelving) could be incorporated to accommodate glass boxes or food caddies where required.