

PROJECT	DATE	BY	REFERENCE
5018551 – One Horton Heath, Secondary Infrastructure Road Eastleigh Borough Council	24/10/2025	CL	5018551-RDG-XX-ST-DOC-C-2601

TITLE	REV
Hampshire Highways – Technical Responses Report	P01

1. INTRODUCTION

Ridge have been appointed by Eastleigh Borough Council to produce a technical design for a new road with associated infrastructure passing through the new One Horton Heath development in Horton Heath, Hampshire.

As part of these works, Hampshire Highways have been consulted to provide input on the proposed design.

Following several iterations of comments from the team at Hampshire Highways on an uncontrolled spreadsheet this report aims to provide formal responses to the queries raised.

2. TECHNICAL QUERIES

2.1. Query 1

Query

The internal distributor road has a 2m footway, either adjacent or close to the carriageway, for the length of the northern section of the road between Quobleigh Breach Junction and the Fir Tree Lane access. However, this section does not have cycle provision. While it is noted that there are alternative cycle routes across the site, these do not always provide the most direct route from all dwellings to amenities, with the internal distributor road appearing a more direct and convenient option from certain locations. Furthermore, given Reserved Matters for the housing layout have not been submitted, it is unknown if all future dwellings would be able to conveniently access alternative cycle facilities via appropriate, lightly trafficked residential streets.

Response

Footpath upgraded to cycleway between Quobleigh Breach Junction and the Fir Tree Lane access from 2.0m wide to 3.0m wide. This is shown on drawings 0701-0712 & 0131-0134.

2.2. Query 2

Query

The submitted movement strategy shows a very circuitous route for cycles (dashed green within the extract below), significantly longer than following the spine road (red dashed). There is ample lateral width for the footways to be increased to minimum (3m) shared use width here, providing a connection from the cycle facilities on The Avenue to those shown on Fir Tree Lane.

Inclusion of cycle provision on one side of the internal distributor road as a minimum between the link to Fir Tree Lane and Quobleigh Breach Junction with The Avenue is considered necessary to make the proposals acceptable.

Response

Footpath upgraded to cycleway (2.0m up to 3.0m) in this area. This is shown on drawings 0701-0712 & 0131-0134.

2.3. Query 3

Query

There is no pedestrian or cycle provision proposed on the southern side of the internal distributor road, between the bus stops and local centre area (extract below). Clarity should be provided regarding how residents of this parcel - The Holme (shaded blue), south of the internal distributor road - would travel by foot and cycle.

Response

Footpath added on the southern side of the road at detention basin within The Holme to the nearby crossings. This is shown on drawing 0132.

2.4. Query 4

Query

A missing section of shared use foot and cycleway on the northern side of the internal distributor road between the junction linking north to Fir Tree Lane and the pedestrian and cycle route south, just to the west of the junction, was noted previously. The PCSR states this is now included on drawing 5018551-RDG-Z02-ST-DR-C-0708, which is correct. However, this section is still missing on other drawings, including the Site Wide Infrastructure drawing 5018551-RDG-XX-ST-DR-C-0134 Rev P01; inclusion on and consistency across all drawings to be secured under this application is required.

Response

All relevant drawings have been updated to show the shared use path. This is shown on drawings 0708 & 0134.

2.5. Query 5

Query

It was previously raised that the east-west link south of, and running parallel to, Fir Tree Lane (north of the local centre) should be shared use, not pedestrian only, from the point it diverges from the carriageway and routes behind the existing hedge/ tree line. This is relevant as the crossing on the link between the internal distributor road and Fir Tree Lane (which is within the application red line) should be able to accommodate cycles. Alternatively, it may be preferable to move the north-south shared use provision to the eastern side of the Fir Tree Lane link to allow easier access to the local centre and school by cycle. The applicant has noted this and states it will be addressed in the Reserved Matters planning application for the Local Centre. This is acceptable, however, this link is still shown as a footpath and the crossing (which is within this application) is shown as pedestrians only. The plans should be updated to make it clear the crossing, and onward route, can accommodate cycles.

Response

The path has been upgraded to shared use in the area requested. This is shown on drawing 0132.

2.6. Query 6

Query

Furthermore, there is a stub/ spur north of the existing Fir Tree Lane. There is a footway only, with no segregated cycle provision shown, although this may be a drawing error as the footway appears wide enough to be shared use. It is not clear how many dwellings this road will serve; however, it is likely that segregated cycle provision will be necessary. This should be shown on the plan for the area being permitted within this application.

Response

The path has been upgraded to shared use on western side of connection to Fir Tree Lane. Full junction design is subject to the submitted S278 agreement. This is shown on drawing 0708.

2.7. Query 7

Query

Regarding crossing points, it is challenging to agree the precise location and appropriate form of crossing points without knowing the surrounding layout; that is, the internal pedestrian and cycle routes, number of dwellings served off these routes, location of the school entrance and amenities and layout of the local centre. Given this information is not available, the HA would require some flexibility, possibly via planning condition, to amend the crossing forms and exact locations once the surrounding Reserved Matters applications are progressed. As a general principle:

Uncontrolled crossings in residential areas appear appropriate, although refuge crossings at busier locations, rather than just dropped kerbs, may be required.

Parallel crossings in the vicinity of the school and sports pitches are supported.

Parallel crossings (rather than zebra crossings) should be provided in the Local Centre area.

Response

Crossings have formalised to Parallel crossings from zebra crossings. The exact locations are to be resolved via planning condition. This is shown on drawings 0131-0134

2.8. Query 8

Query

The latest drawings show two crossing points between the link to Fir Tree Lane and Quobleigh Breach Junction with The Avenue; one at the proposed bus stops within The Holme parcel and one near the link to Fir Tree Lane. It is the HA's view that at least one additional crossing point should be provided between the bus stops and Quobleigh Breach junction. While the PCSR states a crossing has been added, and it does appear on Surfacing and Kerbing Layout Sheet 11, this does not appear on any other drawings. This should be included on all drawings submitted for approval.

Response

An additional crossing between Quobleigh Breach and Green Infrastructure has been added to plans 0711 & 0131.

A third crossing point has been added. Crossing form (uncontrolled or controlled, and if controlled, in what form) to be decided during condition discharge.

2.9. Query 9

Query

Three crossings are proposed in the vicinity of the local centre; these are shown on the Signing and Lining drawings Sheets 7 and 8 as zebra crossings, but on other drawings as dropped kerbs or with a series of oblong boxes (extract below). The proposals should be consistent across all submitted drawings. Also, given these crossings link two cycle routes, they should be Parallel, rather than Zebra crossings.

Response

All crossings have been upgraded to parallel crossings. The changes are shown on drawings 0701-0712 & 1201-1212.

2.10. Query 10

Query

The crossings adjacent to the school site are linking cycle routes either side. They are shown as parallel crossings on Signing and Lining Sheets 5 and 6, which is appropriate, but as Zebra crossings on other drawings, including the Overall Site Layout drawing (5018551-RDG-XX-ST-DRC-0130 Rev P02). All drawings to be secured under this application should be consistent.

Response

All crossings have been upgraded to parallel crossings. The revised crossings are shown on drawings 0701-0712 & 1201-1212.

2.11. Query 11

Query

It is noted that Park & Stride facilities are proposed for school trips. The PCSR states that Park & Stride Facilities are located within the area earmarked for the Sports Pitches/ Allotments and will be shared accordingly. This is acceptable in principle, noting that adequate parking space provisions, operational issues to ensure the parking is available and appropriate pedestrian links to the school will be reviewed as part of any future Reserved Matters application for that area.

Response

No response required.

2.12. Query 12

Query

The Movement Strategy (30454A/19 Rev C) shows cycle provision to the east of the internal distributor road. This provides cycle links to the Primary School, Sports Pitches and onwards to the Local Centre from the Lower Acre and from and through future residential parcels east of the internal distributor road, which is acceptable. Provision of these indicative routes at the Reserved Matters stage should be secured.

Response

No response required.

2.13. Query 13

Query

A refuge (rather than parallel) crossing south of the sports pitches is proposed. This is considered acceptable given the pedestrian and cycle routes shown to the east in the Movement Strategy. However, an onward cycle route from this crossing point should be provided.

Response

Cycle links will be provided in Upper Acre Reserved Matters application - to be under planning condition for this parcel.

2.14. Query 14

Query

As stated previously, no provision is shown regarding how pedestrians would cross the school access road when travelling north-south along the internal distributor road. Given this forms part of this application, the HA feel this should be resolved now as it does not appear dependant on the future layout of this area beyond the internal distributor road red line. The PCSR suggests this is conditioned. While seemingly unnecessary, the HA can accept this approach if LPA officers are supportive. It should be noted that the pedestrian link should be provided on the north-south desire line without significant deviation into the sports pitches access road.

Response

A pedestrian priority crossing has been added at the front of the school. This is shown on drawings 0133 & 0705.

2.15. Query 15

Query

Visibility splays from all controlled and uncontrolled pedestrian and cycle crossings have been provided. Some visibility splays pass over the open space between the carriageway and footway. The principles of this are acceptable but it should be ensured, likely via planning condition, that no structure, erection or planting exceeding 0.6m in height shall be placed within

the visibility splays. The applicant is in agreement with this approach, stating 'it is requested that a condition be placed under the application that all visibility splays be kept clear of any obstruction. This will be included in the landscaping and street furniture designs/layouts.

Response

The red line boundaries have been updated to be at the back of the visibility splays from both vehicles & pedestrians. Landscape Architects have been instructed to keep vegetation/trees/obstructions clear from these areas. Wording of the planning condition is to be agreed. The changes are shown on drawings 0131-0134 & 0011-0022

2.16. Query 16

Query

However, on sheets 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 there are visibility splays that pass over land outside the application boundary. As above, assurance will be required that this area will be kept clear of obstruction to maintain acceptable visibility. This may require amending the red line boundary of this application so visibility splays fall within this application and can be secured by condition.

Response

The red line boundaries have been updated to be at the back of the visibility splays from both vehicles & pedestrians. Landscape Architects have been instructed to keep vegetation/trees/obstructions clear from these areas. Wording of the planning condition is to be agreed. The changes are shown on drawings 0131-0134 & 0011-0022

2.17. Query 17

Query

It was previously raised that amendments to Public Rights of Way (PRoW) appear acceptable in principle (including conditioning PRoW diversions) and in accordance with the principles agreed under permission F/21/91185.

However, comments and confirmation from HCC's Countryside Service team should be sort given they manage PRoW in Hampshire. The applicant states that discussions are ongoing and a response to the above will be provided once all queries are resolved.

Response

Applications for the PRoW works are being dealt with directly with Hampshire Countryside Services.

2.18. Query 18

Query

Where footways and cycleways cross side roads, at some locations pedestrian and cycle priority is provided and at others it is not, with what appears to be a traditional bellmouth arrangement. Pedestrian and cycle priority should be provided at all crossings of side roads, unless justification is provided and agreed.

Response

"Copenhagen" crossings have been introduced on all junctions to provide continuous priority to pedestrians. The amendments are shown on drawings 0131-0134 & 0011-0022.

2.19. Query 19

Query

Finally, it appears that no vertical deflection at crossings or junctions is proposed. The applicant should confirm this is correct. It may be appropriate for vertical deflection to be used at the pedestrian and cycle priority crossings of side roads, but this can be explored at detailed design and/ or if raised through subsequent Road Safety Audits. With reference to raised tables, it should be noted that on bus routes, the maximum recommended on/off ramp gradient is 1 in 20.

Response

No bus access has been provided into side roads other than connection to Fir Tree Lane and the school. As agreed with HCC, these will have a ramp up to the crossing at a maximum gradient of 1:20 so it can be traversed by a bus.

2.20. Query 20

Query

A bus service to be delivered by the applicant serving both Eastleigh and Hedge End rail stations and town centres has been secured within the FRP; this includes that the service must be available within a maximum walking distance of 400 metres of any dwelling and/or commercial building (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the County Council). Similar obligations will be included in the outline permission, if granted. Given the above, a bus will have to route via the internal distributor road to meet the 400m walking distance criteria. Four bus stops (that is, two pairs of stops) are proposed within this internal distributor road application.

Response

Noted – No action required from designer.

2.21. Query 21

Query

It is noted that Go South Coast as a local bus operator have responded to the latest proposals and feel the provision of only two bus stops is inadequate. While the number and layout of bus stops should be agreed with local bus companies and other consultees, including the body who will ultimately adopt and maintain the shelters, the currently proposals will leave areas of the development in excess of the agreed 400m walking distance. The HA appreciate that it may not be reasonably possible to achieve all development within the 400m criteria, and are prepared to be pragmatic if direct and high quality walking routes are delivered; however, every effort should be made to reach this criteria through a good number of stops being proposed at sensible and well dispersed locations across the site. This is not the case currently and it appears more could be done to encourage bus use. A plan showing a 400m radii from each pair of bus stops would be useful for context, noting that the

'on the ground' walked distance would be greater than this, although to an unknown extent given reserved matters for the surrounding areas have not been progressed.

Response

Bus stop locations to be resolved by condition. No action required from designer.

2.22. Query 22

Query

The applicant has suggested a condition to allow time for discussions to be finalised with the bus operator. This may also allow the internal layout to be progressed, which could be beneficial in siting bus stops. The HA are agreeable to such a condition. Furthermore, the applicant has suggested a second condition is imposed securing that the local centre Reserved Matters application includes bus stops; this is again considered acceptable.

Response

To be resolved by condition. No action for designer.

2.23. Query 23

Query

A design speed of 30mph is proposed throughout the internal distributor road (including past the local centre and school), which is acceptable in principle. Given it is now known that a S38 Agreement will not be progressed for the internal distributor road, as above, a condition should be included within any future planning permission ensuring visibility splays remain clear in perpetuity; the applicant agrees with this approach. However, this may require an amendment to the red line of this application.

Response

All red line boundaries have been set outside of 30mph vis splay extents. Refer to drawings 2200-2203

2.24. Query 24

Query

As stated previously, while the proposed widths appear acceptable, until Reserve Matters applications are submitted for the parcels served, it is difficult to say with certainty and some minor amendments may be required at a later stage. Regarding the link north to Fir Tree Lane, the applicant has stated:

The connection from Foxwood Road to Fir Tree Lane is confirmed to be 6.5m wide with 3.0m c-way/f-path on the western side and 2.0m footpath on the east. Routes of bus movements to be conditioned. The 6.5m width should be acceptable to allow bus use, subject to tracking, and the commitment to providing suitable bus routes via a condition is noted.

Response

The connection with Fir Tree Lane is being agreed under S278 application which has been submitted to Hampshire CC (currently with Russell Hayes).

The road geometry layouts have been provided for main distributor road and are shown on drawings 1121-1124.

2.25. Query 25

Query

The alignment throughout should be reviewed, whilst long straights are to be avoided, some of the curves and 'kinks' throughout are sudden, without a smooth transition; this has led to issue with vehicle tracking along the primary road. Also, no geometries have been shown on any layouts; these should be provided.

Updated vehicle tracking has been submitted and comments are provided below. It is noted the link to Fir Tree Lane has not been tracked, but is dealt with by the proposed condition above.

Response

The connection with Fir Tree Lane is being agreed under a S278 application (currently with Russell Hayes).

Road geometry layouts provided for main distributor road are 1121-1124. And the updated tracking drawings are 2201-2224.

2.26. Query 26

Query

Regarding the tracking of a bus, there are various instances of conflict on bends. Consideration should be given to bend widening or larger radii to remove this conflict, noting HCC's TG2 states buses in opposing directions should be able to pass. The applicant's responses, and RSA Auditor's comments, are noted; however, the HA feel the below should be resolved at this stage:

Sheet 5, the bus is outside the carriageway and overrunning the side road and there is conflict through the parallel crossing.

Sheet 6, there is conflict through the zebra crossing and the bend.

Sheet 8 and 10, there is conflict through the bend.

Sheet 11, the vehicle overruns the inner kerb.

Response

The road alignment has been shifted and the vehicle tracking re-run to resolve these issues. The amendments can be found on tracking drawings 2201-2224.

2.27. Query 27

Query

Regarding refuse vehicle tracking, the applicant appears to demonstrate that refuse vehicles can pass on the primary road. However, there is no tracking to/ from any of the secondary roads; as these form part of the application and works, tracking in accordance with HCC's TG2 should be provided

The exact junction geometry, and subsequent tracking, could be conditioned. However, the junction location must remain as proposed given the red line boundary would not accommodate the required visibility splays if the junction locations were to change. Furthermore, increasing the junction size would not be possible as the red line is tight up against the land take/ vis splays for each junction. There will be little flexibility to amend the junctions within the red line at a later date.

Response

The junctions shown on this application have been used as a constraint for all parcel design so will tie into this proposal. As the detailed layouts come forward for each parcel, the access can be reviewed by Hampshire.

2.28. Query 28

Query

In terms of other vehicles, all tracking scenarios required in HCC's TG2 should be provided for assessment, including entering and egressing side roads. Alternatively, if a condition is imposed to agree these junctions as part of future Reserved Matters applications, tracking can be picked up at that time.

The applicant should note that it may be acceptable for the refuse vehicle to cross into the opposing carriageway when accessing and egressing sideroads, depending upon the circumstances and what these serve. No vehicle should overhang pedestrian and cycle facilities for any movement; in the above instances the carriageway should be widened accordingly.

Response

The junctions shown on this application have been used as a constraint for all parcel design so will tie into this proposal. As the detailed layouts come forward for each parcel, the access can be reviewed by Hampshire Highways.

2.29. Query 29

Query

Confirmation of forecast total vehicular movements using side road accesses, and forecast movements of larger vehicles, should be provided for the HA to form a view on the acceptability of the proposed geometry or advise if realignment is required. If this information is not available until the Reserved Matters stage, then it should be noted that the designs proposed under this application may have to be amended. This should be reflected in the permission if granted.

Response

This information is not available at this time. Vehicle numbers/movements will be calculated once final parcel designs are completed so will be subject to RM application - EBC to agree wording of condition.

2.30. Query 30

Query

The principle of continuous crossings of sideroads, giving pedestrians and cycles priority, is welcomed. As noted above, it appears that pedestrian and cycle priority has been provided at some, but not all, side roads; this should be included at all side roads. Also, the Reserved Matters layout of the surrounding parcels should consider the visibility splays required to achieve continuous crossings of sideroads; on other parcels within the One Horton Heath development the housing layout/ boundary features have blocked the required visibility splays making pedestrian and cycle priority impossible to deliver; this situation should not be repeated.

Response

The query is noted. Pedestrian priority crossings have been introduced to all relevant junctions. New layouts can be found on drawings 0131-0134

2.31. Query 31

Query

Indicative drainage and street lighting designs were previously provided, and no substantial issues were noted. The revised RSA raises no issues with regard to the above at this stage. Regarding surface water drainage, the principle of providing sewers within the main carriageway appears reasonable. The gully catchment drawing demonstrate that suitable gully provision has been provided at the major pedestrian crossing points throughout the site. It is presumed gully placement will be suitable for all minor crossing provision throughout the site. In terms of foul water, the principle of providing sewers within the main carriageway is reasonable. It is noted that some lighting is proposed at the carriageway edge (where a segregated footway is located to the rear). However, it is presumed that the proposed street lighting will be designed/provided by a qualified street lighting designer, providing provision that meets the required lighting levels for the site. The RSA1 raised no issues with the indicative design.

Response

EBC to agree wording of condition for street lighting design - proposed street lighting layout is on combined services drawings 0521-0532.

2.32. Query 32

Query

The principle of providing services in the footways with suitable road crossings as shown would appear reasonable. It is presumed all services will require agreement with the applicable statutory undertakers regardless.

Response

Noted – no action required.

2.33. Query 33

Query

The proposed details refer to HCC kerb types throughout with suitable dropped kerb provision at pedestrian crossing points. A mixture of tarmac and block paving at crossings have been proposed. These proposals appear acceptable.

Response

Noted – no action required.

2.34. Query 34

Query

The provision of a cambered carriageway throughout appears acceptable and suitable. Regarding longitudinal sections, the following have not been raised in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA1) and are not considered reasons to object to the application. However, the applicant should consider the below.

- The Sag value between chainage 10m and 50m (-4.629) would appear to be outside the minimum values set out in DMRB CD109. This may affect road user comfort and where possible this should meet the minimum requirements set out in DMRB CD109 Table 2.10
- The gradient between chainage 730m and 795m is c.1:181; this may lead to drainage issues. Suitable gully placement would be required through this area to ensure adequate drainage of the carriageway.
- The Sag value between chainage 1230m and 1250m (-5.000) would appear to be outside the minimum values set out in DMRB CD109. This may affect road user comfort and where possible this should meet the minimum requirements set out in DMRB CD109 Table 2.10.
- At chainage 1304m a crest has been introduced to get 'up and over' a pipe. This results in a crest K Value of 2. This would appear to be outside the minimum values set out in DMRB CD109. This may affect road user comfort and where possible this should meet the minimum requirements set out in DMRB CD109 Table 2.10. A more suitable crest value/ design should be explored in this location.

Response

Levels have been updated to comply with DMRB and outcome of raising levels to satisfy cut/fill requirements. Updated levels on drawings:

- Long section: 0715-0718.
- Levels layouts: 1101-1112.

Side junction levels removed as these will be agreed upon design of adjacent parcels.

2.35. Query 35

Query

As previously noted, a number of Ordinary Watercourse Consents will be required, regardless of progression of the S38 process. Achieving these is a separate and standalone process the applicant will have to progress.

Response

Noted – these are being applied for as required.

2.36. Query 36

Query

Quobleigh Breach Design

Previously, two different proposals/ layouts were included for this junction; both have now been removed. The PCSR states:

We confirm that the 278 drawings are being progressed. A condition for the 278 to be progressed could be utilised if it is felt that it is necessary. Given this junction forms part of this application, the principle of the design should be agreed under this application; the HA do not feel it is appropriate to condition this when it is a fundamental part of the application that can be resolved now. Submission of the S278 General Arrangement drawing (including geometry and visibility splays), tracking and a Stage 1 RSA should be submitted for review. If the LPA are of the view that conditioning the final in principle layout of this junction is acceptable, the HA will accept this.

Response

Ridge is progressing a S278 agreement with HCC for this design. No action required as part of this response.

2.37. Query 37

Query

Quobleigh Breach Capacity

Capacity modelling of the proposed in principle design should be provided. This has not been addressed in the PCSR. As above, if the LPA are of the view that conditioning the final in principle layout of this junction is acceptable, with capacity modelling to be provided as part of discharging this condition, the HA will accept this.

Response

Capacity will be checked as part of S278 agreement process. Calculations have previously been submitted.

2.38. Query 38

Query

School Access Design

The PCSR states:

The Zebra crossing is located on a key desire line to encourage pedestrians and potentially cyclists from the wider OHH development to the south. A PV2 calculation has been attached to demonstrate that a Zebra Crossing is the appropriate option. The final positioning of any Zebra Crossing could be addressed at the detail design / technical approval stage. The PV2 calculation has been reviewed and the HA agree a Parallel (not Zebra) crossing point at this location is appropriate. Given this road is not being offered for adoption, the HA will not be party to any further detail design/ technical approval process; as such, the appropriate location needs to either be agreed now, or conditioned for agreement at a later date. The distance of 20m between the access and crossing as presented is acceptable given no RSA concerns were raised.

The HA previously requested that clarification be provided regarding the parking provision proposed for the school, including if shared parking arrangements for school drop off/ pick up are proposed with the sports pitches and/or Local Centre. The PCSR states the below, which is considered an acceptable approach:

It is requested that this matter is placed under condition in the reserved matters application for the sports pitches and allotments as these areas will provide parking facilities for the school. As stated previously, given this road will remain private, a condition should be included to ensure the applicant resolves any parent parking issues in the vicinity of the school through adequate management, measures and/or infrastructure. This condition should also ensure appropriate school road markings and signage are installed prior to occupation of the school. It is noted that fencing has been added adjacent to the school site, however the above still applies.

Response

Parallel crossings have now been provided next to school and are shown on Drawing 0705.

Provision of parking/drop off to be agreed upon submission of Reserved Matters application for the school.

2.39. Query 39

Query

Route to Fir Tree Lane Capacity

The capacity of the junction of the internal distributor road and the link north to the existing Fir Tree Lane has not been assessed. Under the current outline proposals, this is a through route, as well as an access/ egress for future residents and the nearest access to local centre amenities, the sports pitches and the school. It was previously requested that the forecast traffic flows at this junction are presented and the capacity of this junction modelled.

Regarding this request, the PCSR states:

While we recognise that the route from Fir Tree Lane to the local centre could be utilised by vehicles travelling from Burnetts Lane or via residents from the north of the wider OHH development, we need to re-emphasise Eastleigh Borough Council's desire and commitment to providing a sustainable community in terms of promoting walking, cycling and public transport above the use of the private car. It has been previously discussed that future restrictions to prevent two-way access from Burnetts Lane to the Local Centre could be implemented – which would significantly reduce the number of vehicles using this route. Once these measures have been agreed, then detailed junction modelling of the internal distributor road and the link north to the existing Fir Tree Lane can be undertaken. Given that this application is not a direct traffic generator, there may be value in undertaking the junction design and associated modelling once the local centre layout has been developed to provide a degree of certainty regarding the likely servicing and delivery arrangements which may dictate potential restrictions to Fir Tree Lane. It is appreciated that it is challenging to test capacity and finalise the junction layout when the internal layout/ land uses of the surrounding future Reserved Matters areas are unknown. The above also suggests that some amendments to two-way traffic on Fir Tree Lane may be proposed; the HA have not seen these proposals, and it is not what has been agreed as part of the outline application.

Response

Unable to calculate junction capacity at this time due to unconfirmed number of dwellings north of this location. This can be addressed via condition.

Layout and access to local centre also to be agreed upon application for this area under Reserved Matters with conditions to be included in future permission.

2.40. Query 40

Query

As a general comment, if large parts of this application are to be conditioned and resolved at a later date, the HA question the purpose of this secondary spine road application at this time. However, if the LPA are content to proceed on the basis of conditioning the final layout (including junction capacity modelling) to be reviewed and agreed by the HA at a later date, then this approach is acceptable. The current red line boundary is tight around this junction (extract below); it is possible future design amendments would require changes outside the current red line. As such, it is suggested that the red line in this location is expanded to allow the flexibility to carry out future design changes if necessary.

Response

The red lines have been updated in line with HCC comments. The tightness of the red line around the junction will be resolved as each parcel comes forward and is reviewed by Hampshire Highways through the planning process. The red line boundaries are shown on drawings 0131-0134.

2.41. Query 41

Query

Other Proposed Junctions

There are a number of other proposed junctions coming off the secondary spine road to residential parcels. No junction visibility from the side roads has been provided. Similarly, no forward visibility along the spine road has been provided. These should be demonstrated, including forward Sight Stopping Distance (SSD) to the controlled crossings (beacons). Given the parcels accessed via the side roads will be subject to future Reserved Matters applications, the quantum of development served by each side road is unknown, although it is thought some of these accesses could serve a significant number of (possibly up to c.600) dwellings. While the form and layout of these junctions, subject to comments above, appears broadly acceptable from the information available at this stage, confirmation of the appropriateness of these junctions cannot be confirmed until the HA understand what is being served from each junction. While this can be assessed under future Reserved Matters applications, the HA would like to make it clear that any side road junctions will require further review and may require amendment from the layout presented within this application once the area/ land use/ quantum they serve is known. It should also be noted that emergency access may be required to larger parcels proposed with a single access point; the Emergency Services should be consulted. Accesses to the Local Centre are not shown with any level of detail. It is assumed these will be presented, reviewed and approved as part of the future Reserved Matters applications for this area.

Response

The forward visibility to crossings have been included on drawings 0011-0022.

The access to the Local Centre is to be agreed upon submission of a reserved matters application.

2.42. Query 42

Query

Road Safety Audit

An updated Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA1) dated 10th October 2024 has been submitted and is based on the latest submitted drawings. A Designer's Response to this updated RSA should also be submitted. However, the only problem raised was that visibility splays are shown outside of the control of the HA. Given the applicant has agreed to a condition ensuring all visibility splays will be kept clear, this problem is considered addressed (noting the red line boundary may need to be amended to adequately secure this). Some general points are raised around construction details (particularly chamber covers), drainage and lighting. Given the road is not to be offered for adoption, the HA will not have any control over this as the Safety Auditor suggests. However, the HA suggest a condition is included ensuring the road and associated infrastructure is delivered to a suitable standard and self-certified by the developer.

Response

Noted, the RSA will be reviewed and re-submitted once the final layouts are agreed.