

Planning Application
BROADWAY FARM, BROAD OAK, BOTLEY

Representative	Address	Comments
Dahlia Hill	4 GRANGE COTTAGES BROAD OAK BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2EU	I would like to object as the amount of Heavy Goods vehicles using Broad Oak is already significant. This causes constant traffic jams at peak travel times, making access to my house difficult. Also the speed & weight of these HGV has a negative impact with regards to pollution & road structure, breaking drains & causing potholes. I do not feel the site is suitable for this type of industry & it certainly does not need to be expanded.
David Lange	17 MEADOW GROVE CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 3AT	Hampshire river Itchen is a water stressed bio diverse asset and SSI. All new and future building constructions should have a mandatory rainwater harvesting system installed for all non potable water use, i.e toilets, garden taps, vehicle washing, washing machines. The benefit is two fold, 50% saving on water usage by landowner, year upon year, less abstraction from river Itchen, protecting this fragile environment under threat from increased human consumption. All landscaping should consist of beneficial trees to nature, shrubs/flowers of significant benefit to pollinators, not sterile vegetation that only provides ascetic value, until it becomes an uncontrollable mess due to poor planting choice and no maintenance.
Scott Meeks	POPLAR COTTAGE BROAD OAK BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2EU	Need to address illegal warehouse construction and illegally constructed car park area used by Richmond Skoda prior to new applications. Object to owners trying to build an industrial estate within the centre of Botley to be used by 100+ HGV's day and night negating the benefits of the Botley bypass for all the residents along Broad Oak. Existing businesses operation is operating outside of its permitted hours of Mon-Fri 07:00-19:00 hrs they are running a 24/7 operation currently. Site not fit for purpose to cope with extra capacity of lorries. Currently excessive light pollution from the site during the hours of darkness the place glows and is lit up like a prison. Increase of water run-off to neighbouring properties due to tarmacing of field causing water to run across the A334 which in winter freezes and forms a patch of black ice causing three serious car crashes, two of which struck neighbouring properties. Building over-development within the strategic gap between Hedge End and Botley. Over-development of site to an industrial area adds detrimental affects to neighbouring properties in decrease in value and future sale-ability. Any expansion should be re-directed to a dedicated area fit for purpose such as the Bottings Industrial estate.
Zoe Oxford-Ramadan	1 BROOK COTTAGES BROAD OAK BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2EU	We wish to object for the following reasons: The site has already been overdeveloped without the appropriate planning permissions received - which needs addressing first before allowing further development on the site. Tarmacked areas have been added without consent and much larger buildings erected than officially applied for on their previous planning application, with trees removed and areas of green space now used for parking many vehicles. Subsequently, wildlife has diminished across the field and we now look out onto fencing, with sparse bushes, and a mound of earth partially hiding many vehicles parked towards the rear of the field that was once a lovely open green space, and a beautiful view of the countryside.

		The excessive traffic through Botley is made worse by the amount of heavy goods vehicles and lorries entering and exiting this site, and the bypass is supposed to be the saving grace that is intended to support the reduction of such traffic, filtering it away from the village. However, their expansion has and will only continue to make such issues worse – and already the noise and vibrations caused by the vehicles accessing Broadway Farm has been damaging and intrusive to those of us who live fronting their plot, especially the properties located directly opposite their entrance. Their hours of operating have already increased to 24/7, 365 days per year, despite the official permission given in previous planning applications stating only limited operative hours. This is because Broadway Farm has expanded extensively since 2016, and what began as a bungalow surrounded by fields with 25% business use behind it will now see the site (should this application go ahead) running at approximately 80% industrial use. The site is in a residential area with close proximity to the houses surrounding it and is no longer in keeping with the surroundings, and more specifically it is located within a narrow strategic gap and this needs to be protected from further development. The excessive building on their land has also increased the flood risk, with the main road now experiencing more flooding events than ever before, and we feel that further development will only exacerbate this going forward. A proper assessment of the water flow needs to be done in line with the amount of building and development that currently stands on the site and not based upon the current application only, as this is NOT accurate as it does not take into account all the unpermitted development so far made on the site.
Nicholas Roe	SPRINGTIME COTTAGE BROAD OAK BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2EU	This application is the latest in a series of similar applications with slight variations. Consequently, I have left my comments to the previous application as the latest submission is similar. There are dozens of pages of submission, and I do not have the time to carry out a spot the difference exercise with the previous versions. However, I am happy to discuss any aspects which are considered to be no longer applicable, and I will modify anything which is found to be incorrect after any discussions. I produced my comments with pictures included, but they have not been shown. It would be much more clear if they were there, as the information in the application has photos, diagrams, etc, but people who make comments cannot include them. My main objections are: 1. It is in a designated gap. No amount of planting of hedges, etc should change the fact that it is in the gap, so expansion should not be permitted. Contrary to what is stated in their justification, it is in the narrowest part of the gap, and it is the closest part of the gap to other houses, so it is more intrusive than elsewhere. 2. The current buildings on the site exceed the planning permission. This breach should be addressed first. The breaches are (compared with the last approved application visible on the website - F/ 17/81201 – and this was retrospective to catch up with what had been built beyond what had been approved in the application LDC/17/80680): a. Operating hours 24 /7, 365 days per year, whereas the application was for limited operation between 6am-7pm in the summer and 7am-5pm in the winter b. Two of the buildings already on site are not included in the approved application, another one is about 3 times the size approved, and another one is in a different place. c. Large areas have been covered with tarmac.

		d. The working part of the site is now much larger than that approved. e. Trees have been removed from the site. 3. The traffic assessment is compared with the traffic flows now. These are very high, which is why a bypass is being built. Any traffic assessment should be against the traffic after the bypass. Furthermore, these traffic movements are lorry / HGV movements, so they are more intrusive than general traffic movements. These trucks are not just passing, but are accelerating, decelerating to get into / out of the entrance, so they are more noisy and intrusive than general passing traffic. 4. Building over green fields increases the chances of flooding in the area. The road has already flooded more than previously following the development on the site there now. It is no good just getting the water off their site, the water needs to be retained on their site for all of the their buildings and hard standing since they started to develop the site around 2016/2017. Their assessment of water flows only relates to the new building proposed, and this requires two large ponds. It needs to take account of all of the development that has taken place since 2016 (eg increased tarmac, new buildings, etc). 5. This is the latest in a series of rapid expansions of the site since 2016. Prior to this expansion, the property was a bungalow surrounded by green fields, with less than 25% of the site directly behind the property used for a small business, mainly using smaller vehicles. If this application is approved, around 80% of the site will be used for industrial purposes, using far more HGV's. Presumably, this application will be quickly followed by an application to industrialise the rest of the site. If this application had been made instead of the first application for permitted development (LDC/17/806890), would it have been approved? If not, then why is it even being considered now? 6. The scale of the buildings is completely out of keeping with the small residential properties in the area around the site. POINTS REGARDING BUILDING IN THE GAP The main question to ask is: - Why is this proposal being considered in an area which has been designated as a strategic gap? What is the overriding need for this business to be in this location? It is not like other businesses referenced in the documents such as Hilliers Garden Centre or Richmonds (ex Sparshatts) Garage which have been operating within their defined areas inside the gap for many years. Despite statements that the business has operated for over 25 years, up until 2017, the business was a very limited operation mainly collecting and redistributing pallets from a small area directly behind the bungalow. What has happened is that the business has grown very rapidly since 2017/2018, and has changed to being a distribution and storage business. It is very good that this business is successful, and is in a position to grow and bring more employment. However, it has outgrown the space available, and now should do what every other business that outgrows its site has to do, and move to a site with more space, and which is approved for use for business purposes. Local places that would keep the jobs in the area include Chalcroft Business Park which is promoted as having good road connections, and already has a distribution business there, and currently has units to rent. - There seems to be a concerted effort in the application to provide a justification for building in the GAP, particularly with the report by FABIK. This shows lots of photos from areas around the site, and lots of words about planting hedges, or other mitigation, and attempts to say that the gap is not of high value. This is just a smokescreen and a distraction to draw us into agreeing that some minor tree planting can compensate for tarmacking over a field,
--	--	--

		building a series of huge industrial buildings, and operating HGV lorries 24 hrs a day, 7 days a week. Their report contains misleading information, such as showing a picture with a dimension of 760m above the site claiming that the site is in a wide part of the gap, whereas if you draw the arc of the small 370m measurement that they show, then it is clear that the site is in that narrow part of the gap, not the large part as claimed. PICTURE SHOULD BE HERE - The fundamental point is that this agricultural land, in a designated gap, and should not be allowed to be changed to an industrial site. This has been specifically identified as a necessary separation of the two centres to maintain their different identities. This development is contrary to that stated aim in the local plan recent approved, so raises a concern that the gap will have been compromised, so the whole concept will have been undermined, and the whole gap will be open for development. - Eastleigh Borough Council has published a Settlement Gap Study report, which includes the gap between Hedge End and Botley as Gap I. o P123 of the report shows an aerial photo of the Gap, and it can be seen that the Broadway Farm operation is close to the edge of the gap. It is clear that the photo shows the extent of the development as per the 2017 approved application. Examination of the documents for the current application show that what has already been built covers a significantly larger area that considered when the gap was determined to be of importance. o Broadway Farm is in sub Area 19 of Gap I. For sub Area 16, P131 of the report notes: ☐ Area I 6 - Combination of ribbon development, scattering of mature trees and paddocks to the rear provide a short lived but clear change of character from the built form edges to Hedge End and the wooded arrival to Botley. Whilst the horse paddocks are poor in landscape character, the remnant field boundaries and open nature contribute to the separation between the two settlements particularly when experienced from the A334 and bridleway No. 17. o Broadway Farm is an agricultural site, and it is clearly an important part of the "clear change of character" of the gap. To change it from agricultural to industrial will go against the purpose of the gap. o P134 of the report looks at opportunities in GAP I. Of the 9 points, ☐ 3. Scope for the Botley Bypassto enhance sense of arrival / departure. ☐ 6. Good example of rural roads / sense of leaving settlement with field hedgerows ☐ 9. Address poor field boundary treatments to A334 to reinforce landscape setting and sense of leaving Hedge End settlement o P143 of the Report also provides a table of "Criterion check for each sub area", and Sub Area 16 fulfils all of the 5 criteria required: ☐ The area helps preserve the open nature of the Gap. ☐ The area helps maintain the sense of separation between settlements. ☐ The area plays an important role in defining the settlement character. ☐ The area plays an important role in separation of settlements at risk of coalescence. ☐ The land is necessary in preventing the coalescence of settlements. o Allowing any additional development beyond that approved in 2017 would go against these requirements for the gap. o P135 gives a conclusion in relation to GAP I between Hedge End and Botley, and for sub area 16, it states: ☐ Area I 6 - This area lies at the narrowest section between Botley and Hedge End and performs all Gap functions. The fields
--	--	--

		on both sides of Botley Road (A334) contribute to the perception of Gap's openness and the separation between the two settlements. Thanks to the open nature of those fields, and their predominantly undeveloped character, the sense of leaving / arriving to either of the settlements is maintained despite the short distance (approximately 300m). The fields also contribute to the separation of the settlements for viewers on the bridleway No. 17 to the south. - o The gap should be reinstated to what was approved in 2017, and no additional development should be approved as it would go against these requirements for the gap. THE CURRENT BUILDINGS ON SITE EXCEED THE PLANNING PERMISSION. - This application appears to be for additional facilities, including another very large warehouse. What has already been built appears to exceed what was approved under application F/17/81201 in 2017 (eg extra and larger buildings, increased and larger lorry movements, 24 hr operation, 24 hr high intensity lighting, large areas of tarmac with no water containment, etc). Why is this new application being considered when what has already been built exceeds what has been approved? No further expansion should be considered before any planning breach has been investigated, and remedial actions taken as required. See marked up plan showing no approved development. PICTURE SHOULD BE HERE - The application included a supporting document from Paris Smith which stated that the operating hours would be for limited operation between 6am-7pm in the summer and 7am-5pm in the winter (see Para 7.14 in the first doc, and 7.11 in the revised document). In reality the site is now operating 24 / 7. This extension to 24 / 7 has not been approved, and limited approved hours should be enforced. - It is my view that the site should revert to what was approved in 2017 and no more. TRAFFIC At long last Botley is to get a bypass. This business is expanding, and requires the use of large HGV lorries 24 hr a day, 7 days a week. Once the bypass is in place, these will be a huge proportion of the HGV truck movements. This will completely undermine the opportunity for the bypass to enable Botley to recover from the years of traffic congestion, noise and air pollution. The calculation in section 5 of the i-Transport supporting document is outrageous. The calculation comes to a conclusion that the increase in traffic for this single extra warehouse is only an increase of 0.4%, but uses a number of false assumptions, and nonsensical calculations, including: - It uses traffic numbers from the last couple of years, but there is a by pass about to be built, which has been stated will reduce the traffic by 80% (this number is also included by FABIK in the application submission data). - The calculation looks at the predicted increase against total vehicle movements, but most the vehicle movements from the site are HGV's, which are much more intrusive. There is no equivalence between a bicycle and an HGV. - The calculation of the vehicle increase only covers the period from 7 am to 7 pm (this is correct according to the last approval given in 2017, BUT the site now operates 24 hours a day 7 days a week). As this only covers HALF of the time the site actually operate, then the number of vehicles generated should be DOUBLE the number calculated, ie the calculation should be on 96 HGV's and 24 NHS vehicles, total 120. - o If we take the figures from Table 3.3 of the i-Transport report, it gives the average number of HGV's passing through Botley as 587.
--	--	---

		o Once the by pass is built, the 587 will be reduced by 80%, so there will be 117 HGV's. o So, as this one extra building will generate 96 HGV's, it will nearly double the HGV traffic for one building. - This calculation on its own should be enough to show that the site is completely unsuitable for an industrial distribution site for a major multinational company. - To put this into context, the extra building will generate an extra vehicle every 12 minutes. This only covers the proposed extra building, so taking into account the traffic figures from their report, there will be a vehicle / HGV movement every 4 ½ minutes from the site. This calculation raises significant questions of how much traffic the other buildings are generating, particularly as they are: - Operating in breach of the approved planning by operating 24/7 whereas they should only operate between 7am-7pm - The buildings on site a much bigger than those in the approved 2017 planning application. It looks to be at least twice the size of what was approved. I think that my calculations above are actually conservative, as the total traffic will reduce by 80%, but I expect that the HGV traffic will come down much more, as the centre of Botley will have a weight limit imposed except for access, so the number of HGV's will be much lower, and the HGV's from the Broadway Farm site will actually make up a much larger proportion of the number of HGV's (quite possible nearly all HGV's). The applicants have been able to operate outside their approved planning parameters, because the current high levels of traffic on the road is masking the issue, but this unacceptable increase in HGV's will be starkly apparent once the bypass is built. They are using inconsistent data when it suits them (ie 7am-7pm operation), but are not adhering to it. This actual operation 24/7 has knock on consequences, as the vehicle movements are in anti-social hours, and the site has to be lit 24 /7, so there is significant light pollution. FLOODING I do not agree with the statement in of the application that there is no increase in the flood risk. The road has flooded on a number of occasions, partially blocking the road and creating serious disruption to the traffic flow. After rain there is regular run off from the fields, and from the entrance drive, which makes the road wet and slippery. When there is frost, this excess water makes the road more hazardous, and there have been a number of accidents with cars slipping on wet or icy roads, some of which have resulted in damage to walls, fences, of adjacent properties. There is much more run off from the property over recent years than there was previously, both down the tarmac drive and off the field. There have been several instances of the road past the property being flooded which blocks traffic, and risks damage to cars. Once the flooding has receded, the path is covered in silt which has been blocking the drains. The run off goes into the stream behind the houses on the other side of the road, which then fills to capacity. In the drainage study by Pitman Associates, the calculation is only carried out for (0.26Ha page 23 of report) the area covered by the current application for a new large warehouse, hard standing, and vehicle storage. It is interesting to note that since the last planning application, there is now a large pond added to cope with this water run off. This limit of 0.26 Ha for the analysis is not correct, as the aerial photographs taken from the various applications made by Broadway Farm show that the land has changed from porous to being extensively covered in tarmac.
--	--	--

		Any calculation of storm water holding has to include all of the tarmacked area across the property as this has been carried out since 2016 with no provision for holding the water, not just the small area which is included in this calculation. I also see that they have made an allowance for ponding. This should be looked at carefully as the property is on a significant slope, so the chance of natural ponding seems low, and any reliance on new banks would need confirmation that they would be retained, and maintained to act effectively in the future. The current proposal requires regular (monthly in may case) maintenance of the systems put in place. How can we know that this maintenance will be carried out, particularly in 5 or 10 years time when everyone will have forgotten why it was needed, and no one is monitoring it. If this new building requires two ponds, then what is there already (particularly that outside the approved planning application) should require at least the same if not more water holding. This needs to be addressed now, with a rain water retention calculation being for the whole developed area which looks to be at least 0.75 Ha, not just for the additional 0.26 Ha. On page 8 of the Pitman document (numbered Page 5), they include an extract from the environment agency maps of the area. This is completely misleading. What that map shows is whether the area will flood from local water courses. Clearly, as the farm is up a slope it will not flood. However, what is of interest is whether the development will cause adjacent lower area to have problems. There seems to be an assumption that once the water is off their land, then it is job done and of no concern to them what the consequences may be elsewhere. What is already happening is that the water from the overdeveloped area is running into the adjacent areas and giving problems. The map shows the flooding on the road, and allowing the water from this site to go into the local water courses which are already at capacity will cause problems. RADID EXPANSION OF THE SITE Reviewing the planning application, I have a number of concerns, including: • The supporting document from Luben Beck claims that "For over 30 years, CCW Ltd has operated a very successful international storage and distribution business employing between 60 and 70 staff " (executive summary Page 2) • This is not correct. Up till 2016, the business operated as a low level pallet collection, repair, storage, and redistribution business, employing around 10 people, with a few small flatbed truck movements. It is only since 2016/2017 that the business has expanded rapidly, employed more people, and started 24 /7 operation with frequent HGV trucks. Para 1.3 of the Luben Beck report introduction states "In 2019, much of the current development at the site was considered and approved by the Council " This clearly acknowledges that only some of what has already been built has been approved. My sketch above indicates what has already been built which is beyond what has been approved. The Luben Beck report also has repeated references to the NHS. The photos in the various supporting documents clearly show that the NHS vehicles only occupy a small part of that area, and the rest is used for general storage and vehicle parking. Any weight put onto the application by reference to the NHS should be considered in this light. Para 3.9 of the Luben Beck report gives their response to the
--	--	---

		concern about light pollution as “Subject to the illumination levels needed to achieve safe lighting conditions within the parking and loading zones new down lighter units could be utilized in areas where there was a significant risk of light pollution in surrounding areas. “ So, we note that their view on avoiding light pollution is: - Subject to the illumination levels needed for safe operation - o Light pollution has to be avoided. This statement means that they cannot achieve the level of lighting required for safe operation without light pollution. - o This means that the site is not suitable for an industrial distribution centre - New downlighters could be used - o This statement means that they will not use them - In areas where there is significant risk - o Who decides whether it is a significant risk or not? - o They have clearly decided that they don't care about light pollution. The statements in the Luben Beck document are meaningless, and unenforceable. There is already substantial light pollution on the existing site which should be removed now, and would be helped substantially if the limited operation from 7am-7pm in the planning application were to be enforced. This has to be considered together with their ecology report which shows that there is not much biodiversity, which is not surprising given that they have covered larger areas of the site with tarmac, operate 24/7, and have bright lights on when it is dark. • Para 3.9 also states “The site has operated for over 30 years on the basis that access to it is governed by: - Ø The cargo loading practices at Southampton Docks, - Ø International and U.K. driving regulations and practices, - Ø Employment, security and contractual obligations arising from the competitive nature of maintaining a high-quality storage and distribution business at the Eastleigh location. The nature of the public services provided by the various branches of the NHS - from the Botley site - are new and special and the service providers need ready access at all times. “ This is completely wrong and misleading, and follows from the earlier misleading statement about the site operating for “30 years as a successful international distribution and storage business” The site operated as a small pallet business with limited operating hours until 2016/2017 when they built a number of large buildings without planning permission, and changed to operating 24 /7 contrary to their planning application. Para 4.7 Luben Beck reiterate the misleading statement that the business has been operating in this manner for 30 years, and state that they are operating out of new buildings approved 3 years ago. They fail to mention that half of the buildings on the site are not covered by the planning permission. 4.9 Luben Beck suggest that one more warehouse will have negligible effect. They fail to mention that half of the buildings on the site are not covered by the planning permission. 4.15 Luben Beck state that there will be no increase in traffic, whereas their transport consultant predicts 60 extra vehicles per day using only 7am-7pm. We know that they operate 24 /7 , so the actual number will be 120 extra vehicles per day for this one extra building. • There seems to be a process of expansion of the site that
--	--	--

		has not been formally proposed and agreed, but is done as a series of expansions which have changed the character of the location from rural to industrial without consultation. Has there been an agreement to change the use from agricultural to industrial? • If this application were to be approved, would this be the end of it, or would there be more and more applications to expand the site? It seems that there have been a series of applications in quick succession, so there may be more to follow. • This application does not cover all of the changes that have been made from the last approval planning application. It seems that changes have been made to the property for which I cannot see a planning application. The current proposal appears to roughly double the area of land changed from rural green fields, to be used for industrial purposes. • Some of the justification does not seem to be relevant or complete. Each application uses different numbering for the building, so it is confusing and difficult to follow. • The resultant noise, light pollution, increase in vehicle movements, extended working hours all have an adverse effect on the local area, particularly with the bypass about to be built. CONCLUSIONS The series of planning application show that the site has changed from a small site with minimal warehousing, all contained in a narrow area directly behind the property, to a much larger major business. This has happened in a short period of time over the last 3-4 years, and is a significant change of use which will have consequences for the area including: • Any references in the supporting document such as those from Luben Beck with claims that "For over 30 years, CCW Ltd has operated a very successful international storage and distribution business employing between 60 and 70 staff " (executive summary Page 2) – are not correct • Up till 2016, the business operated as a low level pallet collection, repair, storage, and redistribution business, employing around 10 people, with a few small flatbed truck movements. It is only since 2016/2017 that the business has expanded rapidly, employed more people, and started 24 /7 operation with frequent HGV trucks. • Increased risk of flooding, particularly as the run off calculations only cover a very small element of the new tarmac area, and just push the water off their site into water courses which are already at capacity. • Increased traffic volumes. • Each application has claimed that there will be no increase in traffic, but the data submitted in the successive applications states that the traffic has increase from 25 lorry movements per day to 56 HGV and 49 other vehicles, and the new building will add a further 48 vehicle movements per day. Just this data alone shows that the vehicle traffic at the site has grown enormously in the last few years. • The claims of minimal effects of increased traffic were done on the wrong basis, assuming that the traffic flow is as now. This ignores the fact that there will be a bypass shortly, so the movements of lorries will be much more intrusive • The proposal will adversely affect the noise levels, light pollution, air quality • A development which is in the GAP between Hedge End and Botley. • A proposed change of the use of the land from agricultural to industrial. This raises the prospect of applications for the building of houses which might have been refused on agricultural land to be given for brown field / industrial land. This would then open up the GAP to be developed and destroyed.
--	--	--

		• A simple comparison of the aerial photos shown that the site was essentially contained behind the house, and only had a few small sheds with porous surfaces in the planning application in 2018, whereas now, the site has more than doubled in area, is non porous tarmac all over, and has 7/8 large warehouse buildings. Yet the application still says that there will be minimal effect of traffic. • As an indication of the scale of the change, you only need to look at the LDC application in 2017 which was requesting to remove an old building and to enlarge it to the maximum possible under the LDC of 200m². The new application is to add a single building of 560 m², which is almost treble the size of the building that was proposed under LDC, which was itself double the size of the one that it replaced! This is in addition to the three other similarly large buildings which have been added since 2018. • The current application does not cover all of the changes since the last application. Changes not covered include extra / larger / different building, additional tarmac parking • The application contains a number of provisions which are problems: - o Extended working hours to 24 hours per day - o A suggestion that planting a hedge to hide a development is an acceptable way of changing a green field to a tarmac area with industrial buildings - o Only providing vehicle data for one month. Data should be provided for the last 5 years to cover the period from before the 2017 LDC application, so that we can see justification for the statements that the changes will not result in any increase in vehicle traffic - o Claims that there is no effect on flooding - o Including a biodiversity report after most of the changes have been made. - o Having buildings which are much larger than the surrounding residential properties, so are out of scale for the area. The previous prominent references to the NHS look to be an attempt to influence approval for something that may not otherwise be approved, and, in any case, is for a temporary problem. Is the proposal to remove the tarmac hardstanding and warehouse when they are no longer provided for or required by the NHS? The Design & Access Statement on P3 says "NHS vehicle storage area is for the sole use of the NHS". The aerial photos in the FABIK report on the front cover, and on P6 show that this is not true, as this area is clearly used for pallet storage, and trailer storage. I see the references to the work supports 40-60 jobs, and that they are providing services to the NHS. These are clearly positive things, but in themselves do not provide justification for building on fields in a strategic gap, turning a rural area into an industrial site. This is not the only location where these activities could be carried out, and if the business is successful and needs to grow, then it should be moved to an area where the expansion can be properly managed in a nearby location which is designated as an industrial one. I note that the front cover of the FABIK report is an aerial photos of the site showing what was approved in the 2017 application. This is misleading because other aerial photos from the FABIK reports show what is there now Front cover of FABIK report showing what was approved in 2017 (and should be there now). PICTURE SHOULD BE HERE Aerial photos showing what is on the site now. (Note that the NHS
--	--	--

		area in the top right is mainly used for storage and general vehicle parking, and is only a small part is used for NHS vehicles) PICTURE SHOULD BE HERE What is there now has changed agricultural land into an industrial site, and the proposal to build even more will mean that there is hardly any of the original green fields left on this “farm”. This site should revert to what was approved in 2017 and no more. PLANNING APPLICATION HISTORYPlanning application history. I have looked at the planning applications for Broadway farm which are available on the Eastleigh website, and I note the following. Application F/07/61818 & F/08/64049 These applications covered an extension to the property which was on the site. The refusal of the original application was on the basis that “the development would have an unacceptable visual impact on the site, the character of the area and the Hedge End to Botley Gap, contrary to policies 3.CO, 9.CO and 59.BE” Also ‘ The extension would result in an excessively large dwelling that could be subdivided and undermine the objectives of retaining the property’s availability for agricultural workers, therefore contrary to policy 9.CO The later application was approved, but only on the basis of a smaller extension, and with the agricultural occupancy restriction on the original building built in 1975 on the basis of an agricultural tie, also applied to the new part. The site layout plan for these applications (see Site layout plan (670205 – attached for easy reference) shows the extent of the working part of the property, which can be seen to be directly behind the property. PICTURE SHOULD BE HERE Application LDC/17/80680 This application was to replace an existing building that had reach the end of its life, and was made as a Lawful Development certificate (LDC) request. In the location plan attached, it can be seen that the working area is very similar to that in the plan for the 2007 / 2008 application above, and the size and number of buildings is similar, with one extra building shown. The application was for a building which had a floor area of no more than 200 m2, and would not be used between 7:00pm and 6:30 am. The application included the document “Planning statement-evidence (020002567).pdf”. The last page of this document shows aerial photographs of the site, which show that it was of a similar size to that in the 2007 & 2008 applications (but also extended noticeably to the west), with small buildings, and it does not appear to have originally had hard, non-porous paving. This application was approved for the replacement of a single building with a single larger one of no more than 200 m2.
--	--	--

		PICTURE SHOULD BE HERE PICTURE SHOULD BE HERE Application F/17/81201 This is an application for retrospective planning permission for a number of larger buildings erected on the site at the same time as the LDC approved previously. As can be seen on the "Context Masterplan.pdf" attached to the application, these buildings are significantly larger than those that were in place previously, and were not on the LDC planning application submitted (for example, the building requested under LDC to be 200m², is now almost twice that size). The application and assessment state that "...the works are to improve how the site operates rather than to allow for significant expansion of the business.." and that "...the works have not and are not expected to increase traffic associated with the site.." The original application states that the working hours will remain unchanged as 6am-7pm summer and 7am-5pm winter, with 30 lorry (7.5-44 ton) movements per day in the summer, and 25 in the winter. However, the retrospective application for the larger buildings increased the lorry movements to 45 during the summer, and 35 in the winter, but still within the restricted working hours of 6am-7pm summer and 7am-5pm winter. This, in itself, suggests that the applicants accept that adding buildings increases vehicle traffic. As can be seen from the "site layout plan.pdf" sent with the application this larger development was for 4 buildings, was still broadly within the footprint of the previous operation, and contained gravel parking areas. PICTURE SHOULD BE HERE Application F/21/91859 This planning application appears to be substantially different from those that have been previously submitted. If I look at the "site layout plan.pdf" from the last planning application, it had • 4 buildings, A, B, C D • Gravel parking • A footprint which was similar to the previous ones If I look at the application "21003 2001-PL_Proposed Site Plan.pdf", it bears no resemblance to the previous plans. It has: • 9 buildings rather than 4 • Building 1 looks to be about 6 times bigger than Building B which was previously there, and now covers the area previously shown as "container storage" • Building 2 looks similar to the previous Building A • Building 3 is new, not shown on the previous plan, in an area previous shown as "Container and cage storage" • Building 4 looks similar to Building C on the earlier plan, but larger • Building 5 is new, not shown on the previous plan • Building 6 looks to be about twice the size of Building D on the previous plan • Building 7 was not shown on the previous plan • Building 9 is part of the application
--	--	--

		In addition: - What is marked as "Existing parking area" is a new area which has been created by cutting down trees, and tarmacking over previous grassland. This application is only for a small part of the additional work that has since the previous application was approved. It looks as if the area of industrial land is now roughly double that which it was before the expansion. PICTURE SHOULD BE HERE I cannot see any planning application or approval for : - The tarmac area marked as "Existing parking area" - Building 1 at its current size - Building 3 - Building 5 - Building 6 at its current size - Building 7 The aerial photo of the site included in the document "211026 F Design and Access Statement.pdf" , shows that the development: - Covers a much larger area than what was previously there - The buildings are much larger than those previously there - The whole area is now tarmac, whereas much of it was previously porous PICTURE SHOULD BE HERE The document states that: - The application is for a new storage shed with an area of 560 m2. This should be viewed with the application under LDC/17/80680 which was to remove an existing shed, and extend it to the maximum 200 m2 permissible under the permitted development rules. - There are a number of storage containers, whereas this was used as an argument for allowing the previous larger building, as that would "clean up" the site by transferring the material in the containers to the proposed building. - The application states that "Proposals are of a design, scale and layout in keeping with the surroundings". I cannot see any justification for this statement, as the soundings are all fields, and the development is in the designated gap. - I would like to see the justification for the statement that "Ecological and biodiversity matters will be mitigated by extending the existing hedgerow" - The document appears to suggest that by planting a hedge to hide the development from view from the road, then the development is perfectly acceptable. It is not my understanding of planning policy that you can build whatever you like provided that you plant a hedge high enough to shield it from view. The ecological study was carried out on 19th October 2021. I do not see the relevance of this report, as it was carried out after much of the work has already been done. It is no surprise that there is not much biodiversity if most of the land is covered by tarmac and large sheds, and is the subject of regular movements of HGV's, forklifts, other vehicles, and workers. The report talks about planting "native species", but what has been done is to plant laurel. In the transport report from i-Transport, I see: - Paragraph 4.2.5 states that vehicles exiting the site do not cross over the centreline of the road into oncoming traffic. This is not correct, as vehicles exiting the site have to turn right, so they
--	--	---

		have to cross the oncoming traffic. • Paragraph 4.5.1 gives a swept path analysis stating that no vehicle entering the site crosses to the other carriageway onto oncoming traffic. This is not the case, as large lorries have been observed to swing out to the other carriageway to enter the site. • Table 5.1 gives an average for September of 56 HGVs per day and a further 49 other vehicles. This data is for one month only. Data should be provided for a much longer period to draw any conclusions – Data for the last 5 years is to be provided to show if there has been an increase in vehicle traffic beyond what was approved in the various applications. The application documents state that vehicle movements are logged, so this should be easy to do • Paragraph 5.3.4 states that the new building is expected to create an additional 48 vehicle movements per day. This is contrary to the statement in para 4.4 which says that the new building will not create additional traffic. • Section 5.5 justifies the additional traffic as it is a small increase over the recent average traffic flows. This calculation is on completely the wrong basis. The council has accepted that the road is substantially over its capacity, with the result that a bypass is being built for Botley. The whole purpose of building the bypass is to take traffic out of Botley so that it can revert to a quiet village with little traffic and no HGV's. Any assessment of the impact of increased traffic should be made against the minimal traffic volumes expected once the bypass is built. I do not agree with the statement in para 11 of the application that there is no increase in the flood risk. In the drainage study the calculation is only carried out for the area covered by the current application. This is not correct, as the aerial photographs taken from the various applications made by Broadway Farm show that the land has changed from porous to being extensively covered in tarmac. There is much more run off from the property over recent years than there was previously, both down the tarmac drive and off the field. There have been several instances of the road past the property being flooded which blocks traffic, and risks damage to cars. Once the flooding has receded, the path is covered in silt which has been blocking the drains. The run off goes into the stream behind the houses on the other side of the road, which then fills to capacity. Any calculation of storm water holding has to include all of the tarmacked area across the property, not just the small area which is included in this calculation. I also see that they have made an allowance for ponding. This seems to be unlikely as the property is on a significant slope, so the chance of ponding seems low. Paragraph 19 of the application states that they will be operating 24 hours per day. This is a substantial change from the previous applications which were approved with the condition that the operating hours were restricted to 6am-7pm summer and 7am-5pm winter. This extended operating time will increase traffic, and result in disruption in antisocial hours. We have been aware of noise during the night, and there are bright lights on during the hours of darkness which cause light pollution to our property. Much is made of the use of the land and warehouse for the storage of NHS material and ambulances. The documents state that this need is because of the knock-on effects of COVID-19, with hospital car park space needed for health authority need such as COVID-19 screening, etc, and a sudden need for PPE storage, etc. This is clearly a temporary requirement, so I do not believe that an application for a major permanent expansion of a rural site should be granted for a temporary need, however laudable. There are repeated references to the existing haulage and warehousing business having been in business for over 25 years,
--	--	--

		and references to the site being an industrial site. As you can see from the aerial photographs included from previous planning applications, the warehousing on the site remained very limited until it was suddenly expanded in 2018 with retrospective planning approval, and it has been further drastically expanded since then. This is a substantial further increase. So, whilst there has been a business on the site for some years, it is only in the last 2-3 years that it has grown out of all proportion. Consequently, references to the business for the last 25 years are not relevant as it was a very much smaller operation until 2-3 years ago. Furthermore, given that the house had an agricultural tie in 2008, and the application to use the rear yard of the site for pallet storage was refused in 1997 with application Z/17963/001/00, has approval been given to change the use from agricultural to industrial? Application F/22/93195 - Full planning This application looks to be very similar to the previous one last year Application F/21/91859. Given the volume of documents, and no indication of what has been carried over, and what is new, I have not done a "spot the difference" exercise to see where any changes are. A general review indicates that I believe that the comments on the previous application are still valid, but if there are specific differences that mean that some need to be reviewed, then I would be happy to do so if such issues are identified and advised to me. In addition to the comments on the earlier proposal, general comments on the proposal are: - The information does not seem to be consistent, eg references to sole use by the NHS, but photos showing that it is not being used solely by the NHS. - The aerial photos in the FABIK report show the extent that the current construction on site exceeds what was approved in 2017. It clearly shows the very large Building 1, the area marked as "Existing CCW Services car park, and the "NHS" hard standing area, none of which are in the 2017 application. I do not understand why this application for even more building is being considered, when what is already there is above what has been approved. - The Surface water drainage study still only considers the calculations for the water management / retention of the extra part which is in this application (0.5 Ha). This study shows that large underground retention tanks are required even for this small additional area in this application. If you look at Drawing DP02 on P19 of the report, it clearly shows large areas that were gravel (ie porous) in 2018. The aerial photos show that the whole of the working part of the site is now either covered with tarmac or large, new buildings. Any assessment of water management / retention, must consider all of the recent changes that have been made to the site, since it was developed from the small pallet business after 2016. - The proposal is also to release water into the tributary of the river Hamble. Whilst this may get the water off the site, it puts it into the river, which then affects the stream running behind the houses south the site. This stream is already at capacity, so any additional water is likely to cause problems. - Section 8.1 of the report includes a map of the area from the government flood map. This is used to show that the site does not have a risk of flooding, but any cursory view of the map shows that the road and adjacent areas are at risk. - The report sets out a whole series of regular maintenance procedures that are required for their proposal to operate as designed. This includes several items with monthly checks, some six monthly, and some annually. Who is going to verify that these
--	--	--

		checks are being carried out in the years to come? If they are not carried out, then we should expect that the system will not operate as designed, and the water will not be managed, so will exceed what is allowable and will cause problems. This is not an acceptable proposal. - It is completely unreasonable for the application to say that they are fine because they are getting all of the excess water off their site, but to ignore the knock on effects to adjacent areas. • What puzzles me is that the history of the property is: • 1997 – Planning application for the use of rear yard for pallet storage refused • 2007 – Planning application to extend bungalow refused because the property had an agricultural tie, and “the development would have an unacceptable visual impact on the site, the character of the area and the Hedge End to Botley Gap..” • 2008 – Planning application for smaller extension to the bungalow approved subject to various conditions • 2017 – Planning application to double the size of a single building in a poor condition approved under the Lawful Development Certificate to give a maximum size of 200m2. It seems that the total covered storage area was 3 small building with around 300 m2 TOTAL. • 2018 – Retrospective planning application for much larger buildings, with a maximum of 30 lorry (7.5-44 tonnes) movements per day in limited working hours • 2021 – Planning application for a small part of a development that has already taken place with 9 large buildings, with an area of what looks to be over 2000m2 of covered area. The site has increased the covered area 10 fold, in a few years. The working hours are now unlimited at 24 hrs per day, and the number of lorry movements has increased from say 15 per day before the enlargement started, to now 150. • 2022 - Why is there allowed to be an application for even more building, when what is already there is in excess of what has been approved? • 2022 – Why is there any consideration of an application to change agricultural land to industrial land in a designated GAP? I fail to understand why an extension to the bungalow was considered to “..have an unacceptable visual impact ..”, but this massive change that has happened in 2-3 years, which changes the character of the property from a bungalow surrounded by fields to an industrial site, can be considered as acceptable. The community has been waiting for a bypass for the last 30 years, and once it is in place in the next year, the lorry traffic will be taken away from the area, so that the only heavy vehicle traffic left will be from this site, in increasing numbers, with unlimited operating hours. This completely defeats the purpose of the bypass. I see the references to the work supports 40-60 jobs, and that they are providing services to the NHS. These are clearly positive things, but in themselves do not provide justification for building on fields in a strategic gap, turning a rural area into an industrial site. This is not the only location where these activities could be carried out, and if the business is successful and needs to grow, then it should be moved to an area where the expansion can be properly managed in a nearby location which is designated as an industrial one. The photo below shows the view from the adjacent field (a similar view would be visible from the adjacent houses in Cobbett Way – which are not included in the consultation). The power lines mean
--	--	--

		that trees cannot be grown to provide a shield, and the scale of the industrial buildings in comparison to the houses, shows how the scale of the development is out of character for the area. PICTURE SHOULD BE HERE
Alastair Rhodes	MALLOW COTTAGE BROAD OAK BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2EU	BROAD OAK BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2EU Objection I have lived on the South side of Broad Oak directly opposite the site for a period in excess of 22 years. I submitted objections to both of the previous, subsequently withdrawn, applications. The issues remain the same and the changes proposed in the third application do not provide adequate or convincing responses to the 4 Conditions set out in the Delegated Decision overview of the first application, the most compelling of which are Conditions 1 & 2: Erosion of the Gap Most significantly nothing in the most recent application has changed the fact that the unlawful existing and proposed new developments are other than '...a substantial expansion of the existing industrial operations onto previously undeveloped land outside the urban edge and within a designated Local Gap, resulting in urbanising physical and visual harm upon the gap and the landscape character of the locality' ... contrary to the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan and associated plans and documents mentioned. As Mr Tim Griffin in his Landscape Comments clearly states: 'the site is within designated Countryside and Settlement Gap 7 as identified in the adopted Local Plan. Any development within these areas should be resisted as it erosive and counter to policy.' '...[the application] does not provide sufficient justification for a proposal which will further diminish the Gap. Historic erosion of the Gap by piecemeal development makes it even more important to resist further diminution of the Gap.' The Parish Council also places reduction of the Gap contrary to Policy S6 at the head of its list of objections to the proposal. This proposal is an attempt to continue the gradual but steady erosion of the Settlement Gap that has taken place since the applicant's diversification from its historic pallet business, something which the applicant's advisers ironically advance as justification for further erosion of that Gap. Environmental Mr Griffin's comments, already referred to, provide a clear, step by step analysis as to how the application fails to address the issues raised in respect of the previous two applications, as he states: 'there in nothing presented to alter my view in landscape terms the proposed addition of a further sizeable warehouse on an open grass field will diminish the Gap physically and have an urbanising effect.' It is difficult to understand how a proposal which will involve the development of, by its own submission, 900 sq meters, can have anything other than such an effect. Flooding The application has gone to some lengths to address the issue of surface water control. Whilst the technical reports mean little to a layman, it appears that whilst the North facing side of the site is catered for nothing has been done to address the issue of surface water flow downhill over the entrance drive onto the highway. One of the large blue arrows on the plan in the report shows this as an

		existing direction of flow from the significant catchment, tarmaced, area of the centre of the site and the CCW car park. In periods of prolonged and/or heavy rainfall the outflow of surface water onto the highway is clear to see adding to the significant surface water issues on the road. I cannot see that this is addressed in the application. Highways Whilst the further comments from the Highways Experts seem to have put the Highways Authorities mind at rest there appears to be no recognition of the disruption caused by the current HGV traffic to and from the site in terms of congestion; noise and fumes with visits to the site commencing as early as 5.30am and after 7pm. Comments in other submissions detail such matters. We are advised that the current level of activity is 60 per day, although with car traffic this is substantially greater, it is difficult to imagine what the proposed increase of 73% to 104 visits per day would be like. There are no comments from the Borough Council as Parking Authority, I find this strange given the number of vehicles that are stored on the car park on the site for Richmond cars as evidenced by the morning and evening shuttle of vehicles from the car show rooms to and from the site, incidentally these vehicles do not follow the traffic protocols set up by the applicants which is obviously highly regarded by the Highways Authority. The commentaries submitted with the application continue to advance unsubstantiated statements as evidenced by the responses, the final paragraph of the Design and Access Statement, stating that no demonstrable harm arises from the proposal which demonstrates economic, social and environmental benefits ... is a prime example. The development of the site since 2017 is not only threatening the Local Authority's policy to maintain Hedge End and Botley as separate entities, it has also had a major adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding residential area, any further development of the site, particularly that which impinges on land in the Gap, should be refused.
--	--	--