

Planning Application
23 OATLANDS ROAD, BOTLEY, SOUTHAMPTON, SO32 2DE

Representative	Address	Comments
Andrew Harvey	22 MADDOXFORD LANE BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO32 2DG	Application Number F/22/9420 at 23, Oatlands Road, Botley, SO32 2DE We wish to object to the above planning application on the following grounds: * Our bungalow plot, no 22 in Maddoxford Lane, runs alongside the north east elevation of the proposed build. Oatlands Road and Maddoxford Lane consist of detached houses and bungalows on good size plots. This dwelling would be completely out of character and is overdevelopment for the area. * The dwelling would still appear to be squeezed into the site, the subdivision and development would still reduce the open character formed by lengthy back gardens. * The subdivision would still create a tight site that would appear overdeveloped with both the 5 bedroom house and the 3 bedroom dwelling having inadequate amenity space around them. * The plots of both dwellings would still appear significantly smaller than others in the immediate vicinity and would therefore be greatly out of character. * With reference to section entitled Scale, the proposed building design described to appear as “ancillary outbuilding” is said to “improve the open area” and create “a more aesthetically and pleasing environment complimentary to the street scene when considered as a whole”. We believe it would actually close in the vicinity and detract from the aesthetics of the local area. * Regarding the section Impact on Residential Amenity, neighbouring properties eg no 21 Oatlands Road, would overlook the car parking area, bin store and cycle store. Their upstairs privacy would be compromised by the 3 windows of the proposed build’s kitchen/dining/lounge areas. * Regarding the vehicles using the proposed new drive adjacent to 21 Oatlands Road, there can be no guarantee of limited speed, frequency, number and type of vehicles accessing it nor of the degree of impact, noise and disturbance the neighbours would be exposed to. * Regarding the Landscaping section, there would be fewer trees to preserve the character and appearance of the area as several on the eastern boundary will be removed. * Also, the proposed removal of a large section of mature hedge on Oatlands Road to create the new drive would reduce the visual aspect of the street. The proposed building described as “ancillary outbuilding” and the bin store and cycle store would be visible from the pavement/road. * Regarding the Ecology section, our understanding is that we are in an urban edge not “urban” area and our close proximity to rural and farming land, for example in Wangfield Lane, regularly brings a variety of wild animals including bats and foxes into our garden and across the patio. We know from neighbours this is

		also true for them. * Regarding the section SUDS and reference to soakaways, there is no evidence on the proposed plan of their location. We understand that a minimum distance of 5m from buildings and 2.5m from boundaries is required by building regulations. We are concerned that their positioning would negatively impact on our home due to a lack of distancing between us and the proposed build. * Regarding the section on Sustainability, it is stated that “the proposal will deliver an improvement over the existing CO2 consumption of the building”. As there is currently no building, only garden, it is difficult to see how this could be achieved. * In the section under Conclusion, the subdivision would still not allow for adequate access for parking, turning, loading of private vehicles of varying size such as vans, trucks, caravans, camper vans, SUVs. It would be equally inadequate for emergency vehicles such as fire appliances and ambulances to access the property. * The dwelling would still be in too close proximity to ours. The revised plan holds various inconsistencies when compared with the original eg the distance between the hedge and the proposed build on the eastern boundary. Though this appears to have been increased on the revised plan, what actually seems to have moved is the dotted line representing the wall of the build. It is now shown almost at the hedge therefore giving the impression that the separation distance between the properties has increased. The suggested improvement is inaccurate or at best very minimal. It would make very little difference to our proximity (“relationship”) with the proposed build. * Also, the dwelling’s north east elevation has windows from an en suite and bathroom in very close proximity to and facing our kitchen and dining/living room windows (a few feet). This would result in loss of privacy and introduce noise - flushing, showering, extractor fans - and disturbance as a result of use. * Again, from our windows mentioned above, our outlook would be of the side of the build a few feet away. Currently a partly deciduous hedge exists which is blocking light into our property. It has been our intention since purchasing the bungalow (in August 2021) to remove the hedge and replace it with a lower fence thus permitting more light in. The proposed dwelling would negate this and in fact block light in through above mentioned windows to an even greater degree. * With reference to “marginal concerns” in the Conclusion section, we question the terminology - are the planning officer’s concerns really marginal when taken in conjunction with the concerns outlined by the Parish Council and those of the local residents on this small site? * With reference to the final remarks in the Conclusion section which refer to large estates, these new estates are all being built on greenfield sites as part of Local Government building requirements. The planning process for these developments has been thoroughly worked through with planning officers. These considerations bear no relationship with this one-off development. The comments made in the Conclusion section are emotive and not of any relevance.
Philip Chandler	20 MADDOXFORD LANE BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON	I see no substantial difference to the previous plan application, and therefore my previous comments stand.

	SO32 2DG	The current proposal is unsuitable for the following reasons: 1. The foot print of the proposed building is too large for the site. Meaning that there is the minimum for space between this and the neighbouring boundaries. This would impact direct properties. Although other "backland" are on Oatlands Road, these were on substantially larger plot size or smaller building foot print and with great distance from neighbouring boundaries. 2. It seems reasonable to assume that the premise having 3 bedrooms that there will be more than 2 cars. The doesn't looks that there is enough area to allow more that 2 cars to turn around and exits the drive facing forward on to Oakland Road 3. The access road is place next to 22 property and they would suffer noise from vehicles entering and existing. Also the width of the road and the small parking space would make it difficult for emergency services to gain access (especially fire appliances) 4. Boorley Green has seen large scale housing development that will provide over 1500 homes over the next 3 years, there is little need for one-off additional brown field site development. 5. If built, the existing building would be out of character with the other houses along Oaklands Road in the proportion to size of house to garden. It would give an overdeveloped feel for the area. 6. Views from the upper floors our property would directly overlook proposed development, especially in the winter months It is likely the existing street lighting column would have to be re-positioned to ensure clearance from the proposed drive way. It's noted that no street light design review with Hampshire CC street lighting contractor has been provided as part of the application. In the proposal there is no statement what impact the new development would have to water, sewage to the surrounding properties. Also it is unclear how the property will obtain is electrical feed, as it is unlikely to usable for the existing infrastructure. If built, there would need to be restrictions on further development to ensure that no changes to roof height or footprint would be possible. Additional, points on the proposal: * It is unclear how installing a cycle storage helps to limit the water to 105 litres per person per day * The proposal is noncommittal on committing to actually delivering the proposed limit the water to 105 litres per person per day * The "improvement over the existing CO2 consumption of the building", as there is no existing building it's CO2 consumption must therefore be zero. A improvement on zero would be very impressive. It feels that this may have been cut and pasted from another proposal. * As CO2 seems to be a concern, maybe air source heat pump should be instead of a condensing boiler (which are banned for new from 2025) It would be interesting to know if this build had been built prior to the extension to 23 Oatlands Road (F/16/77958), whether of not that extension would have been approved. As the proposed build definitely wider than the original building.
Dennis Stokes	21 OATLANDS ROAD BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO32 2DE	Planning Application No. F/22/94200 We object to the above application which shows vehicle access to the proposed property being adjacent to our boundary fence and 2 meters from our ground floor sleeping area. The proposed property will be visually intrusive, have limited parking area and

		manoeuvring space and will create unacceptable noise. The applicant has responded to our objection regarding the proximity of the new access road to my boundary fence (see F/22/93238), is incorrect in assuming a store is adjacent to the access road – it is a bedroom. Also, who can say that vehicles are unlikely to pass at a great speed or limited frequency? The 'existing hedge' comprises large shrubs which are likely to be cut down when constructing the access road It will add to the traffic using Oatlands Road which has considerably increased since the building of Botley Park and other developments along Maddoxford Lane and will increase still further when the Botley Bypass is completed. Additional building in the existing Boorley Green area will add to the flooding and sewage discharge which occurs in Crowsnest Lane whenever there is heavy rainfall. There are hundreds of new houses being constructed in the area, why squeeze a bungalow with very little amenity space into an established landscape ?
Adam Bradford	19 OATLANDS ROAD BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO32 2DE	We wish to object to the planning application F/22/94200 as per the following comments. - The proposed building/dwelling its too close to existing dwellings with minimal distance between boundaries. - The existing properties in Oatlands Road have generous gardens, this dwelling will be squeezed in with next to no garden at all, therefore not in keeping with surrounding area. - The rear or property will be overlooked from this dwelling impacting the privacy of No 17, 19 & 21 Oatlands Road. - Additional noise from this proposed dwelling due to lack of space between existing housing impacting immediate properties. Additional noise from traffic gaining access to and from proposed dwelling on to Oatlands Road. - Why squeeze another house in this established road when there are thousands of houses being built around Boorley Green?