

1 Objections to F/23/96103 J Gannaway, Highview House

A summary of my my comments on previous relevant applications is included below.

I also could not get the plans from the Council's website, and they had to be sent to me by email.

20 more cars will only increase the congestion on the B3354/road into Eastleigh, At what point do you say it is too much? Complaints about the potholes on this stretch of road seem to be ignored.

There are a number of errors in the documents.

The Ecological Assessment shows the wrong postcode for the site. It says GU34 5EP.

The Transport statement is 3 years out of date, and still refers to 9 dwellings.

The Drainage plan shows 9 houses. This is from an earlier application. This application is for 8 houses.

2 Comments from the March Planning Appeal F/23/90322

I disagree with many of the points in the Planning Inspector's conclusions.

8 Privacy - The upstairs window of House No 3 overlooks the large picture window of Oakfields. This site is on the edge of the urban area, and development should respect the privacy of existing properties.

10 Noise: The noise will be excessive - the results in the report are averaged - my measurements show the actual noise each time a vehicle goes past, and in 2023 are even more frequent . If the windows are required to be closed to reduce the noise, mechanical ventilation is required, which itself will generate noise, and will not be green.

11 Overheating: Requiring the occupants to open the windows for ventilation would allow excessive noise in.

14 Overdevelopment: The Policy Map 2022 shows the site is right on the boundary of the urban edge, and should take this into account. It is only "suburban" by virtue of the rest of the development. This interpretation is a recipe for creeping development and "urban sprawl".

The properties Oakfields and Hill Cottage immediately adjacent to the development are semi-rural. It will also affect those on the opposite side of the B3354, which are semi rural and back onto fields. I disagree about its "acceptable" appearance. The close boarded fence around it will look bleak. Development at the edge of an urban edge should be tapered to meet the semi-rural surroundings.

24 Phosphates/nitrates - I agree this is a problem.

3 Input to the Planning Appeal: (F/21/90322)/APP/W1715/W/22/3306656 (Amended with comments Nov 2023)

I support the Council's decision to Refuse permission, especially Reasons 1 and 2 about overdevelopment.

The notification of an appeal is not clear on the website - it just says "Decided" on the summary planning page, then "Decided Not yet Determined" on the next page. You have to dig down deeper to see there is an appeal. This may have prevented some people from commenting.

Overheating/Noise:

The mitigation measures for the upstairs rooms seem an unreasonable burden on the occupants. Mechanical ventilation systems would themselves introduce some noise, and would require expensive, non-green, energy to operate them.

Recourse to such measures indicates that the development is too dense.

The noise to the upper floor rooms would not be attenuated much by the fence.

The only change is increasing the fence height from 1.8 to 2m, which it estimates will reduce the noise to 50dB, previously 55dB, and the addition of an "Uncertainty" paragraph, 5.12. This is all speculative.

The Noise Impact Assessment and Traffic studies were done in 2020 during lockdown, so will be unrepresentatively low. The actual noise levels at 2m/3m as cars and lorries pass are typically up to 87dBA measured at the roadside in my driveway, not the 67dBA suggested in the report. In fact, they reached 90dBA three times during 15 minutes around 8:30am, and again 90dBA three times around 9:10am in June 2021. They are highest from large lorries and traffic which exceeds the 30mph limit, which is a common occurrence. The large lorry traffic has continued to get worse in 2023.

Overdevelopment:

There is an existing barrier of trees to the North end of the plot which screens the existing 330 houses from the road. The existing green field plot provides some separation from the B3354 to the East, and ought to remain. The development of 8 houses here will have an adverse impact on the B3354 street scene.

Appeal 7.30 - 7.32 The existing character of the West side of the Winchester Road here is set by properties such as Oakfields, Hill House and the Fox and Hounds, which will be lost if the proposed new houses are built just behind them. These new houses would be on the extreme edge of the Urban area which has only recently been adopted.

The housing densities are very near to those of the existing estate, rather than the much lower values of the Winchester Road, and are not suited to this extreme edge of the Urban area. 2 or 3 bungalows might be reasonable here. The present estate blends in reasonably well, and is distanced from the road, whereas the new development would not. The green space is needed as a break between the estate and Winchester Road. Surely the aim is to produce a gradual, tapered, development to the Urban Edge, not to get in as many houses as possible? You have already allowed some 330 houses on the surrounding land, please do not try to squeeze another 8 properties into the little remaining green space. The 2m high fence running along the East side of whole site will present a bleak appearance to what is, at present, a pleasant field.

The photographs in "Appendix 6 Appeal" (referred to as Appendix 4 in the Appeal text), eg from opposite Oakfields driveway, are taken from a height of about 4'6" above the road, lower than the typical person's eyes, with a wide angle lens. The road is already some 3ft lower than the surrounding land. Thus the red lines do not represent the full impact of the houses on the street view. They would be considerably nearer, and fill in many of the current gaps. The visual impact of the houses on the East side of the Winchester road will be much greater, as they are some 3ft higher than that used in the photos, and their view will be on a level with the proposed development. The pictures (Pic 1-3, attached) show the view from ~5ft9" high, standing in the drive of Highview House. The other two are from the 1st floor of Highview House - similar views would be seen from Albany House and Maple Ridge.

Highway Safety

It will further increase the traffic on the roads into Eastleigh and Winchester which are already overloaded in the rush hours. There are no alternative routes. The original Traffic survey was done nearly ten years ago when the new estate was approved. Already, in the evening, rush hour traffic backs up to beyond Colden Common (typically 1.5 miles). When there are roadworks, the morning rush hour traffic backs up to beyond here, North, to Colden Common.

The junction of Savernake Way with the B3354 is at the brow of a hill, and there have been a number of accidents at this junction since then. Another 8 houses (16-24 vehicles) will further increase the load. There is a 30mph limit on the B3354, but traffic routinely goes considerably faster.

The road surface has continued to crack up under the heavy traffic, and two large potholes have appeared. The ill-fitting manhole covers are still ill-fitting and have not been repaired.

If it does go ahead, the construction traffic should access via the Delamere Gardens side, not via the B3354/Oakfields. The junction and roads on this estate are narrow, and not really suited to heavy construction traffic.

There is no footpath on the East side of Delamere Gardens to service the houses.

Most people will need cars for transport. Designing with people walking to their destination is largely inappropriate in this location, which is on the far edge of Eastleigh.

Appeal 7.41 Isolated patches of dried grass do not make for a good argument and are a sign that such small areas of grass are not sustainable.

Environmental

Appeal 7.45-7.46 There does not seem to be an Appendix 16, but the increased phosphorus and nitrate loadings are a cause for concern.

Local Infrastructure

It will further increase pressure on local infrastructure which is already overloaded and getting worse, eg Doctors' Surgeries and Schools. You cannot go on adding new houses without providing new infrastructure.

Design

The roof height of the houses 3-8 has increased from 8200 to 8825/8650/8750mm. The ceiling height has remained the same at 5175mm. Can the roof height be kept to the same as 50-52 Delamere Gardens, as the higher houses at 56/58 Delamere Gardens stand out significantly?

I would be concerned if the plan included trees that grew taller than the houses. I would like to see a condition imposed that the trees would not exceed the height of the houses. I have planning permission for an Amateur Radio mast on my property, and my antennas need a clear view of the horizon, particularly to the West. I do not want to put the mast up any higher.

Japanese Knotweed

I note with some concern that the Japanese Knotweed on the site has not been completely eradicated. I thought this was required to be done when permission for the estate (330 houses) was given.



Pic1



Pic2



Pic3