

Additional Objection

Planning Application F/26/101367 - 4 Oakwood Road, Chandler's Ford Proposal: Change of Use from C3 to C2 Supported Living (Six Units)

Re: Consultee Response from Hampshire Highways, dated 10 June 2026.

I write as the immediately adjoining neighbour at 2 Oakwood Road to submit a further objection to this application in light of the Hampshire County Council Highways consultee response letter published on the planning portal. I respectfully request that this submission is read alongside my formal objection already lodged and available on the planning portal.

I am deeply concerned that the information provided by the applicant appears to have been accepted at face value, without a site visit and without sufficient scrutiny of the inaccuracies and omissions identified in my original objection.

1. Concern regarding the assertion of a “low-level trip-generating use”

I strongly dispute the assertion that the proposed development would constitute a low-level trip-generating use.

The proposed institutional use of the property as supported living accommodation for six adults with complex learning disabilities, together with the presence of up to six staff members and regular shift changes, would inevitably result in a significant intensification of the use of the site. This would generate considerably more vehicle movements than a typical single-family dwelling.

The resulting increase in traffic, parking demand and on-street parking overspill along Oakwood Road would place additional pressure on the surrounding highway network, including Hiltingbury Road. This is particularly concerning given that Oakwood Road and Hiltingbury Road form part of a busy school route used daily by large numbers of children walking and cycling past the property.

2. Visibility splay and driveway parking layout

The visibility available at the property's access is already constrained by the brick walls on either side of the entrance and by vehicles parked on Oakwood Road. As a result, drivers do not benefit from a clear and unobstructed view of approaching pedestrians, cyclists or vehicles.

The proposed parking arrangement is inadequate and impractical and would further increase the difficulty of safely manoeuvring vehicles into and out of the site. The restricted layout would be likely to require additional reversing movements, thereby exacerbating existing visibility concerns and increasing safety risks.

These concerns are compounded by the proposal to allocate an area of the driveway for bin storage adjacent to the boundary with my property. This arrangement is wholly inappropriate. The proposed bin storage area would be located directly beside the entrance to my property

and would be clearly visible from both my dining room and the bedrooms above, resulting in a significant adverse impact on residential amenity (images 1 to 3).

The close proximity of Nos. 2 and 4 Oakwood Road is highly relevant. The side wall of No. 4 is positioned directly on the boundary with No. 2, and there is a window facing towards my property. On my side of the boundary, this faces our en-suite bedroom and a bathroom (see images 4 and 5). The proximity between the two properties makes the impacts of the proposed use, parking arrangements, bin storage, and noises particularly significant.

Furthermore, the driveway is plainly inadequate to accommodate five vehicles in a practical and safe manner as they would block the entrance or exit from the back of the property (image 3). I also note again that the application refers to additional parking availability at “Croye Close”; however, no such road exists in Chandler’s Ford. This raises further concerns regarding the accuracy of the information relied upon in the application and consultee response.

In addition, the Census data referenced and relied upon by Hampshire Highways is dated and does not provide a reliable basis for assessing the transport impacts of this proposal. Assumptions regarding car sharing, bus usage, cycling and walking cannot be relied upon as an accurate reflection of the travel patterns associated with this specific use and its occupants, staff and visitors.

3. Distance to the nearest bus stop

The Transport Assessment states that the nearest bus stop is within 450 metres of the site. This assertion appears to be incorrect.

The nearest bus stop is located on Winchester Road and is approximately 0.5 miles from the property for Southampton-bound services. The walking distance is greater still for Winchester-bound services.

The actual distance therefore substantially exceeds both the 450 metres stated in the Transport Assessment and the 400-metre public transport accessibility standard requirement. This discrepancy does not appear to have been identified or questioned within the Hampshire Highways response (see Google Maps screenshots at images 6 to 8).

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, together with those contained in my original objection, I respectfully request that the Council gives full consideration to these additional matters and refuses the application.

Yours faithfully,

Ainhwa Campàs Velasco

2 Oakwood Road, Chandler’s Ford, Eastleigh

Appendix: images

1.



2.



3.



4.



5.



6.



7.



8.

