

Planning Application F/26/100809

The Orchard, 5 Westgate Mews, Kenilworth Gardens, Southampton, SO30 3RE

Representative	Address	Comments
D McNamara	13 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	See documents.
B McNamara	13 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	See documents.
Mike Sawford	24 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	I would strongly oppose this. The road is not suitable for large vehicles and lorries coming up and down to build 8 properties. It would cause a lot of noise and disruption. Parking is not great either with many visitors parking at the entrance to the road and it's difficult for cars to proceed up the road as it is. The road is a quiet residential cul de sac and this is what appealed to us moving here. If I need to do anything else to be involved in any meetings or need to submit anything further, please let me know.
Robert Faulkner	GREENTILES MOORHILL ROAD WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3AX	Traffic is already congested in hedge end , with seemingly no plans to improve. This will only add to the problems, including telegraph hill. How is this going to be addressed? Also I can see any documents review the application properly?
Bryan Ede	1 Kenilworth Gardens West End Southampton SO30 3RE	There is already excessive road side parking and access is regularly compromised leading to bins not being emptied , ambulances delayed and pedestrian walk ways blocked , this will only be made worse with more residents and more traffic being permitted into the cul de sac .
Stefan Hargrave	25 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	As someone living on the proposed access road to the new dwellings I object to this development as the road is struggling as it is to take the traffic it already has let alone the heavy machinery to build the houses and subsequent traffic once built. On a practical basis, our bins are often not picked up due to cars parked and blocking the bin lorries at the entrance to Kenilworth Gardens - this wont magically get better. This road is not suitable for the traffic intended both during and after the build.
Christine Jackson	9 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	I have no objection to the houses being built, however I do object to the access being through Kenilworth Gardens. It's a very narrow winding road with a blind bend. Cars park at the end of the road by Telegraph Road cause problems to everyday traffic, but especially bin collection lorries.. We also have young children living here. Better access would be through the industrial estate on Botley Road..
Ian Chiddle	4 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	I have lived in Kenilworth Gardens for almost 22 years and my main concern about adding this development is the additional traffic it will create. The entrance to Kenilworth Gardens from Telegraph Road is not wide enough for the existing requirements. The bendy nature of the road coupled with the constant parking of visitors and carers to the retirement flats makes access a difficult negotiation. On several occasions our waste bins have not been emptied to plan because the lorry could not pass the obstructing cars. The double yellow lines are often ignored and parking up on the pedestrian walkway is

		very common. No one enforces the laws around these issues. Building 8 more homes will only add to the existing problem! Would it be possible for the bendy section of our road to be widened considerably as a condition on the developers? We realise the carers in particular need to come by car to do their work and provision for them should be made.
Jonathan Ayres	22 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	I object to this development on a number of reasons, first this will cause increase traffic congestion in the area, which is already extremely high, lead to further degradation of the road network, which gets poorer by the week. It is an overdevelopment of the area with the narrow road network. The current state of parking is already high, additional housing with extra services, additional people visiting would overload the close. In addition the logistics of vehicles for the development would cause havoc to the people of the close, reducing the quality of life with pollution of the development and noise pollution. The impact on the general environment will only make everything worse. Adding housing on an already high population density area, with a overburdened road network is ludicrous.
Melanie Trim	12 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	I am writing to object to the above application on the grounds of highway safety, parking impact, and the unsuitability of the proposed access route through Kenilworth Gardens, which is a quiet cul-de-sac already experiencing significant congestion issues. 1. Severe Impact on Parking in a Constrained Cul-de-Sac The road already suffers from heavy on-street parking, limiting manoeuvrability and leaving little room for additional vehicles. The proposal for 18 new parking spaces will significantly worsen the situation. Furthermore, the provision of only two visitor spaces for eight 3- and 4-bedroom homes is wholly inadequate. These larger family homes typically generate higher levels of car ownership and regular visitor traffic, meaning two spaces cannot reasonably meet expected demand. 2. Access via Kenilworth Gardens is Inappropriate and Unsafe Kenilworth Gardens is a narrow cul-de-sac not designed to accommodate additional through-traffic. Increased vehicle movements would introduce risks to pedestrians and residents in an area with already tight constraints. 3. Waste Collection and Emergency Vehicle Access Bin lorries often cannot reach the end of the road due to parked vehicles, resulting in missed collections and hazardous reversing manoeuvres. Importantly, fire engines would also be unable to safely access the road due to its restricted width, existing parking congestion, and lack of suitable turning space. This presents a serious risk to life and property, as emergency response times would be compromised by the physical constraints of the cul-de-sac. 4. Harm to the Character and Amenity of a Quiet Cul-de-Sac The increased traffic, noise, and vehicular activity generated by the proposed development would negatively affect the peaceful character of the area. 5. Insufficient Justification for Intensified Access No adequate technical assessment has been provided to demonstrate that the existing access can safely accommodate increased vehicle flows, emergency vehicles, or waste-collection vehicles. Conclusion For the reasons stated above, I request that the council refuse the application due to the unacceptable impact on highway safety, residential amenity, and both essential and emergency-service access.
Sheila Belcher	10 KENILWORTH GARDENS	I wish to formally object to the proposal to build eight new

	WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	houses on land located behind my home. The only access to the proposed development is via the existing cul-de-sac serving my property. This road is narrow and was not designed to accommodate construction traffic or a significant increase in daily vehicle movements. The size and frequency of construction vehicles would create serious safety concerns and disruption for existing residents. Traffic congestion in the area is already a significant problem due to the number of new housing developments approved in recent years. The addition of traffic from eight further dwellings would worsen congestion and place further strain on an already overburdened local road network. The development would also have a harmful impact on residential amenity through increased noise, disturbance, and traffic, particularly during the construction period. The access arrangements alone would materially affect the quiet enjoyment of our homes. For these reasons, I believe the proposed development is unsuitable for this location and respectfully request that the application be refused.
ian & Sandra Palmer	ORCHARD LODGE KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	We wish to object to the planning application referenced at F/26/100809. The application to build 8 detached houses is unacceptable in a road that already experiences severe issues with access and egress for the residents, service and emergency vehicles. 18 additional parking places are planned for, which together with cars for new residents, visitors, service delivery vehicles etc brings a potential for an additional 50 to 60 vehicle movements per day. This in a road that houses a sheltered housing development which already has insufficient off road parking, and is also home to an Adult residential and care home. These residents have high demand for emergency services and the road is already frequently blocked which inhibits access. Service vehicles such as home delivery, and refuse are frequently required to mount pavements and recreational space to enable passage. Household removal companies are often unable to access Kenilworth gardens because of vehicles congestion. We are extremely concerned that access for construction traffic is via Kenilworth Gardens. The previously mentioned vehicular congestion will inhibit safe passage of these heavy goods vehicles and increased damage to amenity land, pavements and gardens is of course to be expected. Safety concerns would be elevated for both children playing in Kenilworth Gardens, elderly and infirm residents of the sheltered housing development and the Adult Care Home, all of which have reduced mobility. The road is largely marked with double yellow lines, which are often ignored. The road is further congested during the cricket season and when The Rose Bowl is used for public events such as concerts and fireworks displays. Access to the proposed development should not be through Kenilworth Gardens as alternatives are available through Messrs Pitters Yard, or The Rose Bowl. We do not consider this development to be appropriate from such a heavily congested residential road.
Lyn Caplen	3 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	I strongly object to The Orchard site access being through Kenilworth Gardens and Westgate Mews. I cannot understand why this is even being proposed when there are, quite clearly, other safer and more sensible ways to access the site from Botley Road (via Pitter businesses). Kenilworth Gardens, leading to Westgate Mews, is an extremely narrow, winding road, which is already unable to cope with the volume of traffic. On a daily basis we residents have to contend with verge and pavement parking (especially outside Fielders Court and Sportsman's Place), with delivery vehicles and dustcarts regularly being unable to gain access. Additional cars and the inevitable heavy construction traffic would create

		an even more chaotic and potentially dangerous environment for our residential area.
Andrew Munden	8 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	I live at number 8 Kenilworth Gardens and object to this planning application for 2 reasons. Firstly the placement of units 7 and 8 is at the back of my home and puts 2 "large 2 story dwellings" in place with their rear's close to my back garden. These dwellings will be higher than the existing trees (which I note will be "partially retained and thinned due to dominance" whatever that means) and so light into the rear of my property will be affected but also their upper windows will look into our rear garden and rear windows. The placement at the edge of the development to squeeze in the number of homes close to the rear of my garden and the thinning of the trees that might provide our home with some privacy, is my main concern. My second concern is the transport and disruption issues during the building- which will be significant- and parking issues after they are occupied. Kenilworth Gardens is not appropriate for building materials etc to be transported up- its already difficult to navigate with parked cars as visitors to the old person's home use the on street parking as do residents. The provision of parking in the development is not enough with only 2 visitor spaces. With that many homes squeezed into an odd shaped area with no "on street" parking of its own- parking issues will certainly occur down into Kenilworth Gardens and create disruption and bad feeling between residents wanting to park near their homes.
Helen Shaw	19A KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	Kenilworth Gardens is already a very busy street and vehicles already find it difficult to get into the street due to the number of cars parked on the road near the old people's housing it would not be safe to have additional traffic in this area.
Pitter Commercials Ltd	PITTER BROS BOTLEY ROAD WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3HA	As neighbours to the proposed site and as a business that has operated on our site for many years, Pitter Commercials Ltd would like to express our concerns about this proposed residential development. As noted elsewhere, with our workshop only 100 yards away from the proposed site, the noise we emit could well affect these proposed dwellings. Also, although our core workshop opening hours are 6am to 9pm, vehicle movements can occur at any time, 24 hours a day 7 days a week, in particular from breakdown and recovery activities. This could create vehicle noise right up to the boundary of these proposed properties at any time. The yard is also well lit during the hours of darkness for health & safety and security reasons which could well affect these proposed dwellings. Although there are already houses around us these proposed new houses may well have greater exposure to noise and light due to their particular location in relation to our site.
Russell Burtenshaw	2 WESTGATE MEWS KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	See documents.
David Sage	1 WESTGATE MEWS KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	My main objection is that the access through the private drive of Westgate Mews is wholly unsuitable . The Transport Statement is at best misleading by trying to give the impression that this will accommodate 2 way traffic with a minimum width of 4.7m . This is incorrect as the minimum width is 3.7m on entrance to Westgate Mews from Kenilworth Gardens. This entrance is flanked by brick walls and for the first length by private parking ground belonging to no 1 and no 4 Westgate mews. Specific comment on the report:

		2.21 "road is 4.7m wide but reducing to 4.3m on approach to site" This is incorrect and misleading as it is 3.7m wide on entry from Kenilworth Gardens to the private drive of Westgate Mews. 3.2.1 "The access road would maintain the 4.3m width upon entry to the site .." This is misleading as it omits to mention that the access through the private drive of Westgate Mews from Kenilworth Gardens is 3.7m wide. 3.4.1 Emergency access "iii A minimum carriageway in excess of 3.7m is maintained through the site" This is the only reference to the actual entrance width of 3.7m which proves that the previous references to minimum 4.7m are misleading. Also it says " in excess of 3.7m which it is not. 4.1.4 "negligible impact on local road network" . But does not reference that this will at least triple the traffic through the narrow entrance via the private drive of Westgate Mews from Kenilworth Gardens. This is not suitable especially as houses at no1 and no 4 have to reverse blind out of their private drives into this entrance. DRAWINGS SITE OVERVIEW . This highlights 4.7m as the width but does not highlight 3.7m on the entrance from Kenilworth Gardens into Westgate Mews. Again very misleading. TWO WAY PASSING . Illustrates two way passing between houses no2and no3 Westgate Mews. Again misleading as this is not really possible unless they are very small vehicles at this point and certainly 2 way passing is impossible at the entrance into Westgate Mews from Kenilworth Gardens- again not mentioned. In summary on the transport issues to access this development through the private drive of Westgate Mews should be a non starter. More suitable access could be provided through the industrial estate onto Botley road or link into the Utilita Bowl development? I would recommend that you view the proposed access via Westgate Mews to give you a clear picture . I also note that the environmental health report states than " I object to this development on noise grounds" Worth noting that the proposed new properties would also be impacted by light pollution from the industrial estate as floodlights are on all night.
Penny Searles	1 WESTGATE MEWS KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	See documents.
Stephen Lisicki	4 WESTGATE MEWS KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	Formal Objection to Planning Application F/26/100809 Attention of Case Officer Gary Osmond Application Number F/26/100809 Applicant Macra Ltd (on behalf of the owners of 5 Westgate Mews). I oppose the proposed planning application for the development of The Orchard at house number 5 Westgate Mews submitted by Macra Ltd (on behalf of the owners of 5 Westgate Mews) as I believe that it contravenes the following planning regulation requirements: 1) Vehicle & Pedestrian Access Pedestrian access only exists within Kenilworth Gardens, NO pedestrian access exists within Westgate Mews which was only built to accommodate the five existing properties. Access and egress to Westgate Mews is only available through Kenilworth Gardens which itself is an extremely narrow residential cul de sac, accessed only by one singular approach from Telegraph Road. No consideration in this

		application has been given to the families and young children currently living in Kenilworth Gardens together with the needs of the elderly residents of Fielders Court and their carers, together with the residents of Sportsmans Place. 2) Environmental Issues Several trees which I believe included one fully mature oak tree and one walnut tree have already been felled in the orchard in advance of this planning application without notification to the immediate neighbours within Westgate Mews. Were these trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders and if so was permission granted by Eastleigh Borough Council for the felling of any protected trees in advance of this application? 3) Excessive Noise, Dust & Air Pollution The planning committee should be aware that Westgate Mews is not an adopted road, it is in fact a private road used to service the existing five dwellings, the road is only 3.70 metres wide at its point of entry and varies in width between 4.60 and 4.67 metres during its 32.40 metre length, the width of the entry to 5 Westgate Mews then decreases to 4.45 metres wide. Consideration should be given to the excessive noise, dust and air pollution levels created by heavy daily construction traffic, vehicles and machinery generated on a daily basis during the construction period together with the impact that it will have on the health and wellbeing of the pensioners and residents of house numbers 1 to 4 Westgate Mews and other adjacent neighbours living within Kenilworth Gardens. 4) Other Considerations Whilst the entrance road to Westgate Mews is solely owned by the residents of 5 Westgate Mews, the maintenance and upkeep of the road is the legal responsibility of all five existing properties, therefore who would be responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of the road and its entrance during the construction period (when it would be accessed by heavy construction traffic, plant and delivery lorries on a daily basis) and its subsequent use by new residents of The Orchard, should planning permission be granted? The planning committee should also be aware that during the cricket season, matches and other social events (music concerts, firework displays & the like) hosted at the Utilita Bowl often result in additional traffic congestion within Kenilworth Gardens (caused by illegally parked cars) despite the presence of double yellow lines and parking cones which are constantly ignored and never monitored or enforced by parking attendants and the like. Finally, to support my objection please find attached a list of Precedents where planning application has been denied due to inadequate road entrance widths via 3.70 metre drives and the like. Precedents listed in attached spreadsheet
Julie Burtenshaw	2 WESTGATE MEWS KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	I wish to formally object to the proposed development, my main concern being the mere 3.7m entrance to Westgate Mews. This entrance is flanked by brick walls and is not at all suitable to accommodate the planned increase in through traffic. There are no pavements along the private drive, making it unsafe for pedestrians and disabled users. Even as the drive widens to 4.3m, it would be impossible for two cars to safely pass and difficult for Fire and Rescue appliances to navigate. At the entrance to Kenilworth Gardens, there is already an issue with a lack of parking for carers and visitors to Fielders Court (Retirement Housing), and this causes congestion and

		pavement parking. There have been several occasions when our refuse has not been collected as the dustcart has not been able to access the road. Also, during events at the Utilita Bowl, the road suffers from extreme overspill parking, often making it impassible for large vehicles and unsafe for pedestrians. The proposed level of development is excessive and relies on the removal of several existing trees. There would be issues with overlooking, overbearing impact and loss of privacy for adjoining properties. The build would create excessive noise, dust and air pollution for existing residents. The proposed new properties would be exposed to noise and light pollution from the adjacent commercial business.
Steve Goring	23 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	I wholly object to this application on the grounds that access and egress through Kenilworth Gardens will place further stress on an already congested , narrow winding road. Residents have to battle daily against the inconsiderate parking of care home workers and other users due to the complete lack of space. Having the Cricket ground so close exacerbates the issues on match days. Parking on the kerb is normal and I have personally witnessed near misses between time crunched delivery vehicles and residents of Leighside carehome for younger adults with disabilities and autism when they are forced into the road being unable to pass vehicles on the kerb. I have made my observations known to the manager of the carehome. I note with interest that the photographs used in the Transport statement (Figs 2.3 2.5) are several years old and most certainly do not represent the current state of the transport situation and are quite misleading. I respectfully suggest that application F/26/100809 be rejected for the reasons stated, the road system just can not cope and I fear for the safety of people in the area.
Judith Tyser	11 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	I strongly object to this planning application. Once again Kenilworth Gardens is being subjected to an unnecessary development. I wholeheartedly support the comments made by the other objectors to this planning application, and I am astounded this application has progressed thus far. The access to Kenilworth Gardens is dangerous enough as it is without further development of Westgate Mews. To have construction traffic to and from the building site will make living in this road very unpleasant and hazardous. When Michael Pitter was allowed to develop the orchard, the residents of Kenilworth Gardens who fought for a restricted access to Westgate Mews believed we had protected the area from the risk of further development. Now we find the family, and developers wish to fill in what remains of Miss Moody's orchard, now a garden, bringing chaos and over development to Kenilworth Gardens and Westgate Mews.
Brad Davis-White	21 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	To whom it may concern, I am writing as a resident of Kenilworth Gardens to formally object to the above planning application for the construction of 8 detached dwellings on the green space behind numbers 7–13 Kenilworth Gardens. Having reviewed the details available, I share the serious concerns already raised by neighbours regarding the impact this development would have on our road and the surrounding area. Firstly, there is already insufficient parking within Kenilworth

		Gardens and Westgate Mews. The proposed development indicates 18 parking spaces for eight dwellings, which does not appear adequate when considering multi-car households, visitors, and service vehicles. Existing residents already experience difficulty parking, and any overspill would inevitably add further strain to the limited space available within this small cul-de-sac. Secondly, traffic levels on the road are already substantial and, at times, overcrowded. Access and egress can be challenging, particularly during peak hours. In the summer months, the situation becomes significantly worse. The cul-de-sac frequently becomes gridlocked due to the volume of people attempting to park in this very confined space, particularly during local concerts and cricket events. Vehicles often struggle to pass one another or turn safely, and emergency access could be compromised. Introducing potentially dozens of additional vehicle movements per day would exacerbate an already problematic situation and raise clear highway safety concerns. I am also concerned about the impact of the construction phase. The narrow nature of the road means that the regular movement of heavy goods vehicles and contractors' vans would create disruption, congestion, noise, and safety hazards. Furthermore, it would create a difficult and potentially unpleasant environment for both existing residents and any future occupants of the proposed properties during what is likely to be a prolonged build period. Of particular importance is the presence of a home on the street for adults with learning difficulties, whose residents regularly come and go independently. The increase in traffic—especially large construction vehicles manoeuvring within a tight cul-de-sac—poses a substantial and unacceptable risk to their safety. The wellbeing of these vulnerable residents must be given significant weight in any decision. For all of the above reasons, I strongly believe that this development would have a detrimental impact on highway safety, residential amenity, and the overall character and functionality of this small cul-de-sac. I respectfully request that the Council carefully consider these objections and refuse the application. Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments. Mr B M T Davis-White
Deborah Davis	21 KENILWORTH GARDENS WEST END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 3RE	Dear Sir/Madam, We write to formally object to the proposed development of eight detached dwellings on the green space behind 7–13 Kenilworth Gardens. Parking within Kenilworth Gardens and Westgate Mews is already insufficient, which restricts access and manoeuvrability along these narrow roads. Westgate Mews is also too tight to comfortably accommodate additional traffic, particularly larger vehicles. There is an existing strain from delivery vans and lorries entering and exiting the area, including refuse lorries and articulated vehicles which regularly block access. On a previous occasion, fire engines were unable to gain entry due to the restricted width at the bottom of the road. Access via Kenilworth Gardens is simply not suitable for large vehicles. We have already experienced damage to vehicles and property as a result of large vehicles attempting to navigate these unsuitable roads. The road surface along Telegraph is already deteriorating, with numerous potholes. Increased use by heavy vans, trucks and construction vehicles would only exacerbate this problem. We also object to the significant disruption that building works would bring to what is otherwise a quiet and peaceful residential area. There is a home on the street for autistic adults, whose carers

		and support staff already face parking constraints, which in turn causes inconvenience for other residents. Additionally, there is an assisted living home at the bottom of the gardens housing elderly residents who do not need further stress or disturbance. Increased traffic and construction activity would adversely affect these vulnerable members of our community. For these reasons, we respectfully request that this application is refused. Yours faithfully, Mr & Mrs A Davis
--	--	---