

Appeal 6015024

Interested party comments

Appeal type	Planning
Appeal procedure	Written
Appeal site	The Orchard, 5 Westgate Mews, Kenilworth Gardens, Southampton, SO30 3RE
Agent contact details	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Local planning authority	Eastleigh
Application number	F/26/100809

Interested party 1

Comments	As a resident of Kenilworth Gardens that will be the directly affected by this development, I wish to object. We already have issues with highway access, most days blocked by visitors to Fielders Court and visitors to events at the Utilita Bowl. On many occasions our refuse collections are missed due to limited highway access in to KenilworthGardens. These are not home for young local families, this is an unnecessary development that brings nothing to the local community but more vehicles and more issues for the residents of Kenilworth Gardens.
----------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 2

Comments	I object to this proposal as it conflicts with local and national planning policies that seek to protect and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure. The wildlife strip bordering the site, owned by the residents of Telegraph Heights, functions as an established ecological buffer and green corridor of demonstrable value. The land proposed for development is not previously developed land, but a large residential garden that currently operates as semi-natural habitat, providing foraging, shelter, and movement space for wildlife, directly supporting the adjacent strip and the wider area. Together, the garden and wildlife strip form a connected and functioning ecological network for local biodiversity, including deer, badgers, foxes, hedgehogs, bats, buzzards, owls, nesting birds, squirrels, and other species reliant on habitat continuity and low levels of disturbance. The impact on the wildlife strip and the loss of this garden would therefore represent a significant reduction in available habitat and ecological connectivity, rather than a neutral land-use
----------	--

change. The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, proximity, and associated construction and occupation, presents a clear risk of harm through increased disturbance, noise, artificial lighting, vehicular movements, and the permanent removal of vegetation and natural screening. These impacts would materially diminish the effectiveness of both the wildlife strip and the surrounding habitat as a functioning ecological corridor. I am particularly concerned that the cumulative and long-term impacts of the proposal would result in a permanent degradation of ecological value and biodiversity balance within the area. Approval of this scheme would further risk establishing an undesirable precedent for the incremental loss of garden land that currently contributes to local biodiversity.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 3

Comments

The proposed development requires access through Kenilworth Gardens from Telegraph Road. There is insufficient turning space for construction traffic to enter Kenilworth Gardens from Telegraph Road because the junction is heavily congested with parked cars which frequently reduce the width of Kenilworth Gardens so that two family cars cannot pass.

Kenilworth Gardens is a winding road for the first 100 metres and is so frequently congested that residents often suffer having no refuse collected as refuse vehicles cannot gain access. In June and July Eastleigh Borough Council were unable to gain access to collect refuse for a period of four weeks. It is submitted that Kenilworth Gardens does not provide a suitable access point for the proposed development.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 4

Comments

I object to the appeal and lodge further information in relation to the appellants submission

Supporting documents

[Response to Appeal Access F26-100809.docx \(/published-document/7351596c-f566-46b8-9470-4783c943126e\)](#)

Interested party 5

Comments

I objected to the planning application and I object to the Appeal. Please see attached document

Supporting documents

[Appeal ref 6015024 David Sage.docx \(/published-document/9a999421-35c2-4562-b159-e8c4eff4621a\)](#)

Interested party 6

Comments	I would object to the this proposal as it's currently a quiet cul de sac but can suffer with traffic with parking or access. The entrance to the road is pretty narrow and tight as it is so allowing more vehicles and lorries for building work would have a significant impact. The noise for the proposed work would also be significant and there are young families living on this road.
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 7

Comments	Access is very limited with refuge lorries unable to collect waste on a number of occasions. Another access route needs to be allocated to this site as the proposed access route is not adequate.
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 8

Comments	8thSeptember 2026 Dear Sir/Madam, RE: APPEAL REFERENCE 6015024 — LAND AT THE ORCHARD, 5 WESTGATE MEWS, KENILWORTH GARDENS, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 3RE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY REFERENCE: F/26/100809 I am writing to provide a further representation objecting to this appeal, further to my original objection to the underlying application (F/26/100809) dated [date of original comment]. I maintain all the points made in that original objection, and ask that it be treated as forming part of this appeal representation. This letter focuses specifically on new points arising from the Appellant's Statement of Case and supporting Transport Note, which I do not believe were before the Council at the time of its decision. 1. The Appellant's characterisation of the Highway Authority's position is misleading The Appellant's Statement of Case (paragraph 7.32) and supporting Bright Plan Technical Note (2026-05-08-6785-TN01) both state that Hampshire County Council, as Local Highway Authority, "raised no objection in principle" to the development and that this "confirm[s] that the access arrangements are acceptable in highway safety terms." I have reviewed HCC's actual consultation response, dated 16 February 2026 (from Matt Grantham, Principal Transport Planner,
----------	--

and reproduced as Appendix A to the Appellant's own Transport Note). That letter does not support the conclusion the Appellant draws from it:

- HCC's letter is explicit that it is a holding response: "additional information is required prior to a formal response being issued." No formal, final view was ever given by the Highway Authority on this application.
- HCC's own words on the access itself: the arrangement "looks tight," and — critically — HCC states that "with the increased dwelling numbers... the potential for [conflicting movements requiring a vehicle to reverse onto the highway] would be expected to rise accordingly which would not be welcomed." This is the Highway Authority itself identifying the precise safety concern that residents have raised, not dismissing it.
- On the internal site layout, HCC's reviewer stated that refuse and emergency vehicle tracking "does look tight," and that "any conflict such as an oncoming vehicle or a vehicle parked outside of a designated parking bay is likely to cause obstruction... resulting in missed bin collections, or potentially not being able to turn at the designated turning head." This independently corroborates, from the Highway Authority's own professional assessment, the exact problems long-standing residents have described from direct experience — missed refuse collections and vehicles being unable to pass or turn at the bottom of Kenilworth Gardens and Westgate Mews.
- HCC recommended that Hampshire Fire and Rescue and the Council's own Direct Services (refuse) team be consulted "if they have not been already" — indicating these bodies had not, at that stage, confirmed the access was workable for their vehicles.
- HCC's letter records only 1 visitor parking space in the scheme it reviewed, describing this as "potentially low for 8 dwellings." The Appellant's Statement of Case (paragraph 4.13) now refers to 2 visitor spaces; I would ask the Inspector to clarify with the Appellant whether the scheme has changed since HCC's review, and if so, whether HCC has had the opportunity to reassess it.

I would respectfully ask the Inspector to treat the "no objection in principle" wording in HCC's letter for what it is — a standard formula in a holding response requesting further information — rather than as the clean endorsement the Appellant's Statement of Case presents it as.

2. The Transport Note's access width figures should be read alongside residents' own evidence

The Appellant's Transport Note confirms that the access is 3.7 metres wide at the brick piers where Westgate Mews meets Kenilworth Gardens, continuing at this width for 5 metres before widening to 4.7 metres. Several neighbouring residents raised detailed, evidenced objections to the original application specifically disputing how this constraint was represented in the original Transport Statement, including paragraph-by-paragraph analysis of that document. I would ask the Inspector to have regard to those original objections when assessing the Appellant's swept-path and encounter-probability modelling, which — however carefully modelled in the abstract — does not reflect residents' lived, repeated experience of vehicles being unable to pass, refuse collections being

missed, and on at least one occasion a fire engine being unable to gain entry at this point.

3. Vulnerable residents on the access route

Kenilworth Gardens and Westgate Mews serve, in addition to ordinary residential dwellings, Fielders Court (retirement/sheltered housing) and Leighside (a residential care home for adults with autism and learning disabilities), whose residents and carers already rely on this constrained road network. The Appellant's Statement of Case addresses traffic generation and encounter probability in general, statistical terms, but does not engage at all with the specific vulnerability of these residents, or with the cumulative effect of construction traffic and increased permanent vehicle movements on their safety. I ask the Inspector to give this material weight independent of the general highway safety assessment.

4. Matters raised by residents not addressed in the Appellant's Statement of Case

Two further points from residents' original objections do not appear to have been addressed anywhere in the Appellant's Statement of Case or its supporting documents:

- Tree felling prior to the application: it was reported that a mature oak and a walnut tree were felled from the site between pre-application discussions and submission of the full application, without notification to neighbouring properties. I would ask the Inspector to confirm with the Council whether these trees were the subject of any Tree Preservation Order, and if so, whether consent was obtained prior to felling.
- Light pollution: Pitter Commercial's own comment on the application, and residents' objections, both raise the impact of the adjoining commercial yard's overnight security lighting on the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed dwellings. The Appellant's Statement of Case addresses noise from the Pitter Commercial site in detail (including a dedicated Acoustic Assessment) but does not address light pollution at all.

5. Conclusion

None of the above is intended to reopen matters the Council did assess and refuse on their own reasons; rather, it is intended to draw the Inspector's attention to the gap between how the Appellant's Statement of Case characterises the Highway Authority's position and what that authority actually said, and to matters raised by long-standing residents that remain unaddressed in the appeal documents. I would ask that this representation, together with my original objection, be given full weight in the Inspector's determination of this appeal.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 9

Comments

Formal Objection to Planning Appeal Reference 6015024
Appellant's name E Bizzey c/o Macra Ltd (on behalf of the owners of 5 Westgate Mews).

I oppose the proposed appeal for the development of The Orchard at house number 5 Westgate Mews submitted by E Bizzey c/o Macra Ltd (on behalf of the owners of 5 Westgate Mews) and the objections stated in my original submission to the planning application (reference F/26/100809) remain.

I believe that the Ken Clarke Planning Consultants Grounds For Appeal document is

both misleading and inaccurate, for example:

1) Vehicle & Pedestrian Access (items 7.30 to 7.56 of the said document).

Item 7.33 (page 37) states that "the brick piers are at the end of Westgate Mews"

this is incorrect, the brick piers (and adjoining boundary walls) are at the front

entrance to Westgate Mews.

To then state that the road continues for five metres before widening to a width of

4.70 metre is also misleading, the road varies in width between 4.60 and 4.67

metres wide before reducing in width to 4.45 metres wide at is entrance to house

number 5 Westgate Mews.

The difference between the stated 4.70 metre road width and those dimensions

stated above are crucial as it means that passing traffic will need to trespass onto

the privately owned driveways of house numbers 1 to 4 Westgate Mews.

2) Environmental Health (items 7.59 and 7.62)

These items refer to the proposed extension to the existing boundary wall

between Pitters Commercial Yard and the proposed development of the Orchard

within Westgate Mews.

To describe the existing wall as an "acoustic wall" is questionable as it is presently

a boundary wall situated behind a hedge of fully mature conifer trees which are

both dense and considerably higher than the so called acoustic wall.

I would suggest that any acoustic benefits are achieved by a combination of the

boundary wall and the substantially mature conifers and I would draw the

committee's attention to the comments and summary made by the Consultee

Response headed Environmental Health – Westgate Mews dated 05/02/2026 in

which Mr A Pires(Pollution Control Manager) objects to the "development in noise

grounds”.

In order to accommodate the proposed development, I believe that the referred to conifers will need to be felled and therefore any acoustic benefit that they provide will no longer exist.

3) Excessive Noise, Dust & Air Pollution

I reiterate the comments made in my initial objection to the planning application regarding the excessive, noise, dust and air pollution where I state the following:
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.

Supporting documents

[IMG_1339.jpeg \(/published-document/544e9d31-dba9-4028-9463-6209104d341a\)](#)
[IMG_1338.jpeg \(/published-document/a2e1a01c-9987-45d2-a5ba-7a132f8c9888\)](#)
[IMG_1340.jpeg \(/published-document/b2ae2775-d9ec-48a6-8c7e-f0f5fff8f773\)](#)
[IMG_1337.jpeg \(/published-document/bf2a6191-eb47-4ede-ba07-fd6d71741350\)](#)

Interested party 10

Comments

The Planning Inspectorate

Site Address: The Orchard, 5 Westgate Mews, West End, Southampton, SO30 3RE

Appellant: Mr. E. Bizzey (c/o Macra Ltd)

RE: Representation in respect of Appeal against the Refusal of Planning Permission for Application F/26/100809

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a resident of 2 Westgate Mews to submit my representation regarding the above-mentioned planning appeal lodged by the Appellant, Mr. E. Bizzey.

I wish to confirm that my original objections to this application remain fully active and relevant. Having reviewed the appeal documentation, my severe concerns regarding the suitability and safety of the development remain unaddressed. I strongly request that the

Planning Inspector dismisses this appeal based on the following key points:

1. Inadequate Access Width and Highway Safety Concerns

Access to the proposed development via Westgate Mews is fundamentally hazardous and fails to provide or maintain safe access and egress for future occupiers and existing users:

Severe Pinch Points: The entrance to Westgate Mews measures a mere 3.7 metres in width and is flanked by brick walls. While the lane widens slightly over a very short distance, it quickly narrows back down to 4.3 metres. This constrained geometry makes it impossible for two vehicles to pass one another safely without encroaching onto private amenity spaces or risking damage to private property.

Increased Traffic & Speed Risks: Due to the physical gradient and decline of the road, vehicles exiting Number 5 Westgate Mews frequently gather speed. Adding a further eight dwellings will substantially increase vehicle movements on an already hazardous incline, compounding collision risks at an unviable access point.

2. Deficit in Basic Pedestrian and Road Infrastructure

The access route lacks fundamental safety infrastructure to accommodate the volume of traffic generated by eight additional dwellings:

There is no designated pedestrian footpath, forcing pedestrians, children, and vehicle traffic to share a single narrow carriageway.

There is no street lighting along this route, creating severely hazardous conditions during nighttime hours for both drivers and pedestrians.

3. Severe Local Parking Deficit

The immediate area suffers from a critical, existing shortage of parking spaces. The application makes no realistic provision for visitor or overflow parking:

Surrounding local roads are regularly congested with vehicles overspilling onto pavements, hindering emergency vehicle access and pedestrian movement.

This pre-existing gridlock escalates into extreme congestion during major events at the nearby Utilita Bowl. Introducing eight additional households without adequate on-site parking capacity will severely compound this local crisis.

4. Unacceptable Amenity Impacts (Acoustics & Lighting)

The proposal fails to deliver an acceptable standard of residential amenity for future occupants, contrary to local and national planning policies:

Lighting Intrusiveness: While a boundary wall has been proposed to mitigate noise from the adjacent commercial site, no consideration whatsoever has been given to light pollution. The plans fail to address security lighting or the intrusive glare from existing floodlights operating during late-night events at the Utilita Bowl.

Situating eight homes in such immediate proximity to two independent, high-intensity floodlighting sources deprives future occupiers of an adequate quality of life and living standard.

5. Awkward Layout and Impact on Neighbouring Amenity (Plot 1 / Unit 1)
In addition to the issues outlined above, the layout of the proposed development—specifically in relation to Plot 1—is unacceptable:

Layout & Separation Distances: Plot 1 is positioned very awkwardly in relation to the retained property. Unit 1 appears tightly constrained between neighbouring dwellings, with severely limited separation distances.

Loss of Vegetation & Privacy: The proposed removal of existing vegetation will exacerbate significant issues regarding overlooking, overbearing impact, and a severe loss of privacy for adjoining properties.

Daylight & Outlook: The cramped positioning of this unit will result in distinct adverse impacts on nearby residents in terms of loss of outlook and restriction of daylight.

For the reasons outlined above, the proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the site that jeopardises highway safety, lacks vital infrastructure, and provides a substandard living environment while harming existing residential amenities.

I respectfully urge the Planning Inspector to uphold the local planning authority's decision and dismiss this appeal.

Yours sincerely,

Julie Burtenshaw

Resident, 2 Westgate Mews.

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 11

Comments	I am at a total loss for words as to how this application has got this far. It was previously turned down due to the overwhelming number of objections. Kenilworth Gardens is a narrow winding cul-de-sac with a series of sharp bends, a care home (Fielders Court) at the head of the road adjoining Telegraph Road has 13 parking spaces for over 50 residents (How was this allowed ?), the overspill park on the narrow road along with their carer's and support staff causing at times an impenetrable barrier for larger vehicles, refuse collection, emergency fire response.
----------	--

At the other end of Kenilworth is Leighside carehome for younger adults with learning and autism disabilities, again insufficient parking at the property so carers continuously park across residents driveways, these people work shifts so this is 24/7 360.

Access and egress to the proposed sight will be virtually impossible given the number of vehicles that park on the pavements, if they don't park on the pavements then it will be completely impossible.

As part of this response I walked to the boundary of the proposed development to see how many other trees would have to be removed and was able to watch a group of deer grazing, this brings up a very salient point that with the development of the cricket ground and other housing developments in this overcrowded area wildlife is on the decrease. Regularly we would see badgers but not anymore.

This is development for developments sake in a wholly inappropriate area that will impose a negative effect on residents and wildlife alike - I absolutely oppose this application.

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 12

Comments

Kenilworth gardens roads are not suitable for move traffic let alone the lorry's needed to access Kenilworth Gardens to do the building work. We miss bin days because the bin lorry can't access our road because of the parked cars.
Can supply pictures if needed.

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 13

Comments

I object to the application as it still does not address the access issues and concerns from Kenilworth Gardens into Westgate Mews. especially for services such as:
Emergency vehicle access — Fire appliances need 3.7 m minimum, unobstructed, meaning parked cars or boundary walls make it non-compliant.
Refuse and service vehicles — Large vehicles require wider passing space or turning areas.
Pedestrian safety —Due to No street lights or pavements this will lead to conflict between vehicles and pedestrians,
Access can be difficult for existing residents on most days due to the narrow carriageway.and parked cars in the road.

Supporting documents	IMG_1616.jpeg (/published-document/e197de6d-308a-4f47-813b-5586daaa3f0c) IMG_1617.jpeg (/published-document/eea2e35e-106f-4409-8a5e-672d889bc757)
----------------------	--

Interested party 14

Comments

The access to Kenilworth Gardens measures 483cms only and has double yellow lines extending into the road entrance. Beyond the double yellow lines cars are parked which greatly restrict the road width further to the point where it is difficult for two cars to pass without folding their mirrors. Most of Kenilworth Gardens is already marked with double yellow lines.

Refuse collection vehicles frequently omit collections from Kenilworth Gardens as they are unable to gain access. Emergency vehicles would have to mount pavements and private gardens to gain access.

If the proposed development was to proceed, the many large construction vehicles that would need to access the site could not do so without experiencing the same issues. There is no suitable access for the development through Kenilworth Gardens and I therefore submit that the application is again refused.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 15

Comments

I do not support this Appeal.

Please see the following attachments -

Pdf Letter - Dated 22 September 2026
Photographs x 4

Supporting documents

[Appeal Ref 6015024 - 22 September 2026 - D McNamara.pdf \(/published-document/c0fa80f5-ba42-4b2d-896c-7c71a59ba098\)](#)
[IMG_20260921_095555 - Copy.jpg \(/published-document/5197cddb-a37f-48ae-8719-b3867bdd9d70\)](#)
[IMG_20260921_095538.jpg \(/published-document/e5f44999-93d7-4843-88e0-b4e33506ba12\)](#)
[IMG_20260904_105851.jpg \(/published-document/8e0faa7b-fe70-4cd0-bae7-ca6e95e596a2\)](#)
[IMG_20260904_110620.jpg \(/published-document/29bb1b6c-6514-4188-a4d1-ffc670ee1fd4\)](#)

Interested party 16

Comments

To: The Planning Inspectorate
Re: Appeal Reference: 6015024
Application Reference: F/26/100809
Site: The Orchard, 5 Westgate Mews, Kenilworth Gardens,
Southampton, SO30 3RE

Proposed Development: Construction of 8 detached dwellings with associated amenity space, parking and landscaping
Objection to the Appeal: Upholding the Refusal of Planning

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write to object to the appeal against the refusal of planning application F/26/100809 at The Orchard, 5 Westgate Mews. The reasons for the council's refusal are clear and supported by substantial evidence. The appeal fails to address fundamental issues that undermine the suitability and acceptability of this development, as detailed below.

1. Conflict with Local Plan Policy and Design Guidance

The proposed development is contrary to the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan and its Supplementary Planning Documents. The plans do not provide high-quality amenity space, do not respect local character, and do not achieve the required standard of environment for future residents. The scheme is cramped, sets dwellings too close together, and fails to provide adequate space for soft landscaping or meaningful tree replacement. It does not reflect the character or density of the established neighbourhood and is inconsistent with the local plan requirements for new development, which seek high design quality, good amenity, and a layout in keeping with its context.

2. Highway Safety, Access, and Parking Deficiencies

The proposed access through Westgate Mews and Kenilworth Gardens is inadequate. Westgate Mews is a narrow, private cul-de-sac with no footway, designed for very limited traffic. The increased vehicle movements and the introduction of additional dwellings would create safety hazards for pedestrians and residents and would place unacceptable pressure on already congested parking and access. Service and emergency vehicles already struggle to access this area due to on-street parking and narrow road widths; more development would only make these issues worse, and the technical submissions on swept paths and tracking do not overcome these real-world constraints. Furthermore, the two proposed visitor parking spaces are inadequate for the size and type of dwellings proposed, creating further overspill risk.

3. Harm to Local Character and Residential Amenity

This scheme would erode the established character of a quiet residential cul-de-sac by introducing significant new traffic, noise, and disruption. It would reduce the quality of life for existing and future residents, with oppressive hard boundaries, excessive hardstanding, and a lack of meaningful landscaped space. The quality and usability of amenity spaces for future occupiers would be poor, and the boundary treatments and retained hedges would create enclosed, overshadowed, and unwelcoming gardens, not high-quality homes.

4. Noise and Environmental Disturbance

The application site is immediately adjacent to a long-established commercial haulage yard and the Utilita Bowl stadium, both of which generate significant noise at all hours. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that internal or external noise levels would be acceptable for new residential properties or that effective mitigation is achievable. The proposals risk placing residents in unacceptable living conditions and may also threaten legitimate existing businesses by generating complaints.

5. Failure to Achieve Satisfactory Tree Replacement or Biodiversity Net Gain

Several established and significant trees were removed from the site before the application, but there is insufficient space within the new layout to accommodate suitable replacement planting. The scheme does not provide enough new or replacement trees and instead relies on off-site compensation. There is also no clear or robust evidence that the minimum national requirement for biodiversity net gain will be achieved.

6. Unresolved Recreational and Nutrient Impacts on Protected Sites

At the time of refusal, the application had not secured any binding or enforceable mitigation for the impact of increased nutrients or recreational pressure on the protected Solent and New Forest sites. Promises to implement legal agreements after refusal do not correct the deficiency at decision point. These are matters of legal compliance and cannot be put aside for later resolution.

7. Planning Balance

Eastleigh's current housing supply shortfall does not override the serious harms this development would cause. The adverse impacts relating to layout, amenity, highways safety, trees, ecological impact, and policy non-compliance carry far more weight than the limited benefit of a small number of units.

Conclusion

For all these reasons, the appeal scheme is fundamentally at odds with adopted planning policies and national requirements. The council's refusal was entirely justified, and the reasons for refusal remain unaddressed in substance. I urge the Inspector to dismiss the appeal.

Yours sincerely

Melanie and Paul Trim

Interested party 17

Comments	I would like to remind the secretary of state of my previous comments made within my objection to Eastleigh borough council during the planning application phase. There are some headline issues here that will have detrimental impact on our community & the environment if this was to go ahead. Firstly being access & egress the road is far too narrow (as demonstrated to Eastleigh borough council in the photographic evidence already provided) to accommodate large vehicles on a daily basis let alone trucks. Secondly emergency vehicles being a priority that cannot get through as the width of the road is far too tight. On numerous occasions our bins have not been collected due to bin lorries not able to get access to the close. Kenilworth Gardens was not designed to be a through road as it stands. The Vulnerable people of the community who live in a residential care home. The impact on our wildlife whose homes are destroyed if this were to go ahead. Notably the trees that are effected which is the home of many birds. Regards Mr & Mrs Davis
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 18

Comments	I live in Kenilworth gardens. I objected ot the original planning application and i repeat the same objections here. As set out in the orginal decision, the road and access way is in no way big enough to deal with the contruction vehicles required or the additional traffic of the additional dwellings proposed, let alone the additional residents and their visitors if built. The road is already very hard to navigate with parking near the entrance difficult and causing problems for vehicles to get up the road. Parking is an issue and this development does not allow enough spaces for visitors, so they will clog up the close with their parking. Also there are too many properties squeezed into the proposed site and 2 of the houses will over look my garden at the rear, affecting light and privacy. I am also concerned by reference to thinning the tree line- which is the only privacy that we will have here. The original decision is correct, there are better places to put more houses in the borough, this proposal does not provide a good solution and will hugely adversely affect the present residents. The original rejection should stand.
Supporting documents	No documents