

Planning Application O/23/96432
Land to the West of Cobbett Way, Botley

Represente e	Address	Comments
Graham Hunter	13 SALWEY ROAD BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2SX	Planning Apication O/23/96432 Objection: The application is contrary to the Adopted Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan 2016 – 2036 The site is not allocated for development within the plan period. It is also contrary I believe to the following policies: S1: S2: S3: S5: S6: S8: S9: S10: DM2: DM4: DM6: DM10: DM11: DM12: DM32: DM33: DM36 The application is contrary to the Botley Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – 2036 The site is not allocated for development within the plan period. The Botley Neighbourhood Plan has been submitted for Examination, and therefore now has some weight afforded. The application site is within a defined settlement gap as per policy S6, therefore development should not be permitted. The site is crossed by three High pressure strategic fuel pipelines, both Oil/ aviation fuel and natural gas. The site location and the area of Boadoak is liable to frequent flooding, in particular at times of heavy rain full. Access onto Boadoak is deemed hazardous. The site is rich in wildlife and biodiversity, including bat's, possibly becheim, grass snakes, door mice, badgers and is a migratory site for Honey Buzzards during the warmer months. The local sewer system is already at capacity. Land within the settlement gap is prone to flooding.
Graham Hunter	13 SALWEY ROAD BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2SX	In addition, no social or shared ownership dwellings are proposed
Paul Turner	3 GRANGE COTTAGES BROAD OAK BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2EU	I am objecting to this development as is is is the settlement gap between Hedge End and Botley. Development in this area is contrary to Strategic Policy S6 in the Local Plan to "restrict development in the countryside principally in order to maintain its rural character and to limit urbanisation" I believe the loss of this green space will undermine the physical separation of settlements and will have an urbanising effect detrimental to the countryside. This development will add further pressure to local services such as doctors and add more traffic to the road between Hedge End and Botley which should be restricted following the opening of the Botley Bypass
Helen Saunders	6 COBBETT WAY BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2ET	Ref PLANNING Application no.0/23/96432 The proposed development of 34 mixed tenure homes. West of Cobbett Way is an unnecessary addition to the already planned scope of mixed tenure developments across the Botley (Woodhouse Lane, Winchester St, Borley Park), Whiteley, Horton Heath & Hedge End areas. Whilst noted this proposal is more sensitive to the objections raised on previous planning applications & a reduced number of homes. This is still a development that will significantly reduce the strategic gap, between Hedge End & Botley. The suggested 35% affordable homes which are let at 20% less market value rent is already accommodated in the above new developments and advertised 'affordable rent' are in fact not affordable. This quantity also provides little to no indent of affordable new housing shortfall. This proposal see's the site traffic and new residential traffic feed through a very quiet & safe residential no through road of Cobbett Way. In addition to this there is likely development to be proposed adjacent to

		Cobbett Way at the Woodhill School site access also via Brook Lane. On project completion, traffic creates a approx. minimum 34 cars addition to travel via Cobbett Way leading to Brook Lane/Broad Oak Junction. This Junction has poor visibility & risk of safety to drivers wishing to turn right on to Board Oak towards Botley High St. Board Oak/High Street is significantly congested with traffic at peak times in both directions. Due to rush hour traffic towards Whiteley and J7 M27. A continuous 40mph stream of traffic in both directions off peak times. There are continuous vehicle accidents between the Garage & Brook cottage on board oak. The proposal shows an Emergency Access & potential pedestrian access adjacent to Mallow Cottage & Brook Cottages. Pedestrian access without suitable footpaths or crossing measures is a significant risk to accident & life. If the development progresses, this should be considered the only method of site access during & post construction with suitable traffic calming measures on Board Oak. The access to the development for site traffic via Cobbett Way should only be considered as pedestrian access preserving the quietness of the established neighbourhood and protecting the number of wildlife seen in the adjacent wooded areas. The Landscape buffer is drawn as an insignificant depth & directly adjacent to the resident's fence lines of Cobbett Way. The proposal is premature for the current build & Infrastructure plans of the direct & wider area. Plans for the site to be utilised for new homes should only be considered upon the completion of the Botley Bypass which will aid the diversion of traffic from the immediate Botley High St/Board Oak/Maypole Roundabout to lower Northam Road areas. The tenure split for the development should be aimed purely to immediate community & aging residents currently housed in larger low affordable homes wishing to downsize but not willing to move into low to mid rise homes or care home. A good example of this is Chepping Gardens, Purbeck House & Mortimer Road Botley. A proposal of this kind would be more sympathetic to the residents of the immediate fence line. Will aid traffic measures and incentives those residents in Hedge End & Botley that are currently under occupying larger Affordable homes. Privately owned residents also seek private affordable smaller Bungalow home in the area & are in demand.
Marissa Biggs	16 COBBETT WAY BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2ET	Definitely would ruin the ares with extra traffic and for wildlife
Maurice Payne	8 TAPLIN DRIVE HEDGE END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 4NU	Surely there needs to be a green gap between Hedge End and Botley, how much more housing must we endure.
Jon Plumley	5 COBBETT WAY BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2ET	I object to the proposed development as the proposed access route is currently a quiet cul-de-sac which during weekends and evenings has residents' cars parked for its entire length along its West kerb and often several on the East side outside the garages at the South end. The supposed 'sections of the road which widen...' in paragraph 3.5 of the applicant's Transport Statement refers to the single turning head at the South end of the cul-de-sac which often has residents parked on both sides of it as there are no driveways here, and provides the only access to the garages and the only point to turn. When residents' cars are parked, there is only enough room for a single narrow lane beside them. I also object to the outline planning application on the grounds that (as acknowledged in the applicant's 'TRANSPORT STATEMENT' paragraph 3.6) there is no footpath on Brook Lane, and yet according to their statement (para 6.4) they intend to increase the traffic flow through this bottleneck with an additional 148no vehicle movements over a 12-hour period. Their Transport Statement (para 6.5) says that 148 vehicle trips represents a 1% increase in traffic along the A334 (which it may do) but

		using the same criteria it represents a 580% increase in vehicle trips along Cobbett Way which is the proposed access route, NOT the A334. There will also be a proportionate increase on Brook Lane that is far in excess of the stated 1%. Cobbett Way is a quiet residential cul-de-sac which houses a number of families with school-aged children who are currently able to play and ride their bicycles safely in the street. There are also several elderly and disabled residents that are able to use Cobbett Way and Brook Lane to walk to local amenities as they are currently quiet roads. All of the above transport shortcomings fail to comply with EBC Policy DM13, 'General development criteria – transport' which amongst other requirements states that 'all new development must have safe and convenient access to the highway network' – this proposal does not. The proposed development contravenes ALL of the 'Strategic policy S6, Protection of settlement gaps' requirements as :- a. It would undermine the physical and visual extent of the gap by actually reducing it by half. b. i. It would have an urbanising effect as it is currently a green field used to graze horses and occasionally harbours wildlife such as deer, buzzards and slowworms. ii. it would have a detrimental effect on the separate identities of adjoining settlements as it is already the narrowest point without halving it. (see Figure 3b of the Eastleigh Borough Settlement Gap Study) and Page 131 (extract) - Area I 6 – which states 'Combination of ribbon development, scattering of mature trees and paddocks to the rear provide a short lived but clear change of character from the built form edges to Hedge End and the wooded arrival to Botley. Whilst the horse paddocks are poor in landscape character, the remnant field boundaries and open nature contribute to the separation between the two settlements particularly when experienced from the A334 and bridleway No. 17'.
Paul Martin	14 WILLOW CLOSE HEDGE END SOUTHAMPTON SO30 0PW	The proposal will increase traffic congestion at peak times from the development into Brook Lane and into the development from Brook Lane. As well as increasing the risk of pedestrian / horse / deer / cyclists - vehicle collisions in the very narrow section of Brook Lane. This could further see traffic at peak times from the development queuing south down Brook Lane back south to the road bend increasing the risk of accidents. The Broad Oak/ Brook Lane junction has poor visibility for emerging traffic. This development could increase the likelihood of road accidents. Traffic from the development is more likely to access Holmesland lane to reach the new bypass creating a rat run and an unintended consequence of this development.
David Lange	17 MEADOW GROVE CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 3AT	Overdevelopment 1 Horton Heath already affecting local infrastructure Water abstraction from River Itchen [SSI] detrimental to natural environment. How will local schools, hospitals, GP surgery's cope? Where is the new infrastructure? Excessive traffic to and from site Increased pollution
Lucy Halcrow	22 BLOSSOM CLOSE BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2FR	With the recent large developments at Borley Park and at Bardnfield way and Heath House Lane Hedge End, I believe there is surely not a great need for more housing in the area. I estimate that with every dwelling comes an average of 2 cars. So therefore there could be around 60/70 Extra vehicles travelling the roads in the area. Definately not needed as there is already too many using these roads. I walk along Brook Lane with my young children to Botley School, as do many families who live in this area and I feel that the road is already unsafe for passage by foot as there are no pavements or safe places to cross. Unless this is rectified with the new housing then i fear i

		may not be able to continue our walks to and from Botley via this route as it will become more unsafe with extra traffic on these roads. Therefore I object to this development.
Monique Wassili	2 BROOK COTTAGES BROAD OAK BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2EU	The main reason I object to this development is because of access to the site. I feel that brook lane could not cope with the volume of traffic in its current state with it being a narrow road, under lit and no pedestrian walkways, I feel this would be a safety concern. It is also difficult to pull out of brook lane onto the main road with the added volume of traffic this creates more issues with the road changing to a 40mph at this point, this could be amended by making it a 30 mph limit further along the road. Also on the plans it is not clear how much parking would be allocated to residents and could compromise the already busy parking on cobbett way. Also I did notice a tree report, but a lot of the trees on the land were cleared last summer before the application went in, this seems like the wrong order in which to proceed? Another concern is the environment as this was a big factor when we submitted planning permission, bats, swifts and hedgehogs were all considered with our planning, what considerations are in place for this? We were told we needed bat boxes, swift boxes and routes for hedgehogs, is this going to be the same for the new development? There have also been foxes, badgers and deer spotted around the site close to the garages on cobbett way, have there been any surveys carried out to allow for these particular species as I noticed a reptile report but nothing with regards to them.
Anna Thompsett	17A CROWS NEST LANE BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO32 2DD	There has been an enormous amount of development in the area and this is not a suitable location for further building. The roads are choked, there are not enough services and our green spaces need to be maintained.
Michael Wood	4 BLOSSOM CLOSE BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2FR	There is nowhere near enough infrastructure in the area, no pavement along brook lane which already makes the school walk dangerous, that's without adding more cars etc. that's not to mention doctors/schools etc. It also eats into the land gap between Botley/hedge end which is meant to remain as part of the local plan.
John Woollard	LABURNHAMS BROOK LANE BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2ER	This field is one of only two fields that form the wildlife corridor between the open fields /country parks of the southern parishes and the open countryside of Hampshire north of Botley. The significance for moving animals such as deer should not be underestimated.
Paul McCabe	16 ORCHARD COURT BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2DX	My objections include but are not limited to the following points: The change of use of this land and a decision to allow building of 34 dwelling will lead to a reduction in the settlement gap between the villages of Hedge End and Botley. When looking at the plan (GLS_090_104_1102 REV A) it is obvious that this is the worst place to allow any building, the proposed development is at the narrowest point already between Hedge End and Botley. This development will only lead reducing the gap further and ONLY one field separating both villages. Brook Lane is a small, narrow and unmarked lane that only allows access to a small number of dwellings. The lane is not suitable for a large increase in traffic that would come about as a result of this development. There is a narrow point between Cobbett Way and the A334 that only allows 1 vehicle to pass at a time. There is no path along the side of Brook Lane, an increase of traffic along Brook Lane will make it more dangerous for pedestrians walking along the lane. A path should be built along Brook Lane towards the A334 in order to provide a safe environment for all of the current and proposed future users of the lane. Cobbett Way is a cul-de-sac and the proposed access would make it a "through road" for the proposed development. This will only reduce the environmental conditions for the residents who live along that section of

		Cobbett Way, it will result in a large increase in traffic passing their houses. This will result in an increase in both noise and carbon emissions which ultimately will reduce the air quality in the area, thus severely impacting on the enjoyment of living in those properties that the residents currently appreciate. The potential pedestrian connection will provide access for pedestrians onto the A334, this is a busy road without a foot path on this side of the road. There is no designated crossing point on this part of the road. This proposal will effectively give pedestrians access to the road with nowhere to go.
Connor Potter	18 COBBETT WAY BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2ET	I object to this proposal for a number of reasons. I would like to highlight the fact that Cobbett Way is a Cul-De-Sac with residents cars parked on the road. Down the whole road you can not fit 2 cars down it at the same time. The same also applies to Brook Lane. Brook Lane is a narrow country road that has 1 passing spot built into it. This again shows the road cannot take 2 cars passing each other unless you are at the passing point. This makes attaching a housing estate through these roads unacceptable as the road infrastructure cannot take it. The exit from Brook Lane is also a problem as visibility is poor when exiting this road. Having an increased traffic road passing through here would make it extremely hazardous. Flooding is also an issue in Brook Lane as road suffers from flooding every time it rains with the flooding becoming deep at times which makes it tricky enough for cars to get through. Cobbett Way and Brook Lane also sees a number of walkers. With small pavements at Cobbett Way and no pavements at Brook Lane, increased traffic would be a serious threat to these walkers. I would also like to bring up the nature in the area and how diverse it is. Living next to this field I see various different wildlife on a day to day basis. I was surprised to see that the Ecological report only found Slowworms to be present in the field. I regularly see Rabbits, Fox's, Badgers and Deer in the field. I am disappointed this was not looked at in this report. I feel this shows a rough investigation was done without going into any detail. It is also a key spot for birds of prey. The report does not mention about Buzzards and Hawks who dive into the field to hunt for food. Once again, the report is lacking this detail. These birds of prey also suggest that prey like frogs and mice are present in the field. During darkness, Owls can also be heard in around this field area. This field has a wealth of wildlife within it, far more than the report suggests. I feel like the plans proposed have not been investigated in proper detail and have not considered the implications of local residents and wildlife
Lesley Norster	13 ORCHARD COURT BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2DX	I am concerned about the hedgerow and mature trees which border this site . Previous developers have shown scant regard for flora in the local area by cutting down existing trees. (Woodhouse Lane is one example). There are numerous species of birds and wildlife including buzzards, owls, deer and foxes in the fields and hedgerows surrounding the site and I fear the development will impact greatly impact their habitat. The increased traffic, light pollution and increase in noise levels will all have a detrimental effect on the environment. Access to the site will greatly effect local residents quality of life due to all this. And the extra traffic flow in and out of the development will have a negative effect on the air quality through Botley village and beyond.
Kim Surey	2 PLUMTREE COTTAGE BROAD OAK BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2EU	Access. A334 blackspot. Constant crashes on blind s bend. Reduce speed to 30mph or mini roundabout might be of some benefit on Broad Oak to slow traffic which treats Broad Oak as a racetrack. The sheer number of crashes on this S bend is ridiculous. In one 6 week period there were two. One head on. Speeding here is a major problem. Even Brook Lane has crashes where people pulling out cannot see traffic approaching. My driveway is the same. The next exit would be the proposed site. Blind exit/entrance with unseen traffic speeding out of the village. Yet more crashes.

		One of last fields along A334. Development would destroy yet more of the village character. Access into experimental Road. Is that a protected byway of some sort? Again a part of our rural scene here. Blind bend on Brook Lane. It is overdevelopment in an ancient village location. Is it the intention of HCC to completely destroy southern villages while leaving those the other side of the Winchester boundary untouched? There are other reasons but I will leave it there.
Peninnah Houghton	13 COBBETT WAY BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2ET	I am objecting to this application for the following reasons: 1. Highway safety, inadequate access – the proposal for the access to be from Cobbett Way is unsuitable as the junction with Brook Lane could not cope with the huge increase in traffic (circa 34 extra vehicles) which this would cause. Brook Lane itself does not have a pavement so adding this number of additional cars would be a danger for pedestrians. This is a single track and there is only one space for cars to pass. In addition there is frequent flooding on Brook Lane between Cobbett Way and the A334 when there has been heavy rain which is a hazard for vehicles and pedestrians and limits access at times. 2. The proposal would demonstrably harm the amenities enjoyed by local residents living in Cobbett Way, in particular safe and available on-road parking, valuable green space and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential environment. Cobbett Way is a quiet cul-de-sac which would see an increase of at least 34 cars (presuming at least one per household as a minimum) driving in and out of an area where there are only 7 houses currently. This would cause congestion in what is currently a quiet cul de sac. 3. The application is contrary to the Botley Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – 2036 4. Impact on wildlife – there are many different species that can be found in the field such as deer, badgers, foxes, bats and many different types of birds including birds of prey.
Nicholas Roe	SPRINGTIME COTTAGE BROAD OAK BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2EU	As with the previous proposal by the same developer in 2016 to build 90+ houses on the site, this application has the look of a "fishing expedition" to identify objections, to then be able to say that they have addressed them, so the application should go ahead. A prime example of that is to show the entrance to the development via Corbett Way, which is completely unsuitable. I would expect that the developer will put in a revised application with the entrance to the site off Broad Oak, directly onto the main road. This will enable them to say that they are addressing concerns raised. Nothing should be allowed to mask the fact that any development on this site in the designated strategic gap is completely unacceptable. The site is in the narrowest part of the gap, and this development would reduce the width of gap left to about half what it is now. I raise the following concerns: 1. The proposed development is in the strategic gap. This is in the narrowest part of the gap and building on this site will reduce the gap by 50%! If this site is released for development it sets a precedent for further developments which will "merge" Hedge End, Broad Oak and Botley. This is the primary reason for the gap policy. With the Boorley Green development on the golf course to the north which is 1,000 units there has already been considerable allocations for housing in this gap. 2. I do not believe that this site is sustainable. The major developments already taking place within a few miles of the area at Borley Green, Whitley, and Horton One, are putting considerable strain on already severely overstretched local services for schools, GP surgeries, dentists practices, sewage capacity, water run off, power grid, telephones, etc.

		3. As already noted above, the proposal to direct the site traffic through Corbett Way and Brook Lane is not viable, as it puts traffic through a quiet residential cut de sac, and then onto Brook Lane which is narrow, and has a difficult exit onto the main road. Where a footpath is shown on the proposed development plans exiting onto the main road, there is no footpath on that side of the road, so everyone would have to cross a busy road. 4. The flood risk assessment, looks primarily at whether the site will flood, which it will not because it is on high ground. It does not properly take into account the effects that the increased water run off from the hard / impervious surfaces that the development will introduce on the surrounding lower level areas. Any development on this site will increase the flooding risk in the surrounding areas, particularly where the main road is already subject to problems. The plan proposes to use the local water courses, but these are already at capacity, and cannot take any more. There is no mention that the Hamble River is tidal up to the nearby Pudbrook Lake, which significantly affects the capacity of the local water courses to take run off. The run off from the field already flows through our garden when it rains, so any addition of hard surfaces will make the situation worse. I also note that the plan is to add ponds to alleviate the flooding issue, but I see that they have been sited at the highest part of the site, which I find surprising as it would require the water to run up hill. 5. Given that the proposal by the same developer in 2016 was for 90+ houses on the site, the current proposal for 34 houses is a substantial reduction. I ask whether this is a "trojan horse" proposal by the developer to try to get approval for a small development, and, once they get approval in principle to develop in the designated strategic Gap, then the developer will try to change the application to increase the number of houses back to somewhere nearer the 90+ in the first proposal. As general comments on some of the information presented: - I note the the tree survey includes trees and hedges in our garden. I am interested to understand why trees and plants not on the site are included in this survey. - The site was cleared by a ground clearance team and tree surgeons shortly before the ecological and reptile surveys, so I do not consider that they are representative of the ecology and wild life that were living on the site before that was done. For instance, we used to regularly see deer and hear owls on the site. - The development does not provide sufficient parking for the number of vehicles that will be generated by those living, visiting and delivering to / working on the site. This will spill over into the surrounding hosing areas causing problems. Additionally, any traffic assessment should be made against the traffic that will be on the adjacent roads after the Botley by pass is completed in the next couple of years. - I note that the application says that the land is not part of an Agricultural Holding. I do not know the legal term that is intended here, but my understanding is that the land is agricultural land. - The ecological study looks odd, as it pro-ports to demonstrate that building on the site will improve the ecology. Whilst the field is not the finest pasture, to claim that building houses, and roads and then adding a couple of ponds which will not be properly maintained with council cut backs is an improvement on a green field site is nonsense. If the developer is that keen on improving the environment, there is no need to wait, they can improve the quality of the area now. - As the site rises from the road, any development will overlook our property, and therefore affect our amenity. Building will add noise, light pollution, and reduce air quality, further affecting our amenity. - There is a lot of discussion about the requirement to provide a certain number of houses in the area, and a contention that the borough will not be able to meet the requirement, apparently being several thousand short. Whether this is correct or not does not mean that this is a suitable site to build houses, as it is clearly not, and, in any case, 34 houses does not get close to meeting the claimed shortfall, so the argument seems
--	--	---

		spurious. - The developer acknowledges that they are trying to build on land design noted as the gap. The proposal attempts to claim that building on the site will enhance the gap. They are trying to claim that you can build whatever you like as long as you plant a hedge and some trees to hide it. I would be interested to see the planning policy that supports this approach. - The noise survey took readings with the adjacent road in use as a very busy A334. There is shortly to be a by pass built for Botley, so the noise levels will reduce substantially. Any assessment should be made against the noise levels without any traffic on the adjacent road, as that will soon be the situation.
Martyn Cam	3 COBBETT WAY BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2ET	Date 20/12/23 Planning Application Number O/23/96432 Application Type Outline planning Site Address Land to the west of Cobbett Way. (Land Off Cobbett Way, Botley) I object to the proposed development as the development does not comply with any of the requirements of the strategic policy S6. The outlined site sits at the narrowest point of the Botley/ Hedge End settlement gap at only 305m, (reference 16) as taken from the following the Eastleigh Borough statement gap policy undertaken on behalf of Eastleigh Borough Council. Date: 15/10/2020 REFERENCE: DD422R02 REVISION: FINAL PAGE 122 (extract) Area I 6 - Combination of ribbon development, scattering of mature trees, and paddocks to the rear provide a short-lived but clear change of character from the built-form edges to Hedge End and the wooded arrival to Botley. Whilst the horse paddocks are poor in landscape character, the remnant field boundaries and open nature contribute to the separation between the two settlements particularly when experienced from the A334 and bridleway No.17 The proposed development contravenes ALL of the requirements to protect the settlement gap as required in the following extract of the Eastleigh Borough Council adopted local plan April 2022. Strategic policy S6, protection of settlement gaps 1. Development within a settlement gap as set out in the policy's map will be permitted provided that. a. It would not undermine the physical extent and/ or visual separation of a settlement b. It would not have an urbanising effect detrimental to; i. The character of the countryside; or j. The separate identity of adjoining settlements. I Object to the outline planning application because; 1. It will undermine the physical and visual extent of the gap by reducing it by over half. This will have an impact on the divide that will be unrecoverable. 2. It will be destroying what is currently a green field site that not only is visually outstanding naturally full of wildlife from insects and occasionally deer, buzzards, and slowworms. Also grazing horses. 3. It will destroy the effect of separate identities of adjoining settlements. As pointed out already it's the narrowest point without having it. I object to the proposed development as the proposed access route is currently a quiet cul-de-sac that during weekends and evenings has residents' cars parked for its entire length along the West kerb and often several on the east side outside the garages at the South end. The supposed section of road which widen in paragraph 3.5 of the application transport statement refers to the single turning head at the South end of the cul-de-sac which often has residents parked on both sides of it and

		provides the only access to the garage is the only point to turn. When residents' cars are parked there is only enough room for a single narrow lane beside them whereas the planning proposal states that: 3.5 unrestricted car park is available along Cobbett Way and does not occur along the western side of the carriageway heading towards the site access however there are sections of the road which widen where laybys are provided and good visibility is available to enable vehicles to wait for one another to pass. This is not the Case. In fact cobbett way has a tight left hand turn just as you rise into the road and I believe with increased traffic will become dangerous for residents and road users due to the nature of the layout. The road with parked cars on is only 2.6m wide and without its only 4.8m wide. I object to the outline planning application because as written in the applicant's TRANSPORT STATEMENT NOVEMBER 2023 the(Mulberry Investment Pension Scheme) paragraph 3.6 states that there are no footpaths on Brook Lane: 3.6 Cobbett Way is accessed from Brook Lane which is a narrow lane with no footway provisions. There is a section of road only suitable for one-way vehicle movement where vehicles must give way to each other. Yet they intend to increase the traffic flow through this bottleneck with an additional 148 vehicle movements over each 12 hour period. 6.4 table 8 demonstrates that for a 35no. Unit residential development it is anticipated that 16 vehicle trips would be generated in the AM peak period, 15 vehicle movements in the PM peak period and 148 vehicle trips over a 12 hour period. The transport statement then says that 148 vehicle trips represent a 1% increase in traffic along the A334 (which it may do) but using the same criteria it represents a 580% increase in the vehicle trips along the South end of Corbett way which is the proposed access route, not the A334 there will also be a proportionate increase on Brook Lane that is far over the stated 1%. 6.5 when considered over a 12- hour period this equates to circa 12 vehicle movements an hour i.e., roughly one every 5 minutes in addition an increase of 148 vehicle movements equates to less than a 1% increase in traffic along the A334 (assuming all vehicles would travel via the A334) The access to the site in the proposal is not off the A334 . the proposed application is using Brook Lane and then into Cobbett Way for access. All of the above transport shortcomings fail to comply with the ECB policy DM13, General development criteria – transport' which amongst other requirements states that 'all new development must have a safe and convenient access to the highway network this proposal does not.
Zoë Johnstone	17 COBBETT WAY BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2ET	1. Access via Cobbett Way to Brook Lane: 1.1. Vehicular access: 1.1.1. The corner of Brook Lane and Cobbett Way is near a sharp bend heading to the right (south), away from Broadoak, and visibility leaving Cobbett Way is poor, with traffic often travelling too fast. Visibility to the left is poor if vegetation is not regularly cut back. 1.1.2. Between Cobbett Way and the junction of Broadoak/High Street the road over Pudbrook Lake is only wide enough for single line traffic, so additional traffic will worsen access. 1.1.3. The stretch between Cobbett Way and the bridge is often flooded in Autumn and Winter as the drains get blocked with fallen leaves that get crushed beneath the current levels of traffic. 1.1.4. Brook Lane is not always a quiet country lane as stated in the planning application: farm vehicles and vehicles accessing the waste treatment plant add to the aforementioned risks. 1.1.5. All of the above points indicate that additional traffic would add to the current dangers and delays. 1.2. Pedestrian Access: 1.2.1. As above, Brook Lane is very narrow, and has no pavements/footways for pedestrians. It is already dangerous to walk up there especially in the aforementioned narrow area, and additional pedestrians and vehicular traffic can only exacerbate what is already a

		problem. 1.2.2. The lane is poorly maintained, meaning that pedestrians cannot walk at the sides of the road. These issues include: 1.2.2.1. overgrowing vegetation including hedges on the East side (near Woodhill School boundary), 1.2.2.2. a serious gap in road surface by the boundary with Richmond, with holes that are dangerous, but not always visible 1.2.2.3. and particularly in autumn and winter, slippery fallen leaves not cleared on both sides, and 1.2.2.4. mud on both sides, 1.2.3. See 1.13 above. 2. Access to A334 (Broadoak/High Street): 2.1. Vehicular access: 2.1.1. The junction of Brook Lane and A334 (Broadoak/High Street) is on another sharp bend and visibility is limited in both directions. Even now vehicles often have a long wait before they can turn right onto High Street, and again, additional traffic can only make this worse. 2.2. Pedestrian Access: 2.2.1. Gated Field access to A334: the applicants have failed to mention adequately the dangers that arise from the fact there is no pavement in either direction as you leave what is currently the gateway on the south side of the A334, and neither do they give any indication how they would anticipate mitigating the associated dangers. The only way pedestrians would be able to access the walkway on the north side of the road would be to cross it: it is a busy road, and although it may be quieter when the bypass is finished, there will still be a reasonable amount of traffic. There is no pedestrian crossing closer than the one near Botley School. This company have investigated building on this land previously (2016) and know that there is no chance of a pavement/footway being installed on the south side of the A334 as the road is far too narrow. In fact, they did not submit an application then, anecdotally because they realised that permission would not be granted for these reasons of access 2.2.2. Access via footpath from Cobbett Way: again, the application is missing vital information: there is no footway on the A334 to the West at the end of the footpath. The footway to the East is narrow and ill-defined as it passes Richmond car sales showroom. It all but disappears as the road crosses the bridge over Pudbrook Lake, again requiring any pedestrians to cross a busy road, or to walk in the road approaching a significant bend where visibility is reduced. 3. Cobbett Way – access to proposed development. 3.1. Vehicular traffic: The end of Cobbett Way in question was only ever designed as a cul-de-sac, with the amount of traffic associated with six houses – residents of the other sections of Cobbett Way do not need to use this section. As such it is narrow, and not designed for the traffic associated with a housing development of this size. We are not convinced by the proposed estimate of additional traffic this would create. 4. Other Issues: 4.1. Local Plan: 4.1.1. The development of this area is not within Eastleigh's Local Plan, and contrary to what the proposal states, would erode the Settlement Gap at that point by at least 50%. 4.2. Housing Need: 4.2.1. The application states that the applicant does not believe that there is sufficient housing in this area. However, the Council has already turned down other local proposals on the basis that there is sufficient in development (Holly Tree Farm and Woodhill School). We wonder whether the applicant has taken full account of the major developments underway in Boorley Green, and Uplands Farms which are within Botley, and also the major developments in Horton Heath and various major developments in Hedge End and West End, and of course Whiteley. 4.2.2. Infrastructure – as mentioned above, we do not believe that the current access/roads are in any way appropriate for this proposal. In addition there is already a severe shortage of GP provision, and while we
--	--	--

		realise this is not the direct responsibility of Eastleigh Borough Council, it does need to be taken into consideration. 4.3. Air Quality: 4.3.1. Air quality on and around the A334 has already been identified as problematic. The additional traffic this proposed development would bring can only add to that. 4.4. Transport Links 4.4.1. The information provided in the transport statement at 4.19 is incorrect. This states the number of trains running: in fact for most of the day there is only one train per hour to all of the destinations, not the 2-4 stated, although there may be additional ones at certain peak times. If the applicant is so badly wrong in this assertion, can we be sure that this misinformation is not repeated elsewhere in the application? 4.4.2. The bus to the train station only runs 4 times per day. As the station is nearly one and a quarter miles away, their suggested time of 23 minutes walk would be for a fit person, not pushing a pushchair or wheelchair, using any other mobility aid, and not carrying shopping or other baggage. In addition, walking to the station would of course entail the risks stated above in 2.2. The alternative would inevitably be driving to the station where the parking is extremely limited, and with high demand during the week. 4.5. Other impacts: 4.5.1. Without further detail on the proposal, it is not possible to make further comment on such issues as visual intrusion, impact on trees etc.
Pamela BEN MARDHIA	23 BLOSSOM CLOSE BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2FR	Having lived in my current house for over 37 years, I have been dismayed to see the over-development of the Hedge End / Botley area and also very relieved that the council has, thus far, remained committed to maintaining the land designated as "a strategic gap" between Hedge End and Botley. This proposed application breaks that commitment and I strongly object to it. The development will considerably increase traffic in Brook Lane, which has become increasingly less safe for walkers, being devoid of dedicated pedestrian space and used more frequently as a means to avoid the impossibly congested A334 by traffic coming from Botley to the Maypole roundabout. Whilst the new bypass will ameliorate this to an extent, 34 houses with their associated traffic will work counter to any relief provided by the bypass. The council's own landscape plan refers to Area I11 (the site of the proposed development) as "contributing to the rural settlement character along Brook Lane and open views further east towards Botley." Imposition of 34 dwellings will significantly impact this rural nature and granting permission to build here will set a precedent which is likely to jeopardise this area even further. The site in question is adjacent to Bridleway 17 which has itself undergone many changes in recent years, none of which can be classed as improvements. Large areas of woodland / shrubbery have been destroyed to facilitate the parking of multiple vehicles associated with the three business now using the bridleway and the siting of clusters of pallets, portable toilets and other industrial equipment, all of which is unsightly and intrusive. What was once a peaceful route for walkers, cyclists and riders is now subject to a significant increase in vehicle use, including heavy goods vehicles far too big and destructive for the bridle path surface. This results in an explosion of potholes which quickly fill with rainwater and turn the whole route into a waterlogged mudbath. The drainage is virtually non-existent and the area now has the appearance of an industrial estate rather than a rural pathway. There is likely to be very limited screening of the proposed Cobbet Way development from Bridleway 17, eventually ruining the rural character of this area completely. I live adjacent to Area I8, described thus in the council's landscape plan: "The linear nature of vegetated field boundaries, whilst gappy, does contribute to the visual separation and sense of leaving/ arriving at the two settlements, particularly when experienced from the rights of way network." I implore the council planning authorities to deny this application and preserve the "visual separation...of the two settlements".
Zoe Oxford-Ramadan	1 BROOK COTTAGES BROAD OAK BOTLEY	We object for many reasons, not limited to the following: This is the last remaining patch of green space between Botley and

	SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2EU	Hedge End. To build on it would not only displace yet more wildlife from the surrounding area (we have had many deer, birds of prey etc, in this field – although considerably less since the apparent unpermitted removal of many trees on this patch of land by the owners) but it would cause significant environmental issues, such as further flooding in an already high-risk area. The drainage in the area is already stretched beyond capacity, and to build further homes along here would only put further undue pressure on this system. Already we get a lot of water runoff from this field from the back of the garages that filters towards our property, and if this area was tarmacked and the natural drainage disturbed I can't imagine the problems it would cause to the surrounding properties. More houses being built here would overlook and devalue those that currently in situ, and it would be against the current planning guidelines, according to Eastleigh Borough Council, as when I previously enquired to the MP Paul Holmes regarding this issue back in May when we noticed some investigative work being done, he looked into this for us and contacted the Council about it, who responded with the following points: • The site falls within a countryside location defined in the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and is not designated for housing development. • Policy S5 of the Local Plan does not allow for unplanned housing development in countryside locations. • The site is also designated as a settlement gap between the built-up settlements of Hedge End and Botley. • Policy S6 of the Local Plan seeks to avoid the coalition of built settlements through the designation of settlement gaps such as this. • As part of the Local Plan process the site was put forward as a potential housing allocation by a developer (Ken Scaddan Associates) in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) for the Local Plan (site 3-18-C Land west of Cobbett Road, Botley). The site was ruled out on the basis that it performed poorly in terms of impacts on the settlement gap (see From SLAA to shortlist report (May 2017)) Regarding the access to this proposed new development being suggested via Brook Lane and Cobbett Way, which is a quiet Cul de Sac and is for residents only, this would be a disaster considering the narrow country lane that Brook Lane is, and the access onto Broad Oak being so incredibly dangerous as it currently stands. There have been multiple accidents on this junction due to the speed of oncoming traffic from the village, and getting out of this road is already nigh on impossible at the best of times. Not only that, but it would also be a significant danger for pedestrians who use Brook Lane to walk their children to school and to walk their dogs, as this is a narrow single lane road with just one passing place between Cobbett Way and Broad Oak/High Street. Having 34 new homes built behind Cobbett Way (in addition to the ones already planned for the old Woodhill School as I understand it), together with their respective cars driving through the area would be extremely detrimental to this peaceful residential area and would significantly affect the quality of life of the current residents in this part of the old village. It would cause significant traffic, parking, noise and air pollution issues for the current local residents if permission was granted. There is already far too much development happening in and around our village, and we are being swallowed up by housing developments and losing all the green spaces in the area. This would be a tragic loss of one of the last areas of green space between Botley and Hedge End if this were to go ahead, and as mentioned above would be incredibly detrimental to the environment.
Barbara Rolfe	15 ORCHARD COURT BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2DX	I believe that this application is to build on part of the strategic gap between Botley and Hedge End. Botley is a historic village, which dates back to Saxon times and indeed is mentioned in the Magna Carta. I think that the majority of Botley inhabitants enjoy village life. If this planning

		application is given the go-ahead, it gives a precedent for further building works across the strategic gap, which will culminate in Botley becoming a suburb of Hedge End. I do not think that this is what the residents of Botley want for their village. The local area has already suffered from too much building, mainly as a result of having no current Local Plan in place! There is also the question of the environmental impact of the area. Despite the current building of the Botley by-pass, I believe that Broad Oak will remain quite a busy road due to the amount of housing which has been built locally. This will have an impact upon air pollution, NHS services and local roads, which are already overcrowded. Cycling is also unsafe on these local roads due to heavy traffic and badly maintained roads. The parcel of land in question would be ideal for the planting of trees, to protect the climate, encourage wildlife, improve air pollution and drainage. We need to plant new, native trees for a healthier planet and to increase habitat for wildlife. Many of these smaller developments become the straw which breaks the camel's back. Please do not permit this development and make use of this opportunity to improve Botley, not destroy it with more housebuilding.
Rob Atwell	15 COBBETT WAY BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2ET	Firstly, this application has been applied for at a strategic time of the year. To end on Boxing Day (a bank holiday after Christmas) is designed to float under the radar when residents are busy during the Christmas period. Comments for this application should not be ending on a bank holiday. I object to this application for a number of reasons. • Cobbett Way is a cul-de-sac. The road layout and size cannot support the through traffic, which would be created from these dwellings. • Broad Oak is a fast and hazardous road. It would not support the traffic created from an extra estate of dwellings trying to enter this road during peak times. • Brook Lane is a 'walkers lane' and the extra traffic created by these dwelling would pose a high hazard to pedestrians and other road users, on this lane • This land is designated as an agricultural green gap. This was relevant for the last planning application, which was rejected, and still relevant today. • Regardless of the estimated yield for agricultural use, this land is a usable field for local residents within an agricultural village, and can be used for things that are not required to make money, but benefit the local residents and community. This land has not had the opportunity to be used for this purpose due to being purchased by land developers 9 years ago, and has simply been passed from developer to developer for the purpose of gaining planning permission for dwellings. This land should be returned to the community for its intended use. • Within a 5 mile radius, there is in excess of 5000 new homes being built in the area. Why would these extra houses be required?
Daniel Lockyer	14 COBBETT WAY BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2ET	I am writing to object to the planning application O/23/964232. My objections, grounded in a detailed review of the submitted documents, are as follows: 1. Traffic and Road Safety Concerns: The 'Transport Statement' (Paragraph 3.6) fails to adequately address the absence of pavements and existing flood risk on Brook Lane, making it particularly perilous for the elderly, families with children, and those with disabilities. The projected increase in traffic (Paragraph 6.4), including 148 vehicle movements over a 12-hour period, is highly unsuitable for the existing narrow road infrastructure. This will exacerbate the already unsafe conditions for pulling out onto main roads, increasing the risk of accidents. 2. Environmental and Ecological Impact: The 'Ecological Report' (Sections 4.2 and 4.3) does not fully account for local biodiversity, notably omitting species like rabbits, badgers, deer, and various birds of prey. This suggests a superficial ecological

		assessment, undermining the real impact on local wildlife. 3. Impact on Village Character and Community: The 'Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' (Section 5.1) overlooks the loss of the crucial settlement gap between Hedge End and Botley, threatening the rural character of our village. The development's design, as per the 'Illustrative Masterplan' (Page 12), will significantly alter the heritage and aesthetic of Botley. 4. Flooding and Drainage Issues: The existing flooding issues, particularly along Brook Lane and the A334, are inadequately addressed in the 'Flood Risk Assessment' (Chapter 3). The document lacks comprehensive mitigation strategies to manage the increased risk of flooding due to the development. 5. Strain on Local Infrastructure: The 'Infrastructure and Services Report' (Section 2.3) does not provide an exhaustive analysis of the strain on local amenities. The increase in population, implied by the number of proposed dwellings, will likely exacerbate existing pressures on schools and healthcare facilities. 6. Policy Compliance and Legal Aspects: The proposal appears to conflict with the Botley Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – 2036 (Policy BP6), particularly regarding the preservation of the village's character and ecological integrity. 7. Review of Submitted Documents: - Arboricultural Report (Appendix B): Fails to fully address the long-term impact on existing trees and vegetation. - Ecological Report (Section 4.5): Omits several key species, raising questions about the biodiversity assessment's thoroughness. - Flood Risk Assessment (Section 3.2): Does not align with observed flooding issues, indicating inadequate risk analysis. - Transport Statement (Paragraph 6.5): Underestimates traffic impact and pedestrian safety concerns. - Design and Access Statement (Paragraph 2.4): Neglects proper integration with Botley's existing village character and infrastructure. In conclusion, the proposed development overlooks crucial environmental, infrastructural, and community aspects. The discrepancies in the submitted documents necessitate a thorough reassessment. I urge the Planning Department to consider these objections carefully. Thank you for considering my objection.
lynne dray	1 COBBETT WAY BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2ET	This is a ridiculous idea cobbett way is far to small to manage potentially 70 plus cars . Due to residents parking in front of their own homes on cobbett way it is realistically a single lane road. Also it's a very quiet road and this would definitely not continue if this planning goes ahead. They have already destroyed our privacy and increased traffic noise by removing the trees on the edge of the field right next to our garden
Robert Hall	44 HIGH STREET BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON SO30 2EA	I object to this development on two grounds: 1) Access to the new houses will be insufficient to support the additional housing. The road used is very narrow and not suitable for additional traffic. I regularly walk in this area and the lack of pavements and the width of the road cause a challenge with the current level of traffic. I can not be safe to add more cars. Also, in line with the drive to move people to walk and use buses, this is not a safe option for any new home dwellers in that area. 2) This is not in line with Eastleigh Borough council's desire and stated aim to maintain a gap between Botley and Hedge End.
Alastair Rhodes	MALLOW COTTAGE BROAD OAK BOTLEY SOUTHAMPTON	The notice of application refers to the applicant's application for outline permission for the development of up to 34 dwellings but states that access only is to be considered. The majority of the information supplied relates to the proposed development itself and it is therefore difficult to

	SO30 2EU	confine comments and observations to the access issue alone, particularly when the section (s6.1) dealing with site access in the Design and Access Statement supporting the application is a single sentence. The decision to confine the application to access only appears to be a tactical one which may be for a number of reasons not least to ascertain information as the quantity and nature of objections from third parties and the issues likely to be raised by the statutory and citizen objectors\commentators, to the full application for the outline permission. Comments on the access application The application appears to be relying principally on the Transport Statement provided by Paul Basham Associates. It is surprising that Hampshire County Council, as Highways Authority, do not appear to have supplied a response to the application and it is to be hoped that the Planning Officer\Committee will have this available to them when considering the application. The Transport Statement bases its assumptions that the development if proceeded with will create and average of additional trip every 5 minutes. This is based upon 16 vehicles making trips and peak hours at each end of the day. I would suggest: a) that for 34 new houses, 16 trips is a considerable underestimate; it is not unreasonable to assume that on average the majority, if not all, of the households will have a vehicle and that considerably more than 50% of these will be used for commuting or school trips during peak hours at either end of the day; b) when averaged out to one vehicle per 5 minutes the additional volume may not seem excessive, the reality is however that such additional trips will not be averaged out across the day and that the majority of them will occur during those peak times so causing congestion. Brook Lane already has traffic calming measures between Cobbett Lane and the A334 which from my personal experience often result in some delay in traffic. Finally, the Access Design section of the Transport Statement appears to take no account of the fact that the road is used for parking by the residents as clearly illustrated in the ariel photographs annexed to the applicants' adviser's reports. This will clearly exacerbate the congestion issues in Cobbett Lane. In the event of the substantive application being unsuccessful the application for access will be superfluous and I therefore include my comments regarding that application also, based on the information lodged. Comments on application for development of up to 34 dwellings etc. Settlement Gap The land is designated as Settlement Gap in the EBC Local Plan 2016 – 2036 (the Plan). The NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development (Paragraph 11) does not apply as the proposal does not accord with the Plan and the fact that the land is designated as Settlement Gap provides a clear reason for refusing the application. The Application suggests that the provisos to Policy S6: “Development within a Settlement Gap [...] will be permitted provided that: a. It would not undermine the physical and/or visual separation of settlement; and b. It would not have an urbanising effect detrimental to: i. The character of the countryside; or ii. The separate identity of the adjoining settlements.” applies. I disagree with these assertions on the following basis: a) the development clearly undermines the physical separation of the settlement; and b) the fact the land cannot be easily seen is neither pertinent nor relevant because the area is not easily visible – the land is more visually accessible than it was when the policy was imposed – there has been substantial tree felling on my property and by the applicant itself so that the access way onto Broad Oak provides a clear view of the land; c) the fact that the properties on the South side of Broad Oak bordering the subject land already encroach onto the gap is irrelevant, all were in existence many years prior to the designation of the land.
--	----------	---

		d) construction of 34 houses by its nature urbanises an area and building houses 'changes the character of the countryside'. Drainage The report underestimates the current flow of ground water into the properties on the Northern border and the available capacity in times of heavy rain of the water course running along that the boundary. The road drains along the length of Broad Oak drain directly into this watercourse, the surface water run off from the fields to the South, including the application land, and the overflow sewer outfall all drain into the stream which raises the level by a metre within an hour. Development of the subject land will doubtless increase the volume of surface water following into the stream and cause flooding problems. We note that the HCC response to the Flood Risk Assessment has pointed out a number of errors which may account for the positive slant of the report. Finally I was surprised to note the reference to Thames Water on page 16 of the Flood Risk Assessment, so far as I can ascertain Thames Water does not provide foul drainage services in this area, if correct then this puts into question the accuracy of, and care with which, this assessment has been prepared. Environmental\Biodiversity Two comments – I find it hard to believe that the building of 34 houses with ancillary infrastructure can provide a positive increase in habitat provision. No mention is made of larger mammals, I have lived here for 30 years and every year there have been deer in the field all year round on a weekly if not daily basis, after the birthing season does are frequently nesting in the long grass with their fawns. There have been and still are long established deer tracks around and across the field. Their habitat in the area is being diminished by residential development and granting this application will further diminish this as well as the other species referred to in the Ecology Response.
--	--	---