

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/W1715/W/24/3347834

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/W1715/W/24/3347834

Appeal By MRS ANNETTE COOPER

Site Address
Pembers Hill Farm
Mortimers Lane
Fair Oak
SO50 7EA

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR JAMES BUDWORTH

Address
36 Pembers Farm Avenue
Eastleigh
Eastleigh
SO50 7QL

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☒ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☒ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I am owner of 36 Pembers Farm Avenue and I object to the appeal on the original ruling for this planning application.

The original application was rejected on the grounds that it would be unsafe due to close proximity to a playground & the fact farm traffic would be going against the flow of traffic. These aspects have not changed, so for me no grounds to appeal.

I would also like to draw attention to the reason for the application in the first place: lack of access to the farmland.

The land our development was built on was previously owned by the applicant and would have known the lack of access when selling the land in the first place, so the original argument is flawed.

Also, since the original application was denied, the applicant has installed an access gate on another side of the field, which is visible from our estate. So it appears that the argument of "no access" is not now valid.

Therefore, the original decision should be upheld due to no solution to the safety aspects on which the application was denied. Secondly, access has been sorted by the applicant themselves, so the arguments made in the original application of 'no access' no longer apply.