

### **Addition to Minute PLAN\_1617\_M14/142.3**

#### **Full text of the objection to Outline Planning Application O/16/79469 – Land North of Church Road**

Bishopstoke Planning Committee objects to this outline planning application on a number of grounds:

- The plans are against Policy 1.CO of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan Review (2001-2011), the wording of which says:

Planning permission will not be granted for development outside the urban edge unless:

- i) it is necessary for agricultural, forestry or horticultural purposes and a countryside location is required or
- ii) it is for an outdoor recreational use or is genuinely required as ancillary to such a use and does not require the provision of buildings, hardstanding or structures which are of a form, scale or design which would demonstrably harm the character of the locality; or
- iii) it is essential for the provision of a public utility service or the appropriate extension of an existing education or health facility and it cannot be located within the urban edge; or
- iv) it meets the criteria in the other policies of this Plan.

- It is contrary to emerging policy S9 of the submitted EBC Local Plan (2011-2029).
- The development is in area designated as countryside.
- The development would be outside the urban edge of Bishopstoke,
- The development would be too close to both the River Itchen SAC and the Colden Common SINC,
- There is currently an over-saturation of development on Church Road and this would only add to the problem.
- The already saturated local road network is not suitable for the additional inevitable daily traffic this development would impose.
- Access on to Church Road would be at the top of a hill, where traffic is known to speed, and where parked vehicles would cause line of sight issues.
- The staggered crossroads being created with Bishops Court would also be dangerous.
- The recent withdrawal of the bus service to the area means that there is no public transport at all.

The Committee concludes that the development is unsustainable, and wishes also to cite a recent decision of the BIFOHH Local Area Committee held on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2016 (Planning application O/15/77465) which refused a similar but smaller development on the grounds of it being unsustainable and in countryside outside the urban edge.