

PLANNING REF : 260917
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 9 Yeosfield
: Riseley
: RG71SG
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Rebecca Haughton
DATE SUBMITTED : 15/05/2026

COMMENTS:

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to the above planning application. My concerns relate to highway impact, flood risk, safety, and the cumulative effects of development. These concerns are set out below.

1. Parking, Highway Safety and Traffic Impact

Source: Hampshire County Council (Highways), TRICS Assessment

The applicant's Transport Assessment concludes that the development would generate approximately 25 vehicle trips during peak hours and 199 daily trips, and that this would not significantly affect the local highway network.

This conclusion is not supported by the local context for the following reasons:

- The TRICS assessment utilises a generic "neighbourhood centre" location type, which does not adequately capture the characteristics and constraints of the local highway network.

- The proposal would add traffic to Basingstoke Road and the A33 corridor, both of which are already subject to congestion and capacity pressures, particularly at peak times.

- The assessment does not sufficiently address cumulative traffic impacts, nor does it demonstrate that sufficient mitigation has been considered.

In this case, there is a clear risk that such impacts have been underestimated.

The application raises broader concerns regarding safety for both pedestrians and road users:

- Increased vehicle movements in an already constrained area could increase the risk of collisions, particularly at junctions and access points on Basingstoke Road.

- There is insufficient evidence demonstrating that safe pedestrian access, crossing provision, and visibility splays have been robustly assessed in light of increased traffic flows.

- The interaction between vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists does not appear to have been fully addressed, particularly where local infrastructure may already be insufficient.

Without clearer mitigation measures, the proposal presents a material risk to public safety.

2. Environmental Impacts

Source: Flood Risk Assessment (AWP) and Appendix F Preliminary Drainage Layout

The Flood Risk Assessment concludes that the site is within Flood Zone 1 and is not susceptible to flooding from multiple sources. However, this conclusion is inconsistent with locally available evidence:

- The Swallowfield Parish Council Flood Risk Group report (April 2025)

(<https://www.swallowfieldpc.gov.uk/your-parish-council/frg>)

provides evidence of recent and ongoing flooding issues within the locality. - There is a documented history of drainage problems, particularly to the east of the site along Bull Lane, where surface water flooding and poor drainage are recurring issues.

- Reliance on Flood Zone classification alone does not adequately account for localised surface water flooding and drainage infrastructure limitations.

The evidence suggests that the proposed SuDS as submitted is not based on real-world conditions.

3. Local and national planning policy

The proposal conflicts with the following National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs:

Parking, highway safety and traffic impact

- NPPF Paragraph 115, which requires that development ensures safe and suitable access for all users and significant impacts from the development on the transport network can be mitigated to an acceptable degree.

- NPPF Paragraph 116, which requires consideration of the severe cumulative impacts on the road network.

- NPPF Paragraph 187, which requires development to avoid placing undue pressure on environmental systems.

Environmental Impacts

- NPPF Paragraph 173, which directs development away from areas at risk of flooding.

- NPPF Paragraph 174, which requires developments to develop areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source.

4. Personal Observations

As a local resident, I have first-hand experience of the existing conditions within the vicinity of the site. In particular, I regularly observe congestion along Basingstoke Road and at its connection with the A33, especially during peak commuting hours, where traffic queues and delays are already common. Even minor increases in traffic can result in noticeable deterioration in flow and increased driver frustration, which in turn can raise safety risks.

In addition, I have personally witnessed standing water and poor drainage in the area, particularly along Bull Lane to the north of the site, following periods of moderate to heavy rainfall. These issues do not appear to be isolated incidents but rather reflect a recurring local problem, which raises concern about the ability of existing drainage infrastructure to accommodate additional development.

These observations reinforce my concern that the impacts of the proposed development may have been underestimated in the submitted assessments, particularly when viewed against real-world conditions experienced by those living in and using the area on a daily basis.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the application raises significant concerns in relation to:

- Highway capacity and safety

- Flood risk and drainage

- Public safety

- Cumulative impacts on infrastructure and environment

It is therefore requested that the Local Planning Authority either:

- Refuses the application, or
- Seeks further detailed evidence, reassessment, and mitigation measures to address the issues identified before any determination is made.

Yours faithfully,

Rebecca Haughton

9 Yeosfield, Riseley
RG7 1SG