

4 March 2026

I refer to your email of 23 February 2026 timed at 15.24 hrs headed "Regeneration". The subject of which is the proposed stopping up of West Street and part of Western Avenue, Andover.

I do NOT wish to withdraw my objections.

The lengthy email entitled "regeneration" could well go into recipients "Spam" filters or simply be deleted because the heading is incorrect and may be misleading. I have spoken with Mr Phil Bryant and Mr David Close this morning and neither have received a response to their objections.

Test Valley Borough Council have taken nearly 2 months to compile a response to the concerns of some Andover residents about the proposed stopping up but gives just 10 working days for residents to confirm that they still object; instead, the letter should state that **residents who wish to withdraw their objections should respond within that time period**. See email of 18 November 2025 from Juliet Bradbury (DfT) stating "**if matters are resolved to their satisfaction, Ann Truss will need to confirm to us that they no longer object**". Asking for responses notifying that residents still object is incorrect.

Mr Peter Hughes, Chairman of our sports group which meets 2 mornings a week at the Leisure centre spoke to me on the morning of 23 February and asked if I had heard from Test Valley as he had not yet heard and advised that he was going away for 3 weeks. On 24 September I telephoned him twice and left messages and emailed twice with no response so he may be out of contact and cannot confirm that he still objects. I therefore suggest that any objector who does not respond by 9 March to your email of 23rd February should be taken as not withdrawing their objection.

Mr Roger Edgell, a former strategic planner for central and local government provided a plan to all Members of the Northern Area Planning Committee on 23 September 2025 which retained one way traffic in West Street. Mr Edgell was offered 9 seconds in which to present his case by the Chairman of the committee. Mr Bob Briggs also provided a plan whereby West Street could be retained as a one way street.

The Council want to build a riverside park adjacent to the Leisure Centre but are now wilfully refusing to look at and consider plans that enable them to build the park whilst not stopping off West Street and retaining it as a safe one way street although the original Council plan retained West Street as one way.

The original Masterplan and discussions with the residents of Andover showed West Street accessing near the Leisure Centre and exiting near the bus station, it did NOT show West Street as two way with an enormous increase in traffic and the resulting noise and traffic pollution in an area where pollution already exceeds the WHO

maximum recommendations. See paragraph 6 of my letter of 18 December 2025 to Mr Crass of the DfT. As a resident of Chantry Lodge my life would be adversely affected by the now proposed change from one way to two way traffic in West Street and drivers and pedestrians will be conflicted and adversely affected. There is a need for people to be able to drive safely into town and for a safe interaction with pedestrians.

Originally West Street was not to be stopped off near the bus station and was to remain one way, the first change from this that can be found was in a report dated 2 October 2024 to the Strategic Regeneration and Partnerships (North) Portfolio Holder. However this change to the original plan does not appear to have been made public. Residents of Chantry Lodge and Portland Grove were invited to a discussion on 19 September 2024 and were advised of the proposed change to West Street; the residents objected to the proposed changes and a petition with 85 signatures was handed into the Council offices on 7 October 2024. I am unable to find any place where the public were advised of the now proposed deviation from the original plan for the riverside park and the proposed change from one to two way traffic. I moved into Chantry Lodge in September 2025 and had no prior knowledge of the now proposed changes to West Street.

The proposed change from the original plan should be subject to advertisement and proper public consultation on the revised proposal.

Furthermore, the planning permission 25/1047/FULLN that the Council granted to themselves shows the “PROPOSAL: Closure/stopping up and removal of southbound carriageway of Western Avenue gyratory and associated changes to the highway network, including West Street and Waterloo Court ...” it does not propose the stopping up of one end of West Street near the bus station.

Turning to your “Common Objection” responses.

CO4, the proposed stopping up of the southern end of West Street means that West Street will become two way and the Council’s response does not address the changes in West Street in terms of traffic.

CO8, the Council must have been aware that the publication of the proposed stopping of parts of West Street and Western Avenue was initially advertised in the Salisbury Journal, a Wiltshire newspaper not the local Andover Advertiser, the local Hampshire newspaper but failed to correct this misapprehension.

CO9, the notices could not be seen by pedestrians or drivers, a point verified by some of my neighbours who went to the locations.

CO11, over what period was the noise assessment carried out?

CO12, over what period was the assessment carried out? It is established that NO2 levels throughout Andover already exceed WHO limits so whatever the modelling result was does not affect this.

CO13, disagree with findings.

CO15 & 16, disagree. One condition of the consent for the Andover Leisure Centre was that the pavement be widened in the interests of safety and a similar condition was also part of the permission for the change of use of part of the ground floor of Chantry Lodge from retail to residential. The proposed narrowing of the pavement in these two places and change from one way to two way traffic conflicts with those two planning consents granted following consultation with the local highway authority. In paragraph 9 of my email objection of 26 November 2025 timed at 15.45 hrs I advised that my husband and I were standing outside Chantry Lodge waiting to cross the road when a bus “swept the pavement”, if the width of the pavement is reduced outside Chantry Lodge and the Leisure Centre as is required by the proposal to make West Street two way then we would have been killed or seriously injured; crossing West Street will become more hazardous if the stopping up is effected. Crossing West Street would become more hazardous for the less agile, mothers with children and students from the Sixth Form College who cross the road whilst wearing ear phones, reading their phones and paying insufficient attention to the traffic. Students from the sixth form college cross in a direct line from the college to the town centre via West Street, they will not detour a longer route via the proposed riverside park.

CO17, see reply to CO15 & 16.

CO18, see response to CO15 & 16.

CO23, drivers may not keep to a 20mph limit and would be frustrated in two way traffic and consequent hold ups.

CO24, disagree.

CO25, Disagree, the function of a bus lane is to reduce congestion not to act as a temporary parking place for PSVs.

CO31, can the Council provide copies of their correspondence with Lidl on this subject?

The Council has not adequately responded to my concerns and objections raised in paragraph 6 of my letter of 12 November 2025, paragraphs 5,6,7,8 and 10 of my letter of 26 November 2025 and paragraphs 3,6,7 and 8 of my letter of 18 December 2025.