

13 April 2026

Thank you for your email dated 13 April 2026. As requested, please find my objecting copy of my written statement [of case], as an objector to the Order, below.

I am affected by the proposed Stopping Up Orders on West Street and Western Avenue, Andover by Test Valley Borough Council and strongly object on the following grounds:

Having attended a number of meetings regarding the River Side Park Scheme and proposed changes to the road layout, it has become quite clear that the development of Western Avenue is not dependant on the stopping up order on West Street and Western Avenue. The scheme is quite capable of going ahead without it and all the disruption, added traffic, noise, pollution, danger, and queues it will bring.

By changing West Street to two way traffic, this will have a detrimental impact on the residents amenity, with a significant increase in traffic (doubling up affectively), including a large volume of buses which currently enter West Street to the bus station and then exit out onto Western Avenue, cars/taxis dropping people off at the bus station (in particular students who then make their way to Peter Symonds and Sparsholt Colleges), all traffic that currently enters into Lidl, not to mention the heavy good vehicles which drop off and pick up at Waitrose and Lidl (currently all HGVs for Lidl do not use West Street having their own provisions to facilitate this). In addition, there are the vehicles that go in and out of Portland Grove. Already a very busy area with residents parking, visitors, and deliveries. Another very real concern is how emergency services vehicles would get in and out of West Street quickly and smoothly. Chantry Lodge for example houses a large number of elderly residents and ambulances and cars used by district nurses are often parked nearby. Only the other day we had a suspected gas leak in Portland Grove, and a gas van was parked in the Grove and a Fire Engine was parked opposite along West Street and next to Chantry Lodge. It was there for some time and created a large queue of traffic. This has the potential to become grid lock if we make all the traffic loop and come back out of West Street. What would happen if we then needed other emergency vehicles on site? All of this extra traffic within West Street will have a detrimental impact on the residents of Portland Grove and Chantry Lodge. Surely this would justify refusing this order on these grounds alone?

The development proposal is supposed to enhance the amenity in the area, and as far as I can see it does not do so. This could still be achieved in other ways which are not only at a much lower cost but by retaining the current traffic layout in West Street and Western Avenue.

Currently there are taxi bays next to the bus station which assists people coming into the town centre, making use of the shops, bus station and supermarket. By removing these there will be a net loss of parking which I feel should be taken into consideration

and weighed against the proposed development of the new Riverside Park, which actually encourages people out of the town centre, not in it.

In addition to this, we have subsequently been informed of two further applications, Waitrose 69-70 Chantry Centre, [Andover](#), SP10 1LY variation to premises licence under S.34 Licensing Act 2003 – Ref: PREM/05/0285, and Lidl's Application to extend delivery hours to Midnight 6 days per week and 8pm on Sundays – Application No, 26/00577/VARN. Both of these further applications will also demonstrate additional traffic through West Street and for additional hours, causing further distress to residents if the stopping up order goes ahead. It might be worth noting, I have also sent objections to both of these requests on 8th April to Test Valley Borough Council. Please see attached.

I would be grateful if you could please take these objections into account.

Appendix – planning application objections:

We are residents of Portland Grove, and we would like to register our strongest objection to both of these applications:

Waitrose 69-70 Chantry Centre, Andover, SP10 1LY variation to premises licence under S.34 Licensing Act 2003 – Ref: PREM/05/0285

- We do not believe this application to be a “minor adjustment” as stated.
- The opening hours stated are not a true reflection of the “current” opening hours for this store They are not currently open 24 hours a day, 7 days per week. This is intentionally misleading.
- We are extremely concerned at the proposal to carry on business activities for 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. The current noise levels and disruption experienced by local residents from Waitrose are totally unacceptable and if the stopping up order does go ahead, thereby altering West Street from a one way to two way traffic system, this will only increase the disruption, pollution and noise levels even further as traffic, including deliveries, will now be required to turn and travel back again in close proximity to residential areas.
- The sale of alcohol for external consumption 24hrs a day, 7 days a week is totally unacceptable, especially within a very close residential area. We already have issues with antisocial behaviour in the town centre and surrounding outskirts, and this has the potential to only exacerbate these issues further. What controls would be put in place, there appears to be no mention of control measures or monitoring or indeed why S.172, which is the appropriate method for off sales, is not being considered here. We are extremely concerned that by allowing this to

go ahead, there will be no control at all of Waitrose's trading activities, and once control is lost it is incredibly difficult to get it back again.

- We do not understand or agree with the argument that compliance with planning conditions is relevant in this situation when determining a licensing application. What is the correlation?

Lidl's Application to extend delivery hours to Midnight 6 days per week and 8pm on Sundays – Application No, 26/00577/VARN

- Deliveries would be from West Street opposite Chantry Lodge and directly adjacent to Portland Grove. This would have a massive impact on the residents of both residential areas.
- The increase in noise, pollution and disruption, throughout the day and in particular so late into the night, would be intolerable, especially so if the stopping up order goes ahead in conjunction with the redevelopment of the proposed Riverside Park. This would mean all traffic which currently traverses a one-way system will move to a two-way system, effectively meaning all vehicles, including delivery lorries, having to arc and swing back close past our houses and apartments twice, and for even longer hours.
- The noise, lights and pollution are not to be underestimated. Not only do these make sleeping difficult currently, they make enjoyment of our small gardens and balconies almost impossible. Increasing the delivery times will only make this much worse for local residents.
- We do not have any faith with regards to how this would be monitored and what would be done to rectify the situation once residents inevitably start to tender their complaints. We were absolutely promised on multiple occasions when the old Leisure Centre was torn down and rebuilt that the current one would be soundproofed. It most certainly has not! Listen to the roller disco every Saturday, it is like attending a festival, it booms out and despite complaints nothing has ever been done about it. We pay our taxes and we should have a say on what happens within our local area and the impact changes will have on us.
- We have legitimate concerns regarding the increase in traffic. Entering and exiting Portland Grove is a nightmare at the best of times, and we often see queues of traffic being blocked up by delivery lorries. This not only means access to our property is impinged, it is also dangerous as emergency vehicles cannot get through, as witnessed just the other week when we had a potential gas leak and the van and fire brigade struggled to gain access.
- Large vehicles entering and exiting late at night also has the potential for increased accidents both to other vehicles and pedestrians.

We would be very grateful if you will consider these points most carefully before making any decision on both applications.