

APPLICANT RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Hayling Garage, 2-4 Church Road, Hayling Island

Local Planning Authority Reference: APP/20/00315

Planning Inspectorate Reference: APP/X1735/W/20/3264502

This document has been produced to address some inaccuracies in the response of from the local planning authority all numbering reflects the numbering of the local authority document provided.

Focus is on section 6 planning considerations

6.5

The applicant statement clearly shows how parking would be addressed to ensure the situation was the same or better than current parking arrangements by reducing sales spaces to provide the required parking for the new bay

6.8

At no point in the applicants statement does it refer to 'historical parking issues' This implies that the applicant considers there to be parking issues, which it does not. The business has run successfully for many years with very few issues with neighbours and parking.

The phrase used was 'they (the council) seems to be utilising this application to address what they see as historical parking practices'

The statement used therefore gives an inaccurate view of this point.

6.8

The reference to a parking plan not being provided is incorrect, it was provided as part of the submission and can still be seen on the planning portal in transferred applications (date marked as being submitted with the application), this was pointed out to the case officer who admitted that it had not been downloaded by the LPA from the portal when the application was processed. We were told by the case officer that this plan was acceptable.

The planning officer did dispute that one of the parking spaces was slightly too small so we agreed that an additional space could be provided if it was decided this was the case. (one further reduction in sales spaces.)

In addition the general comment that the parking at site would be 'further intensified' by the proposal seems to ignore the fact that required spaces can be provided for the proposal suggested as sales spaces would be reduced to allow the required parking. Therefore, this is not the case.

As previously stated the LPA seem to be trying to target previous historical parking practices rather than considering those proposed within the application.

6.8

The LPA states that the proposal would remove existing parking spaces, as stated previously, this area has been used for the external servicing of cars for many years and as such has just bought that process under cover, it has had no impact on parking spaces, the reality is by satisfying the parking requirements of the planning process the likely outcome will be to improve parking due to the designation of non sales spaces.

6.9

This photo is a historic moment in time and not a benchmark for the general rates of parking on site

6.10

We do not believe the description of the site as 'mainly residential' is accurate as per our appeal statement. In addition and within the context of the Coop building and Smith and Austin Industrial units, we do not consider it to be overly bulky

6.13

The council seem to be stating that the existing structure is not in keeping with any existing precedent however the revised application being appealed is not for the existing building it is for a lowered structure with revised external finishes, many of the changes made (from the original application) were to address the LPAs initial concerns.