

This is an update to be read in conjunction with my objection recorded on the web site which I trust you find useful and which we have been in communication about in telephone calls and emails.

Relevant information.

1). Photo of activities conducted in St Nicholas Church. These are important for the community and attract pedestrian visits and traffic plus associated car parking using not only the car park of the building but the streets in the Belmont Estate. Additional traffic generated by the proposed planning application will have a detrimental effect upon the continuation of these activities. The traffic study makes no reference to these activities nor to the increase in traffic that will approach the site from the Hulbert Road junction. This is a significant omission and needs to be addressed by the applicant. Once a corrected planning application has been prepared then the public must be given the opportunity to comment upon the corrected information Photo attached.



2). The applicant has stated there is no residential part of the subject premises. This is untrue. See part 16 of the application which asks 'does your proposal include the gain, loss, or change of use of residential units' the answer given is 'no'. It is difficult for the applicant to explain this an oversight and I think that there is a deliberate attempt to mislead. There is large first floor of some 90 sq. meters being the former living accommodation of the building. The submitted drawings with application describe the new first floor as void and incorrectly states the first floor has 51.95 sq meters under a heading on the plan reading BOH. The information provided is fundamentally incorrect. As I have said this appears to be a deliberate attempt to mislead. Furthermore what does BOH really mean in terms of this application? In planning terms it has no defined meaning. The submitted plans contain substantially incorrect floor areas and need to be corrected and the public need to be able to comment on the corrected information. Floor areas should be stated in metric, and properly defined by reference to the recognised Code of Measuring Practice.

3). The distance from the entrance to the car park of the property to the junction with Hulbert Road via Belmont Grove and Queen Anne's Drive is less than 100 meters. The residential roads are narrow and at present frequently utilised by residents and activities referred to above at St Nicholas Church. It is obvious that there will be an increase in road traffic through these residential roads by visitors to the 'All Hours Supermarket'. There will be a rat run, congestion and danger. The traffic study needs to provide information which properly considers this alternative vehicular approach to the proposed 'All Hours Supermarket'. The complete study then needs to be reviewed by the Hampshire Highways and the public need to have that Consultee report in sufficient time to enable comment.

4). The floor areas of the existing building are accurately set out in the attached document which comes from the Valuation Office and is available from the Government's business rates web site. It accurately describes the commercial parts of the building and attaches values to them for rating. The measurements are stated as NIA which means net internal areas. It is notable that the EXISTING **net internal ground floor area** of this building is 243.98 sq meters. In addition there is a further 94.8 sq meters in the basement which the applicant has omitted to mention in the application document. The applicant has on its drawings stated the Gross internal ground floor is to be 3879 sq feet (which is 360.36 sq meters) but on the application form it says the new gross internal floor space is to be 455 sq meters. Which is it 360 or 455 of A1 floor space? Given there is no mention of the large basement (94.8 sq meters) at all and the intention to change the use of the 90.4 sq meters in the flat to a 'void' use the numbers suggest that by the time this development is complete the entire accommodation on the site may be well over 554 sq meters all potentially for A1 use. Given the whole application is for A1 use, (irrespective of correct floor areas and irrespective of the applicant's description of what they describe as 'sales'), the grant of consent would entitle the applicant to use the entirety as A1 retail floor space. (I accept this may not apply to the so called 'void' on the first floor, but that vacant first floor will remain as surplus space on the site and one can only assume it is being held in reserve for future expansion of the use). This becomes relevant to the studies submitted with the application as they are based upon the much smaller area of '2500 sq ft'. This is false accounting and the car parking resources need to be calculated by the amount of floor area described by the applicant as A1 which is 435 sq meters if the figures are indeed true. The traffic studies also need to be recalculated to reflect the fact that the shop is in fact much larger than the area that the applicant has designated as the trading area it intends to use.

5). It is important to note that the existing use of the application site is not A5 Take Away though the majority of trade has been of that nature, 70% according to the filed letter from the business which has been submitted to support the application. The substantial traffic already generated by this pre-existing Take Away trade is not permitted as it is no longer an ancillary use but has become the principal activity and the counting of the journeys as suggested by the traffic study is erroneous.

6). The car parking study submitted by the applicant states as follows;

4.12 Applying the below formula to the proposed store, 25 car parking spaces will be required as a minimum. The standard also states that 1 motorcycle space is to be provided for every 25 car parking spaces. This has been based on a 348m² GFA / 14m². Table 4.1 Parking Standards Land Use Car standard (minimum) Cycle standard (minimum) Long stay Short stay A1 Shops (food retail) 1 space per 14 sqm covered areas 1 space per 6 staff or 1 per 300 sqm GEA whichever is the greater 1 stand/ 200 sqm GEA

Firstly we do not have a figure for the *Gross external area*. We are given an entirely new floor area of 348 GFA. (what does GFA mean?)

I have already shown that the floor areas are spurious but based upon the Application form the Gross Internal Floor area for which A1 use is applied for is, as stated on the form 455 sq. meters, (potentially 360 sq meters if one references the plan which gives a different figure of GIA 3879 sq ft).

To calculate covered area from gross internal (I think covered area must mean Gross External Area) a rule of thumb is add 10% to the original. hence $455 + 45.5 = 500.1$ sq meters GEA (Possibly $360 + 36 = 396$ GEA if the plan is correct . If the formula provided is correct then the parking requirement for this store is over 28.2 and probably 35.75 for customers including staffparking for 20 full time employees .Given the incorrect and under stated floor areas in the application as a whole the numbers of full time staff may also be understated and needs to be confirmed together with the basis for that calculation.

The calculation for cycles is similarly miscalculated and more of the car park will be dedicated to accommodate that extra requirement. It is self evident the having tried to recalculate the parking needs there is a very significant shortfall.

It is unlikely there will be more than 18 car spaces for a development which should provide twice that number.

7). The traffic study has already been criticised by the Consultee responses and it must now be obvious from the detail I have set out above that a very large increase in traffic is going to be generated. A comprehensive study based on the truth is now required to enable the application to be properly considered. The public need to be able to review the revised information if the consultation process is to have been carried out with proper procedural process.

Some people may like the initial idea of this development but the neighbourhood of Bedhampton will realise their folly if such a substantial 'All Hours Supermarket' is allowed to effectively dominate two key access points leading into the Belmont residential area, ie the junction on the already very busy Bedhampton Road (the western approach road into and away from Havant), and the junction at the intersection of Queen Anne's Drive, Park Lane, Scratchface Lane and the very busy Hulbert Road. There will be significant danger to pedestrians, particularly the children who currently walk to the local infant and primary schools, to those walking to the bus stops of which there are four nearby(within 250 meters), on either sides of the road, one pair on Bedhampton Road, one pair on Havant Road(Lester Avenue), a third pair on Hulbert Road just above the Park Lane/ Queen Anne's/ Scratchface Lane intersection and the fourth pair on Park Lane near the Baptist Church and Post Office. The school crossing patrol bears witness to the high movement of children needing help to cross Hulbert Road at that dangerous intersection, just 100 meters from the proposed 'All Hours Supermarket . Children and elderly also cross both the Bedhampton Road and Havant Road on walks to and from Bidbury Mead Park where there are sporting activities such as football and cricket, the Bowling Club, a valuable childrens playground and onward access to the Broadmarsh water front, especially popular with dog walkers. There will a substantial increase in danger to pedestrians, cyclists and motorised vehicles due to the conflict between traffic seeking to turn across the traffic flows at both the Belmont Road/ Bedhampton Road (B 2177 western approach road into Havant from the A3M/ A27 Rusty Cutter Roundabout) and the Queen Anne's Drive/ Park Lane/ Scratchface Lane intersection with the Hulbert Road(B2150).

Given the considerable failings in the application it is my view that consultation process has been invalidated since the deficiencies have failed to provide the public with the genuine basis for proper assessment of the proposed development. The applicant therefore should either be required to withdraw the proposal and present their proposal again or refused.

I must add that if this were to proceed without the true, accurate and complete information being presented and available for public comment I would consider that to be an abuse of process and would seek a formal review.

However I suspect the analysis I have set out above will help to bring this matter into proper focus and hope you will keep me fully informed of the intended actions to be taken to address my concerns.

If you have any questions then do not hesitate to email or ring me.

[Skip to main content](#)



[Find your business rates valuation](#)

beta This is a new service – your [feedback](#) will help us to improve it.

[Back](#)

[Sign in](#) | [Register](#)

Imperial Palace 37, Belmont Grove, Havant, Hants, PO9 3PT

1 April 2017 - present

Your rateable value is £24,250.00

! Warning This is not the amount you will pay.

[Open all sections](#)

[Valuation information](#)

Description	Restaurant and premises
Local authority	Havant
Local authority reference	001064
Base rate	£100.00
Basis of measurement	NIA
Transitional relief certificate issued	No
Valuation scheme reference	392804
Special category code	234G
Effective date	1 April 2017

[How the valuation was calculated](#)

Parts of the property

Floor	Description	Area m ² /unit	Price per m ² /unit	Value
Ground	Restaurant	180.6	£100.00	£18,060.00
Ground	Office	7.1	£70.00	£497.00
Ground	Public toilets	11.06	£50.00	£553.00
Ground	Public toilets	17.8	£50.00	£890.00
Ground	Kitchen	27.42	£70.00	£1,919.00

Floor	Description	Area m ² /unit	Price per m ² /unit	Value
Basement	Store	40.4	£25.00	£1,010.00
Basement	Store	54.4	£25.00	£1,360.00
Total		338.78		£24,289.00
Total value			£24,289.00	

[Similar properties](#)

[I have a question about my valuation](#)

► Get help with this page.

Support links

[Help](#)

[Feedback](#)

[Cookies](#)

[Terms and conditions](#)

[Privacy](#)

OGL All content is available under the [Open Government Licence v3.0](#), except where otherwise stated

© Crown copyright