

From: Neave, Robert
Sent: 09 September 2015 12:55
To: Daphney Haywood
Subject: RE: Acolaid Case APP/15/00836

Good Afternoon Daphney,

I have reviewed the comments outlined below, I do not consider the matters raised change my view that the revised Travel Plan for London Road, Havant is acceptable.

I entrust the above is clear however please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Regards

Robert Neave
Transport Planner
Strategic Transport
Economy, Transport & Environment
2nd Floor, Ell Court West, The Castle, Winchester, SO23 8UD

From: Daphney Haywood
Sent: 09 September 2015 12:34
To: Neave, Robert
Subject: FW: Acolaid Case APP/15/00836
Importance: High

Robert

Pl see below.

Could you please be aware of these concerns in respect to your response on the revised travel plan

Best regards

Daphney Haywood
Havant Borough Council,
Public Service Plaza,
Civic Centre Road,
Havant,
Hampshire.
PO9 2AX

Web: www.havant.gov.uk

Please note my usual work days are Monday, Wednesday and Thursday

From: David Crichton
Sent: 09 September 2015 12:17
To: Daphney Haywood
Subject: RE: Acolaid Case APP/15/00836
Importance: High

Many thanks for this.

Although I accept that we have now exhausted all avenues for modifying this project there are a number of points which should be noted for when, as the expression goes, 'the solids hit the air conditioning'...

As I know you are aware, my issues are not with your department and the technical process of planning. While we do have some differences about certain aspects of the process – mainly the acceptance as precedent of a permission given four years ago under totally different traffic circumstances – the real issues are the impact on the community and the changes in circumstance that will affect the residents over a period of years. This is why I still believe the application should have gone to the DMC where these matters could have been tested.

The new Travel Plan is still inconsistent and does not actually address the issues we have raised and in particular what I have noted above.

First, section 2.3 refers to the 'active elderly'. That may be the case when residents first move in (although it does imply a rather unusual screening process!) but does not allow for deteriorating health over a period of years (as has been the case at Victory Court) when an increasing number of carers and other visiting support staff (e.g. hairdressers, chiropodists and similar) will need access; these will definitely need car parking close by which is why there is still both apprehension (and annoyance) in Beaconsfield Road. It also raises the intriguing thought that they may simply ship out the now-decrepit when the time arrives...

May I also suggest you read section 4.4 very carefully as on the one hand it refers to 'ownership levels will be low' and then goes on to suggest the use of residents' own vehicles for a car sharing scheme! Given that there will be only four available spaces at times (Lodge Manager and Guest Suite using others) it is clear that these vehicles cannot be left permanently on site (unless there are two or three altruistic residents who will be pleased to provide services for the rest...). The issue we have raised on both Planning Applications therefore remains as there is no alternative permanent parking available in the area.

I do not want to go on too long on this but I wanted both to thank you for your considerable assistance (and patience) through this process and also to give you early warning on the likely storms ahead...

Best wishes,

David