## PLANNING APPLICATION APP/22/00161 DEPUTATION TO PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING 30<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2022

This deputation to the planning committee meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2022, is made on behalf of all the neighbours to the development site and local residents who have objected to this scheme.

There have been over 20 objections, following common themes, which are addressed below.

## **PARKING**

There have been many objections on the grounds that unallocated parking provision would have detrimental effects on the neighbouring streets.

We believe that the HBC Parking SPD has been mis-applied here, and that parking should be provided on an allocated [Parking SPD Table 4a] basis, rather than an unallocated one [Table 4b]. Application of the correct table would lead to a requirement for 14 parking spaces.

The Parking SPD text gives further definition. At **paragraph 3.05**, it states with reference to reduced parking in town centres and other locations, that;

"The level of parking to be provided must be based on the nature and scale of development, access to shops and services together with public transport accessibility. A lower level of provision must not result in displacement of parking pressure into nearby residential areas. Utilising near-site parking in dedicated car parks (not on-street parking) should be considered together with demand based measures to reduce parking pressure".

We contend that reduced parking provision would lead to displacement of parking pressure into Alexandra Avenue, which is already under severe pressure from visitors to Mengham town centre and the beach.

At paragraph 3.06, the Parking SBD goes on to say that;

"On any site where a reduced level of parking provision is considered justified by the Local Planning Authority, the design and layout of the development must include a sufficient space for servicing, emergency services and medical personnel to park, loading and drop off, courier and supermarket deliveries. This should be provided as a single space, the size of which is related to the scale of the proposed development".

The application doesn't make such provision, and cannot for the size of site, given that parking is not permitted at the southern end of Alexandra Avenue.

At paragraph 3.07, the Parking SBD comments that;

"On any other site where a lower level of parking is proposed, this will be assessed on a caseby case basis. A justification would need to be provided which should consider accessibility to shops and services, accessibility to public transport and the site's relation to the relative accessibility of different areas set out in figure 3.1".

The officer's comments in the Report to Committee notes; "Officer Comment: The traffic team's initially comments [Requiring allocated parking provision] were withdrawn at their request, as they were based on allocated, not unallocated parking spaces, in accordance with Havant's Car Parking SPD".

No justification has been provided for unallocated parking, either in the officer's report, or elsewhere. If parking is unallocated on this development, people would not be able to find a space, and will look elsewhere. This will increase the number of vehicle movements to and from the development, by its two entrances. This will increase parking pressure in the northern half of Alexandra Avenue [the southern half is double yellow lined], but will also inevitably lead to illegal 'drop off' parking in the area of the development.

## SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT & ITS OVERBEARING NATURE, CHARACTER & APPEARANCE

The application has shrewdly been pitched as a Seafront development, but in reality it is a development on, and facing, Alexandra Avenue. The site's entrances face that road, as does the building itself. It doesn't sit with the remainder of the street, but dominates and overbears upon it.

Multiple views from the proposed development's many windows will intrude upon neighbours to such an extent that the amenity of those properties will be severely affected. Privacy in particular, will be severely diminished.

The officer's report relates the application's character to the neighbouring apartment development completed approximately 3 years ago. This is erroneous, as the portion facing the seafront is about ¼ of that facing Alexandra Avenue. Correctly viewed on this basis, the application does not respond to the local context.

## THE NEED FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT

The need for this development, in this location isn't proven. The neighbouring apartment development, completed approximately 3 years ago, has not fully sold, and the application's tenure is unclear. There is no affordable element to the residential provision, despite the requirements of local policy. If this to be the case, the justification for such an approach should be given publicly. It has not.

David Towse 28<sup>th</sup> June 2022