

----- Original Message -----

From:

To: Democratic.services@southampton.gov.uk

Sent: Monday, 23 Jan, 2023 At 15:41

Subject: SUBMISSIONS RE APPLICATION NUMBER 22/01188/FUL 6 CROFTON CLOSE SOUTHAMPTON COMMITTEE HEARING TUESDAY 24 JANUARY 2023

To The Planning Committee

I refer to my previous objection to this Application. I see this is recommended for Conditional Approval. I wish to make further observations on matters referred to in the Officer's Report. These mainly relate to parking – and the impact that this development would have on the character and amenity of Crofton Close – issues highlighted by Planning Inspectors on appeals relating to the neighbouring property - 5 Crofton Close.

The proposal here would create a house with 6 bedrooms – 5 of them doubles, with 3 ensembles, lending itself to a large number of adult occupants (up to 11 - even if within the same family) and a correspondingly large number of cars (5 or 6?). This raises real issues regarding parking and amenity.

Number of on-site spaces. The Report states that there will be 4 spaces available – the garage plus 3 spaces on the driveway. However, the garage is behind the end parking space on the driveway. It cannot realistically be expected that any of the occupiers will want to use the garage as their “day to day” parking space – they would run the risk of being blocked in by other occupiers parking on the drive. The realistic useable everyday spaces would be limited to the 3 spaces, not 4 (the 3 spaces on the drive).

Additional cars will therefore have to park elsewhere. The Report refers to the property complying with the minimum parking standard of 3 parking spaces. However that standard is presumably aimed at reducing pressure on other on-street parking resources **where other on-street parking is in fact available**. In other words, it is addressing a scenario where other on-street parking IS available nearby (but the aim of the policy is to limit use of such other **available** parking). Here the position is very different. In Crofton Close there is **no** other on-street parking available. Therefore additional cars from number 6 would have to park either on the narrow road (likely causing an obstruction) or, far more likely, on the pavement. The Inspector in the Appeal Decision for no 5 (the neighbouring property) said (of **this section** of estate Road) in paragraph 11 of his Decision letter dated 14 November 2017, *“Moreover, given the nature of the layout and the fairly narrow estate road there is an unacceptable likelihood of the displaced vehicle being parked on the pavement. Later in the same paragraph the Inspector says “Furthermore it seems to me that additional on-street parking would result in a sense of visual clutter in the streetscene, detracting from the attractive open character.”* Those comments apply with equal force to this application.

Finally there is the issue of precedent – highlighted by each of the Planning Inspectors on previous appeals – and in particular its adverse impact on parking. In paragraph 17 of the same Decision Letter the Inspector concluded that *“Although unacceptable anyway, in itself, for the reasons given, I share the concern of local residents with regard to precedent. Allowing the appeal may well result in significant future pressure from other occupants to carry out similar development **without making adequate car parking provision** [emphasis added]. This would result in further harmful effects.*

Without intending any disrespect, having carefully read the Report to this Committee I do not consider that it took account of the above issues (contrary to the approach of previous Planning Inspectors) and I urge this Panel to refuse the Application.

Thank you for your time.

M Howarth (Crofton Close)