

Appeal Ref	APP/W1715/W/25/3368160
LPA Ref	F/25/99109
Email	ebcplanningsupport@eastleigh.gov.uk

The Planning Inspectorate
Tempel Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

FAO: Caroline Tranter

05 August 2025

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Appeal By: Danny Thompson

Site Address: 1 Gatcombe Gardens, West End, Southampton, Hampshire, SO18 3NA

Appeal Reference: APP/W1715/W/25/3368160

With reference to the above planning appeal, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) are of the opinion that the majority of issues raised are covered in the Reasons for Refusal contained within the LPA's Decision Notice dated 23 June 2025 and the Case Officer's Delegated Report, and would therefore ask that the appointed Inspector take these documents, which have been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the completed questionnaire, as the LPA's Statement of Case together with the following comments in relation to the matters raised within the Appellant's Statement of Case.

Response to the Appellant's Statement of Case

It is noted that the Appellant makes reference within their Statement of Case to a planning approval granted by Fareham Borough Council (Ref: P/25/0408/CU) for the use of an outbuilding at a residential property for a flexible use incorporating a personal training business. Whilst this is noted, the LPA would highlight that each case must be considered on its own merits, in the context within which it falls and on the grounds of its specific and particular impacts, and that the granting of planning permission within one context does not in itself justify consent being given in another.

For example, it is noted that the property within the Fareham Borough that is referred to is not situated on a corner plot in close proximity to a roundabout where there is considered to be more potential for overflow parking to be obstructive and to compromise highway safety. In addition, it is also noted that the suggested number of clients per day (5) and, notably, the hours of operation of that particular business (0700-1900), were less extensive than those proposed as part of the appeal scheme which now suggests a limit of 6 clients per day and has hours of operation of between 0630 and 2030, therefore extending further into the early morning and evening period when, as noted within the Case Officer's Delegated Report, neighbouring residents would have more of an expectation for a greater level of peace and quiet.

The Appellant has suggested that conditions to limit the level of usage and activities on site could appropriately control the use such that this could be considered acceptable in planning terms, with the aforementioned Fareham Borough Council decision being referred to as justification in this regard. The Appellant has, as part of their appeal submission, thereby put forward a suggested list of restrictions (as set out within the Appellant's draft planning conditions) which now, amongst other things, include a limit on the number of sessions per day, as well as the introduction of a 10-minute interval between sessions which had not been proposed at the application stage.

Whilst the LPA would continue to express reservations regarding the effectiveness and enforceability of such restrictions, for example, a limited 10 minute period between sessions would not necessarily prevent a client overlap in the event of a client arriving moderately early and a session slightly overrunning, in any event and even if the appointed Inspector was minded to accept such controls would meet the relevant tests for planning conditions, the LPA would maintain that the impacts associated with the intensity of usage and hours of use suggested would be harmful to both amenity and highway safety as explained in detail within the Case Officer's Delegated Report.

With regards to the highway related implications, the Appellant suggests that up 12 vehicle movements per day associated with the use (if a limit of 6 sessions per day was imposed) would be comparable to or less than a typical multi-car household. The LPA would dispute this statement. Indeed, the most recent National Travel Survey conducted by the Department for Transport (2023) found that the average number of car trips undertaken per person per year was 548, with 363 being as a driver and 185 as a passenger. This equates to 1.5 trips per person per day. The latest data published by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) reports that the average UK household size was 2.35 residents per household in 2024.

A basic calculation using these statistics would give an average total household vehicle trip rate figure of 3.525 trips per day by its occupants. Even allowing for a modest allowance for visitors or deliveries which may occur in addition to this, the overall movements associated with an average household would still be notably less than could be potentially generated by the use proposed as part of this appeal. It should also be noted that such trips would be above and beyond those associated with the household at the application dwelling, which would remain in residential use, and collectively there would thereby be a markedly greater number of movements than would be expected within a residential location, particularly within a cul-de-sac where such movements are more limited. Such movements would, as explained within the Case Officer's Delegated Report, be considered to result in an unacceptable level of disturbance to neighbouring occupiers, to the detriment of their amenity.

The data referred to is available in full at: [NTS 2023: Car availability and trends in car trips - GOV.UK](#) and [Families and households in the UK - Office for National Statistics](#) with an extract of the relevant sections included within Appendix 1 (See Chart 20) and Appendix 2 (See Section 2, Page 6 of the PDF) to this letter for the Inspector's ease of reference.

In terms of parking, the proposals incorporate the provision of an additional car parking space on the property frontage on an area currently laid to grass, which the Appellant has proposed would be a dedicated space for clients, thereby, they have suggested, eliminating the need for on-street parking. The LPA would contest this. As noted above, it is not considered that a 10-minute interval between appointments as now suggested would be sufficient to prevent a potential crossover of clients, whereby vehicles would then need to park on the public highway.

In addition, it would be highlighted that the loss of the garage at the property has in itself reduced the parking provision available for the main dwelling to 2 spaces. The Council's standard for 4-bedroom properties as set out within its adopted Residential Parking Standards SPD (see Appendix 3, Page 13) is for 3 on-plot spaces and, as referenced within the Case Officer's Delegated Report, it was noted on the date of the Case Officer's site visit (which was at a time when no training sessions were in the process of being carried out) that the area of frontage in question was already being used informally for parking purposes. As such, the LPA would maintain that there would be an insufficiency of parking provision and, thereby, a risk of overspill parking which, given the position of the site within the cul-de-sac and adjacent to the Townhill Way Roundabout, would not be welcomed in this location and would create a highway safety risk.

Conclusion

As set out within the Council's Decision Notice dated 23 June 2025 and the accompanying Case Officer's Delegated Report, and which are further supported by the contents of this letter, there is a clear conflict between the proposal and the Policies within the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 (in particular DM1, DM8 and DM14), as a result of which it is clear that the proposal does not accord with the development plan for the purposes of Section 70(2) and 79(4) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Planning permission should therefore be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In this respect, it is acknowledged that the appeal development would have some economic and social benefits in terms of supporting a local business as well as providing for an exercise facility which can promote health and wellbeing. These benefits would not, however, outweigh the harm identified in relation to amenity and highway safety that would arise from the proposals and the conflict with the development plan in these regards. The LPA remain of the view, therefore, that the adverse impacts of the development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework as a whole.

There are no other material considerations that outweigh the conflict with the development plan and, therefore, the LPA respectfully requests that the Inspector dismisses this appeal. Should the Inspector, however, be minded to grant permission, the LPA would request that the conditions set out in Appendix 4 be included as part of the approval.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "N Parker", written over a horizontal line.

Nicholas Parker
Planning Manager

List of Appendices:

- APPENDIX 1: Car Availability and Trends in Car Trips
- APPENDIX 2: Families and Households in the UK _ ONS
- APPENDIX 3: Residential Parking Standards SPD
- APPENDIX 4: Local Planning Authority Suggested List of Planning Conditions