

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

LPA Reference: F/25/99109

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

Response to LPA Comments on Appeal Case

Introduction

We thank the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for their comments set out in their letter of 5 August 2025.

This response addresses only the specific points raised by the LPA, without introducing new evidence, and should be read alongside our original Statement of Case.

Our position remains that the proposed use can operate without harm to residential amenity or highway safety when controlled through appropriately worded planning conditions, conditions which the LPA themselves have suggested in Appendix 4 of their submission.

1. Comparable Planning Approvals

We acknowledge the LPA's point that each case must be determined on its own merits. Our reference to the Fareham Borough Council approval was not intended to claim direct equivalence, but rather to demonstrate that similar small-scale, one-to-one personal training uses have been deemed acceptable under suitable operational restrictions.

As stated in our Statement of Case: *"This demonstrates that such planning conditions and controls are both practical and enforceable."*

The LPA refers to the conditions agreed by Fareham Borough Council as being less extensive than those we have proposed. However, their own suggested Planning Conditions in Appendix 4 do not deviate from what we have put forward, which indicates that they would, in fact, consider these conditions adequate.

2. Planning Conditions

The LPA notes the late submission of our suggested planning conditions. As explained in the introduction to our Statement of Case, we acknowledge that our choice of planning agent, MDT Design, did not assist our early dialogue with the LPA. The application was submitted by this agent, who did not suggest including a statement with our original application.

We followed the advice of our agent, who, as we have since learned, has more of an architectural than a planning background. This is why we later sought to engage directly with the LPA to discuss potential conditions that could address concerns and ensure the application would suit all parties.

Our email to the LPA included as Appendix 7 of our Statement of Case, set out proposed conditions. This was rejected on the basis that the LPA did not consider such conditions appropriate.

3. Car Parking

The LPA disputes our position that a dedicated client parking space, combined with a 10-minute interval between sessions, would prevent overspill parking on the public highway.

The LPA also states that the loss of the garage has reduced on-site parking provision by two spaces. However, the conversion of a garage can be carried out under permitted development rights. If the LPA wishes to restrict such conversions, it would need to amend its approach to permitted development policy.

Furthermore, the LPA or local council cannot control where members of the public park, provided it is in accordance with parking regulations. There are no double yellow lines or parking restrictions outside 1 Gatcombe Gardens.

The LPA states that a 10-minute interval may not prevent a crossover, we are open to discussions around what they feel would be, in the attempt to provide a solution that is satisfactory to all.

We reiterate that the Highways Authority raised **no objection** to our application and supported it on the basis of the dedicated client parking provision.

Conclusion

In light of the above, we maintain that the proposed use can operate without detrimental impact on residential amenity or highway safety, particularly with the safeguards provided by the planning conditions already suggested.

We respectfully request that the Inspector gives weight to:

- The absence of objection from the Highways Authority;
- The practical and enforceable nature of the proposed conditions; and
- The fact that our operational approach has been specifically designed to address concerns about disturbance and parking.

We trust that this response clarifies our position and addresses the points raised by the LPA.