



To: **Planning Reps**
From **Highways Development Management Officer**

Date 12th July 2022

Your Ref 20220583
Location Meopham Vets

This application is a little confusing, the application form and Planning Statement states the car parking will increase from

33 to 43 an increase of 10, yet drawing number 2118-TP-01 shows 49 an increase of 16.

http://gbc-law_web/Enterprise_LIVE/DC/Document/Document/ViewDocument?BrowserTabId=20220712054219566

Two of the disabled parking spaces are poorly located as the walking distance is further than it need be. Ideally spaces 16, to 19 should be reserved for the disabled, although this would reduce capacity slightly, alternatively 18 and 19 together with 20 and 21 would be appropriate with no loss of parking provision.

Looking at the proposal, there are no alterations in the clinics in the original building. The planning statement shows in paragraph 1.2.1 that the practice employs 46 staff and so as far as I can ascertain no additional staff will be employed as a result of development.

Looking at SPG4 the adopted but accepted dated car parking guidance. The car parking provision should be 1 space per 2 staff and four spaces per consulting rooms all being a maximum requirement. As the existing building and staff numbers are unchanged I shall only initially consider the extension in terms of new parking spaces. In terms of clinics the new treatment rooms are Euthanasia, physiotherapy and Endoscopy, the first and last are most unlikely to be in constant use and may well divert staff from other activities as there is no increase in numbers for these treatment rooms. So ten spaces are probably more than adequate for the increase in size, not the 16 shown on the plan. No allowance is considered necessary for the on call bedroom as this will be used when no other or limited staff are on site and the public would only attend in an emergency.

It is noted that photos have been submitted regarding potential parking issues with the current site, but these are very specific to adjacent to the entrance without the wider parking area being included. They were also taken on one visit, so do not provide an evidence base to make a judgement on. (People and cars are a constant).

The Google Satellite and Street View images do not suggest there to be a parking issue, so more evidence is required to support such a claim, or dispute it if the objectors to the proposals wish to support their comments. All photos should be dated and timed.

In terms of the sustainability of the site, there is limited information, at its simplest it would require a postcode analysis of existing clients, showing numbers and distance travelled. Ideally the hospital would then be located to provide the greatest benefit of minimising distance travelled to site for the majority of clients, given the list of districts served with the primary urban area to the north, this would probably be to the north of the current site.

Given that the application is not best supported in terms of the information submitted and the issue with the drawings, my conclusion is as follows;

1. The site at most only requires a maximum of 10 additional parking spaces, but 16 are shown on the drawing submitted.
2. There is insufficient information to make a judgement regarding the location being sustainable.
3. A condition is required to ensure a minimum of 2 secure cycle parking spaces are provided to comply with the requirements of SPG4, one space per two consulting rooms.
4. Two of the disable parking spaces are poorly located and should be positioned closer to the main entrance.

From a highway stance, I do not believe the proposal is ideal, but there is no highway reason to object, given the practice exists.

Les Seaborn

Highways Development Management Officer

Gravesham Borough Council