

We already have all staff fully parked. Either in a legally binding 5 year lease for 5 of the staff parking spaces or the garage within the property itself and any additional staff have parking within the pay and display car park or they cycle or walk or catch a bus to work. So it is only the patients we are talking about here. And as we are all aware there is a very large pay and display car park within 200 metres.

Should the need arise we have parking for staff completely sorted as we have:-

patients drives- within 350 metres we have 6 drives (without even asking many people or advertising for them) which would happily rent a space for daytime parking for staff. It is akin to <https://www.yourparkingspace.co.uk> but a privately arranged equivalent.

We also have 2 farms which could be an additional back up for staff parking on their yard if required 0.4miles and 0.5miles away. Staff could park there at the beginning of the day and people could car share from there to work or they could simply walk or get a taxi.

We are very happy and comfortable that all staff are parked appropriately and safely and if the council wishes to put a stipulation into the planning regarding this then I am more than happy to accept it.

Like I previously said we have the backing and support of the businesses of Cleadon and many many residents, apart from the single objector. You also have letters of support from people who live on Windermere/and the adjacent streets behind the practice. They voted not to have the parking permit scheme twice in the last 6 months and they appreciate that our patients do not park irresponsibly.

The numbers of people travelling by car in a single day is limited, patient parking should not be a concern as we have available parking on Front Street and we refund parking charges from the Britannia Toby Inn Car Park. We also know they park responsibly as we refund the charges for the pay and display car park.

We have the backing of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who both fully support the practice and this planning application. They and the businesses of Cleadon appreciate that 42% of visits to the practice include a visit to other businesses in Cleadon which is important to protect, as 2 businesses closed during Covid and have not reopened.

I noticed the single complainant made a reference to a patient of the practice parking on their driveway! We have telephoned all female patients and spoken to over 95% of the female patients from 1/2/23 and we have been able to establish that it is none of those patients which parked on anyone's drive or was remonstrated with. I would be grateful if the objector could give us an approximate time as to when the incident occurred and an approximate age ( within 20 years) and how the person was identified as a patient of the practice.

As per our website we do reserve the right not to see patients if there is irresponsible parking when attending the dental practice so if the objector contacts us with further information then we will not see the patient again.

I note that the highway authority which in previous applications has made no or very little comment this time has

made extensive comments, and then not supplied the information to us to back up their comments made despite being asked.

From email dated 28/2/23 to the officer

As for:

*'This is notwithstanding the inconvenience and remote locations of the private car parks compared to conveniently located designated on-street parking and residential streets as a comparison under the present arrangement.'*

Rebuttal:

I am not sure which inconvenient or remote locations of private car parks the officer is referring to as they are within a 2 minute walk!

*continued and/or increased indiscriminate parking on residential streets*

Rebuttal:

I am not aware of continued or indiscriminate parking on residential streets could the officer be very specific with instances over the last 2 years when it has occurred.

*Resident's complaints regarding parking problems within residential streets have been significant over the last two years, giving an indication that there is a parking problem in the vicinity of the site.*

Rebuttal:

I would be grateful if the officer could specify how many complaints and by how many individuals have been made in the last 2 years and as a comparison how many have been made in each of the previous 5 years.

—

In the temporary application ST/0977/20/VC I note that the officer stated since the dental practice opened with two treatment rooms on 02/11/2019, there is no substantive evidence to suggest that it has caused any congestion on the highway to the detriment of highway safety as a result of indiscriminate car parking.

And also stated

It is considered that a temporary planning permission in this case would accord with Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 21a-014-20140306 of National Planning Policy Guidance which states that circumstances where a temporary permission may be appropriate include where a trial run is needed in order to assess the effect of the particular development on the area —dated 15/2/21.

The officer has still not disclosed any substantive evidence to suggest the dental practice has caused any congestion on the highway to the detriment of highway safety as a result of indiscriminate car parking.

—

There is a national and local shortage of dental appointments so if this application was refused then it would exacerbate an already fragile situation locally.

We take pride that we serve the Cleadon community and listen to the community and they support us, if the community decided there was a problem they would have said something and they haven't, they support us.