

## **20/02861/FUL - Land at 18 Sandhills Way**

### **Statement to be read at Eastern Area Planning Committee 10<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

I refer to extracts from the previous (refused) application and the current application, which are annexed for convenience of reference but do not contribute to the 500 word count.

I remain of the view that this application should be refused on the basis of:

#### **Parking Provision:**

The previous application was refused on grounds of parking provision, with the Highways Officer citing Policy P1:

*“Two car parking spaces are required for each dwelling”.*

The same Highways Officer in the current application somehow concludes that he cannot object to the application:

*“there is just one existing car parking space on the existing driveway. Therefore, there is an existing parking shortfall of two car parking spaces for the existing dwelling. With this dwelling being reduced from four bedrooms to three, the car parking shortfall is in turn being reduced from two to one.”*

The conclusion that he cannot object on the basis of parking is erroneous based on his own contradictory statement as there is still manifestly a shortfall in the plans of one parking space.

There is an attempt to deal with this in the Planning Officer’s report (though, notably, the wording is not attributable to the Highways Officer in his report):

*“...which in the light of surrounding available communal parking, he considers will be satisfactory and not cause harm to the wider locality.”*

The Highways Officer admitted to not attending the site due to Covid, therefore how can an effectual assessment be made to justify this statement? With respect to any officer visits that take place during office hours (or when the Google vehicle/ satellite passes), they are not going to witness the increasing problem with parking in the area – they need to visit during the evening or at weekends to see that residents have resorted to parking on grass verges because of the lack of communal spaces.

The in excess of 25 objections of the local residents that widely cite parking as a major issue in the locality should be regarded as reliable and it would appear that the current plans still breach Council Planning Policy P1 and should be refused (and by the look of case law, this is not an exceptional circumstance).

#### **Garden size:**

SPD Quality Design recommends gardens of 100sqm.

The current plans are in breach of this recommendation. The current application should be refused.

#### **Character:**

Sandhills Way is a traffic free location. Seeing cars on the frontage of one of the properties would be a prominent and incongruous feature and erode the fundamental feature of Sandhills Way. I would suggest that, contrary to the Planning Officer’s report, it completely justifies the merit in rejecting the application.