

1. Parking shortfall cannot be solved by paving front lawn adjacent to walkway without highway access, except over private property.
2. Conflicting parking information from both applications stated by Mr Goddard causing confusion. (Highways 6.13)  
 05/08/20 **"2 parking places for each dwelling"**  
 07/09/20 (final statement) **"the plans do not change my previous comments 2 parking spaces for each dwelling... results in on street parking adversely affecting road safety and traffic flow"**  
 22/09/20 **" Thank you Emma for your phone call, I understand the existing dwelling already has a parking shortfall that would be reduced by the reduction in size from 4 bedrooms to 3. Therefore I cannot object to the existing shortfall."**

*The dwelling was always to be reduced from 4 to 3, why was this overlooked by Mr Goddard?*  
 This meant as 4 spaces required, 1 vehicle had to be parked on the highway in contradiction to the decision above.

Subsequently this last minute change and emails were a material consideration in the prediction of this second proposal. (Confirmed by Mr Vickers in his Design statement) It appears that 3 parking spaces are now fully acceptable (confirmed on Pg1 of design statement) What caused this decision change?

Furthermore pg11 design statement quotes **"there is enough space within the front garden to accommodate 3 spaces but on balance it is proposed to provide the additional spaces off site"**. Presumably it is now acceptable for 2 cars to be parked on the highway . Another decision change?

3. Mr Goddard requests (Consultation response 18/02/20) should planning be granted **"a construction management plan would need to be included"**

Where is it?

Need to see this plan BEFORE planning decision to show the following conditions will make it impossible for this building to be completed.

- \* access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel.
- \* storage areas
- \*site waste management plan
- \* drainage control measures
- \*access / protection arrangements for public
- \* point of contact / complaints procedures.

The only para 8.1 condition 3 regarding construction is times when work can occur.

4. Para 8.1 Condition 4 Mr Butler's report **"thereafter the parking and turning spaces shall be kept available for parking and manoeuvring at all times."**

This condition cannot be met as there is insufficient turning space (see Parish Council Report 04/02/21 with measurements done on site rather than virtually) without using privately owned land outside the curtilage of 18 Sandhills Way. In conjunction with this if it's impossible for smaller vehicles how will plant equipment manoeuvre within the same curtilage space in order to access and egress the 27 metres from the highway over private land.

5. The private forecourt is for traversing to access / egress a garage. This was granted in 1972 and is in the deeds of the properties. As the only garage in 18 Sandhills Way is to be

removed, the arrangement is no longer applicable. It never was and is still not an access / egress arrangement for plant machinery for a new build.