

Application No: 2018/3010/P
Consultees Name: [REDACTED]
Received: 23/07/2018 21:08:37
Comment: OBJ

Response:

Dear Mr Farrant,

I am writing in relation to the above application. I would refer you back to planning permission ref: 2017/0890/P and the subsequent appeal decision ref: 3186971.

The appellant has cited that the inspector for the above appeal decision, had considered the principle of the car park space acceptable and that there would be no further highway safety issues as a result, therefore there are no other issues now that an appropriate fence provision has been approved.

We contest this. The principle of providing a parking space on current garden/amenity space is resisted in Policy T2. It is our view that the Inspector has erred in his judgement here and the principle of the car parking space should not have been accepted. The appellants already had a parking space and they chose to omit this parking space by converting their garage space into living space. On this basis, any additional parking space should be considered a net increase as there was already adequate parking provision for the dwelling.

Policy T2, sub text (Boundary Treatment and Gardens) is explicit in that it states;

Developments seeking to replace garden areas and/or boundary treatments for the purposes of providing on-site parking will therefore be resisted.

The principle of giving up garden space for a net additional parking space is therefore not acceptable in policy or material terms.

We have had no justification from the applicant in terms of highways safety, visibility splays and the like and it is proposed that this is still a material consideration that needs to be appropriately address by highway engineers. The Inspector states that this issue is not decisive in its own right, however he acknowledges that is an issue. From the proposed design it is hard to see how there would not be safety concerns. The proposed shows and drive in and reverse out proposal. Reversing out onto the road with the new higher fence and a sliding door mechanism would mean reversing blind into the road and would cause a highway safety concern - that on its own would warrant a justifiable reason for refusal.

Finally, the Inspector rightly states that whether a parking space could be satisfactorily accommodated from a design point of view would be a matter for further discussions between the appellant and the Council.

This application forms this further discussion - and we see no reason why this application is acceptable. The loss of soft landscaping and garden use detracts from the visual appearance of the area, the positioning in the centre of the garden means that the entire garden would be compromised by the development. This detracts from an important element of the identity of the host dwellings and the estate. This is further compounded by the imposition of steps into the garden which would be an incongruous feature. The proposed location of a parking space in the centre of the garden would therefore significantly and detrimentally impact upon the character and identity of the area.

In light of the above, we would respectfully request that the application be refused. The principle of a new parking space is not accepted in principle, it would create highway safety issues and would detract significantly and detrimentally to the character and identity of the area.