

Planning Statement - amendment

Scale

The footprint is practically identical, compared to the approved scheme, rather than being, “slightly larger” as the proposal had it.

Parking:

Instead of the approved two spaces arranged as a tandem/layby arrangement, it is proposed to provide them side-on to the highway, making use of the existing flint roadside walling, maintaining the existing vernacular (as opposed to the garage previously proposed).

The proposal is to retain some 6m of the existing high roadside wall, to the same extent that the garage would have retained it. The site plan shows two parking spaces occupying the locations that they would in the previously-proposed garage, thereby allowing the turning area to give the same safe access to the highway that I had evidenced in the Planning Statement.

Comment:

I have often come up against contradictory objections that:

1. Any development puts a strain on parking in the road
2. Excavating for provision of parking spoils the look of the road (by creating a gap).

This proposal successfully both retains almost half the roadside wall (i.e. retains, "the look"), and takes two cars off the limited roadside parking nearby.

Peter Champion

Champion Associates Ltd



8 February 2024