

Dear Mr Taylor

**Re: Planning Application: 13/01615/REM - RIDGEWAY FARM, COMMON PLATT, LYDIARD MILLICENT, PURTON, SN5 4JT**

I write to re-state my objection to the original and now the revised plans.

My objection to the original application was based on the planned number of parking bays not complying with Wiltshire's own requirements. I now note that my objection has not only been disregarded, it has been treated with contempt since the number of planned parking bays has been reduced by 16 rather than increased by the 91 shortfall in the original plans. This now equates to a 21% shortfall. The Wiltshire Local transport plan on page 27 states:

**7.5** Based on surveys in other local authority areas, anecdotal evidence in Wiltshire and the results of the public consultation, the council has decided not to include garages as part of the allocated parking provision except where there are overriding design considerations. In these exceptional circumstances, the council will require design statements and/or transport assessments to demonstrate the need for such provision and/or to set-out the role of alternatives (e.g. car ports which are unlikely to be used for storage and could therefore count towards allocated parking provision).

I have tried over the last few months to get copies of the '*design statements*', '*transport assessments*' or '*alternatives*' as noted in the above clause, with no success. I would point out that your own guidelines state '*e.g. car ports which are unlikely to be used for storage*' – this is an acknowledgement of a typical use of a garage. Councillor Lay has told me I can find the justification in the following documents:

[Design and Access Statement Page 47.](#)

[Planning Supporting Statement Page 9 Para 4.16 and Appendix 4 Consultation Response Summary Page 2 of the schedule; first row of that table on page 2.](#)

[Parking Matrix Schedule.](#)

[Vehicle Tracking Layout.](#)

Well here is what they say:

1. The 'design and access statement' produced by Taylor Wimpey on page 47 (titled 'parking strategy') simply states they will comply with your guidelines. Since they do not, am I to assume this statement is simply a typo or something more cynical?

#### PARKING STRATEGY

A parking provision of 1 space per 1 bed dwelling; 2 spaces per 2 and 3 bed units, and; 3 spaces for 4 beds and above has been applied to the site.

In addition to this 1 parking space will be provided for every 5 dwellings, as visitor parking spaces. This is in accordance with Wiltshire Council's parking guidelines.

2. The planning supporting statement (paragraph 4.16 below) simply refers me to the parking matrix, which is the document I have used to determine the 21% shortfall and so adds no value to the argument. This statement of course is referring to issue 1 of the parking matrix. Since issue 3 has reduced the number, I assume this document has also been updated – I cannot find the update on your web site.

- 4.16 Access and carparking provision for the proposed first phase development, including temporary construction access, is detailed on application plans listed in Appendix 2. Carparking provision is summarised on the submitted carparking schedule (referenced '0484-102 Parking Matrix'). A total of 580 carparking spaces are to be provided, comprising 533 on-plot spaces (including 123 garages) and 47 spaces within the road network. The dimensions and access to carparking spaces and garages are demonstrated on the submitted vehicle tracking plans.

3. Below is the reference to appendix 4. The answer states it “*satisfies car parking requirements for the development and meets council requirements*” – it does not. It then goes on to say that the garages will be fit for purpose – meaning the structure called a ‘garage’ will be big enough for a car. I do not see how this satisfies the ‘*exceptional circumstance*’ clause in your guidelines since stating a structure is fit for purpose cannot be called ‘*exceptional*’. Your guidelines also make a point of car ports being unlikely to be used for storage. A fit for purpose garage can and will also be used for storage. Isn’t this why your guidelines highlight a car port and not a garage as a structure that can be counted as a bay?

<p>As on all estates built post-2000 does not appear enough parking/road access; modern garages not large enough to park the average car in so should not be counted towards parking.</p>	<p>As set out in detail in the DAS statement, carparking provided on the site equates to at least 2 to 3 spaces per house. This satisfies carparking requirements for the development and meets Council requirements. Plans confirm that garages on the site will be designed to achieve 6m by 3m dimensions so as to be large enough to comfortably accommodate the average car.</p>	<p>2</p>
---	---	----------

4. The parking matrix schedule simply shows the non compliance

5. The vehicle tracking layout shows that the planned bays will be designed so a car can actually get in and out of them – how can this be ‘*exceptional*’?

It is clear to me that Wiltshire officers and councillors are not ready to uphold their own requirements and are putting the developer’s needs ahead of the communities they serve. Please provide the documentation that supports the ‘*exceptional circumstances*’ clause in your own guidelines.

In the mean time, I will continue to object to this application.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Fisher

<Address>

10 September 2013

Attached is a copy of the spreadsheet I have created to count the number of spaces and the changes between issue 1 and issue 3 of the parking matrix.

<b>Taylor Wimpey First 218 house build - issue 1</b>						
# beds	# houses	total beds	WCC requirement spaces	Total spaces required	Actual planned	% under
1	6	6	1	6	6	0%
2	27	54	2	54	48	11%
3	114	342	2	228	207	9%
4	63	252	3	189	133	30%
5	8	40	3	24	16	33%
total	218	694		501	410	18%
<b>Taylor Wimpey First 218 house build - issue 3</b>						
# beds	# houses	total beds	WCC requirement spaces	Total spaces required	Actual planned	% under
1	6	6	1	6	6	0%
2	27	54	2	54	47	13%
3	114	342	2	228	191	16%
4	63	252	3	189	134	29%
5	8	40	3	24	16	33%
total	218	694		501	394	21%
<b>changes issue 1 to issue 3</b>						
plot number	was beds	now beds				
164	3	2				
165	3	2				
203	3	2				
206	4	3				
207	5	4				
208	4	5				
209	2	4				
210	2	3				
214	2	3				
total	28	28				
	decrease	increase				
2 beds	3	3				
3 beds	3	3				
4 beds	2	2				
5 beds	1	1				
	9	9				
	Bays	garages	visitors	total		
Issue 1	410	123	47	580		
Issue 3	394	131	46	571		
change	-16	8	-1	-9		