From: Lynn Moss

Sent: 13 April 2019 10:06

To: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow <planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk> **Cc:** Derrick Haley (Cllr) <Derrick.Haley@midsuffolk.gov.uk>; Esther Jewson (Cllr)

<Esther.Jewson@midsuffolk.gov.uk>; Parish Meeting - Thurston

<info@thurstonparishcouncil.gov.uk>; Philip Isbell <Philip.Isbell@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Planning Application DC/18/03547.

For URGENT attention of **Alex Scott** (Case Officer) and **Samantha Harvey** (Senior Development Management Engineer, SCC Highways) (by postal delivery)

Re: Planning Application DC/18/03547 - Submission of details under outline planning permission 4963/16 relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to condition 3, for up to 250 dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure on land west of Ixworth Road. Land west of Ixworth Road, Thurston, Suffolk.

Reason for submission: Newly disclosed information in the Committee Report on Planning Application DC/18/03547 to the Meeting of Mid Suffolk Development Control Committee B on 27 March 2019.

Dear Ms Harvey and Mr Scott.

The Suffolk Design Guide for Residential Areas, Suffolk Parking for Guidance (updated 2015), **Section 4**. Residential Parking Design, **Subsection 4.1**. On Plot Parking, Paragraph 4.1.1. details the minimum dimensions of an on plot garage as being 7.0m x 3.0m (internal dimension) with a clear doorway minimum 2.4m wide.

Such minimum sizes are considered sufficient for the average size family car and cycles as well as some storage space. However a reduced minimum internal garage dimension of 6.0m x 3.0m is acceptable

subject to additional fixed enclosed storage of minimum size 3.0m² being provided.

Any garage provision below these minimum size options is not to be counted as a parking space allocation.

The single, double and triple garage designs, posted to the DC/18/03547 planning application electronic file on 08/01/2019, detail that all three garage designs have a 2.55m clear doorway width, a clear internal width of 3.0m and a clear internal length 6.0m **but do not have any fixed enclosed storage.**

These submitted designs do not therefore comply with either of the options detailed in the Suffolk Parking for Guidance (updated 2015)!!

The consequences of this failure to comply with the minimum garage dimensions would be:the designed single width garage provision would not count at all towards parking provision but would
cover cycle provision:

the designed double width garage provision would count as only one parking provision but would cover cycle provision, and

the designed triple width garage provision for one user only would count as a two parking provision but would cover cycle provision; however if shared between two users would count as only one parking provision whilst providing both users with cycle provision; and if shared between three users would not count as any parking provision whilst providing all three users with cycle provision.

Should tandem designed single, double or triple width garages be any final consideration the consequences would be:-

tandem single width garage provision would count as one parking provision with cycle provision, tandem double width garage provision for one user would count as three parking provisions with cycle provision; however if shared between two users would count as two parking provisions with cycle provision for both users,

tandem triple width garage provision single user would count as five parking provisions with cycle provision,

tandem triple width garage provision with two users would count as four parking provisions with cycle provision for both users, and

tandem triple width garage provision with three users would count as three parking provisions with cycle provision for each user.

I am surprised to find no comment submitted by SCC-Highways, on the DC/18/03547 planning application electronic file, related to the provision of garages for this site on either their acceptability or otherwise.

Does anyone at SCC-Highways have responsibility for this task?

I now refer to the Committee Report to the Meeting of the Mid Suffolk Development Control Committee B on 27/03/2019, Planning Application DC/18/03547 **Section 4.** Site Access, Parking And Highways Safety Considerations,

Subsection 4.1. details that "**Parking and visitor parking meet the requirements under SCC Parking Standards**" however no details on "Parking Allocations" had been added to the DC/18/03547 Planning Application electronic file until 05/04/2019, giving no opportunity for comment by interested parties before this Committee Meeting.

I believe that my above comments must call into question the accuracy of the information supplied to the Committee with regard to both garage parking provision and secure cycle parking provision when no garage is provided. This cycle provision requirement is detailed in Suffolk Guidance for Parking (updated 2015) **Section 7**. Parking Guidance for Use Classes, **C3 and C4**.

Subsection 4.2. details that "SCC-Highways agree parking provision meets minimum requirement for parking places as per Suffolk Parking for Guidance (updated 2015)".

I can find no record of any submission from SCC-Highways that indicates agreement with achieving "minimum requirement for parking spaces as per Suffolk Parking for Guidance (updated 2015)" only that planning application DC/18/03547 parking arrangements must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

Should Scc-Highways have agreed that the Planning Application DC/18/03547 parking provision submission did meet their guidance requirements the **inevitable questions of how, when, why and by whom** will require to be answered together with **whether this decision is a "precedent", or which preceding president(s) does it follow.**

I trust that the above submission will cause a reconsideration of the parking provision for this planning application and/or the matter be progressed further by the empowered recipients.

Regards,

David Moss (Thurston Resident)
Jasmine Cottage, School Road, Thurston, Suffolk. IP31 3SB.