

To:

Mr Simon Davis
Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

From:

MRS M. SLATER
36, WAKEFIELD WAY
PO21 3RS

Date: 4-10-19

Dear Mr Davis,

Re: AW/246/19/PL - Erection of 1 No. 2 Storey End of Terrace House at land adjacent to 34 Wakefield Way, Bognor Regis PO21 3RS

Please take this letter as our formal objection to the above mentioned planning application by Mr & Mrs Paul.

Our objection is based on the findings in the attached report that was undertaken by a resident following discussion between the residents of Wakefield Way. We fully support this report and agree wholly with the contents of it.

Yours sincerely,

Signed

[Redacted Signature]


Name: MRS MAUREEN SLATER

Contact Telephone

[Redacted Contact Telephone]

Email:

[Redacted Email]





Mr Simon Davis,
Planning Department,
Arun District Council.

By Email

Reference: - AW/246/19/PL – Erection of 1 No. 2 Storey End of Terrace House

OBJECTION TO THE AFOREMENTIONED APPLICATION

Please take this document as formal objection to the proposal to build a two-storey house adjacent to the existing property; namely No 34 Wakefield Way.

The proposal is for the new house to sit in the garden belonging to No 34 Wakefield Way and fit between the boundary wall of the estate and attach to the existing property.

The objection is for the following reasons: -

PARKING

Background

Over the past ten years the parking has become an issue for all residents in the street, with inadequate areas for the quantity of vehicles per person now living in the street. Specifically, the dwellings that do not have an attached driveway (House No's 12-46)

When the estate was built originally in 1974, *nearly half (48 per cent) of all households in Great Britain did not have regular use of a car.

**(Office for National Statistics)*

Thus, the number of cars parking within the street would be circa 50% of the number of properties (18 Properties = 9 Vehicles). As of 3/10/2019 with two properties vacant the count of vehicles in these properties (12-46) is 26, an average of 1.4 Cars per Dwelling.

The current parking provision within the street is a parking layby that sits afront properties 12-20 which is 28m in length. If taking the Manual for Streets standard dimensions of a garage for a vehicle as the required width for a vehicle to park of 3m, then this layby would only fit 9 standard size vehicles.

However, the reality in this instance is that, if all residents were able to park "an acceptable distance" from each other then 12 cars would fit in this space.

This still leaves circa 17 cars (excluding visitors) seeking parking on the kerbside adjacent the footpaths alongside House No. 10&12 (2 Cars) and 48&50 (2 Cars), on the shared Garage Access (4 Cars). This mean that the remainder have no choice but to park on the L/H side of the road half on the footpath as there is inadequate provision.

Example of Parking -- Images Taken 9pm 3/10/2019



Parking looking East from Wakefield Way down the shared driveway to garage compound
Parking on both sides leaving just enough room for a car to negotiate its way through



View looking North up Wakefield Way from pavement opposite garage compound --
Layby Full and Parking opposite on kerb



View North up Wakefield Way from road outside garage compound

Application

Reading through the application AW/246/19/PL – made by Mr Ivon Blumer (*Agent*) on behalf of Mr and Mrs Paul (*Applicant*), a design and access statement has been provided to accompany the online application.

I refer specifically to IBA Drawings IBA/520/01, 02 & 03.

In paragraph 2 of the Design and Access Statement on Page 5 of the self-named document, I quote *"Parking is provided on site, with one garage space and one parking space in front of the garage"*

According to the WSCC Consultation on the planning application the WSCC PDC **requires** a minimum of three parking spaces to be provided for this size dwelling in this location.

According to the D&A Statement the proposal by the Applicant would only give 2.

It is our belief that neither of these two proposed spaces constitute a parking provision for the dwelling.

The first of which is a garage situated at the far end of the L/H side of the garage block. This garage is apportioned to No.34 (the existing dwelling) therefore no "additional" space has been created, it has simply been re-assigned from an existing dwelling to the proposed. This conclusion has also been noted within the WSCC Consultation.

This contradicts Item 8 on the Architects own Design Principles, noted on Page 3 of the D&A Statement. I quote, *"The main design principles are, "Not to compromise the amenity space and integrity of No 34 Wakefield Way"*

By assigning a garage belonging to No 34 to the new dwelling, the proposal compromises the amenity space of the existing dwelling, i.e. leaving it with Nil parking provision.

There is also a further point to the proposed use of a garage as a parking space within this application. As per the WSCC Consultation, the garage in question is only 2.5m wide and 5.5m long. This is barely big enough for a standard size family vehicle. However, the Design and Access Statement submitted makes note that the garage will also be the "Bin Store" for three wheeled refuse bins along with space for two bicycles. I do not see how a car, three wheelie bins and two bicycles will fit into this garage. The floor space is simply not enough.

Secondly the area of hard standing in front of the garage cannot be assigned to any one property as it does not fall within the ownership boundaries of the existing dwelling.

I refer specifically to restrictive covenants stipulated in Section 2 of The First Schedule in the Transfer of Land document between Pennant Developments and the original purchaser of No. 34 Wakefield Way.

I quote "A right of way at all times and for all reasonable purposes with or without vehicle in common ALL other persons entitled to the like right over such portion as is not hereby transferred of the garage forecourt, hatched black on the said plan leading to the said garage plot hereby transferred subject to the Transferee bearing a due proportion of the cost of repair and upkeep of the same."

Therefore, no portion of the forecourt area can be apportioned to any one property as its title belongs to all persons entitled under the same Schedule accompanying their deeds.

In short, no provision of any spaces has been provided for the new dwelling, therefore not meeting the regulatory 3 spaces as set down by the WSCC in their PDC.

CONSTRUCTION

The second reason of objection is with regards the planned means of access for the construction of the proposed development. With the site being inaccessible from any roadside location and having no sterile area for delivery of planned materials – all access would have to be from the rear of the property via the "shared" garage forecourt.

For an average three bed house the number and size of vehicles required would not only cause obstructions to all users of the garage forecourt area but also to other residents within Wakefield Way. It would also constitute a Health and Safety hazard with large vehicles having to try and negotiate the turn from Wakefield Way into the forecourt area.

Types and Sizes of Vehicles

Ready-Mix Concrete Lorries

Muck-Away Vehicles

Builder Merchants Lorries – Bricks, Aggregates etc.

Builders Works Vehicles

All the deliveries would have to negotiate the turn into the garage forecourt and all materials placed on the "shared" garage area meaning access to other residents garages would be restricted notwithstanding the fact that depending on the duration of the delivery -- the vehicle could be stuck in the forecourt area if any parking on the turn or in the garage area occurred whilst up at the far end. This in fact happened within the last month as a much smaller delivery vehicle to those mentioned above, was delivering goods to the refurbishment of No. 34. The vehicle had reversed up the far end of the garage block to deliver, during which time a resident had parked next to their house and the lorry could then not get out and was stuck for over half an hour.

To:

Mr Simon Davis
Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

From:

PAUL MANTELL
44 Wakefield Way,
Aldwick,
Bognor Regis,
PO21 3RS

Date:

8/10/19

Dear Mr Davis,


Re: AW/246/19/PL – Erection of 1 No. 2 Storey End of Terrace House at land adjacent to 34 Wakefield Way, Bognor Regis PO21 3RS

Please take this letter as our formal objection to the above mentioned planning application by Mr & Mrs Paul.

Our objection is based on the findings in the attached report that was undertaken by a resident following discussion between the residents of Wakefield Way. We fully support this report and agree wholly with the contents of it.

Yours sincerely,

Signed:



Name:


PAUL MANTELL

Contact Telephone:



Email:





Mr Simon Davis,
Planning Department,
Arun District Council.

By Email

Reference: - AW/246/19/PL – Erection of 1 No. 2 Storey End of Terrace House

OBJECTION TO THE AFOREMENTIONED APPLICATION

Please take this document as formal objection to the proposal to build a two-storey house adjacent to the existing property; namely No 34 Wakefield Way.

The proposal is for the new house to sit in the garden belonging to No 34 Wakefield Way and fit between the boundary wall of the estate and attach to the existing property.

The objection is for the following reasons: -

PARKING

Background

Over the past ten years the parking has become an issue for all residents in the street, with inadequate areas for the quantity of vehicles per person now living in the street. Specifically, the dwellings that do not have an attached driveway (House No's 12-46)

When the estate was built originally in 1974, *nearly half (48 per cent) of all households in Great Britain did not have regular use of a car.

**(Office for National Statistics)*

Thus, the number of cars parking within the street would be circa 50% of the number of properties (18 Properties = 9 Vehicles). As of 3/10/2019 with two properties vacant the count of vehicles in these properties (12-46) is 26, an average of 1.4 Cars per Dwelling.

The current parking provision within the street is a parking layby that sits afront properties 12-20 which is 28m in length. If taking the Manual for Streets standard dimensions of a garage for a vehicle as the required width for a vehicle to park of 3m, then this layby would only fit 9 standard size vehicles.

However, the reality in this instance is that, if all residents were able to park "an acceptable distance" from each other then 12 cars would fit in this space.

This still leaves circa 17 cars (excluding visitors) seeking parking on the kerbside adjacent the footpaths alongside House No. 10&12 (2 Cars) and 48&50 (2 Cars), on the shared Garage Access (4 Cars). This mean that the remainder have no choice but to park on the L/H side of the road half on the footpath as there is inadequate provision.

Example of Parking – Images Taken 9pm 3/10/2019



Parking looking East from Wakefield Way down the shared driveway to garage compound
Parking on both sides leaving just enough room for a car to negotiate its way through



View looking North up Wakefield Way from pavement opposite garage compound –
Layby Full and Parking opposite on kerb



View North up Wakefield Way from road outside garage compound

Application

Reading through the application AW/246/19/PL – made by Mr Ivon Blumer (*Agent*) on behalf of Mr and Mrs Paul (*Applicant*), a design and access statement has been provided to accompany the online application.

I refer specifically to IBA Drawings IBA/520/01, 02 & 03.

In paragraph 2 of the Design and Access Statement on Page 5 of the self-named document, I quote *"Parking is provided on site, with one garage space and one parking space in front of the garage"*

According to the WSCC Consultation on the planning application the WSCC PDC **requires** a minimum of three parking spaces to be provided for this size dwelling in this location.

According to the D&A Statement the proposal by the Applicant would only give 2.

It is our belief that neither of these two proposed spaces constitute a parking provision for the dwelling.

The first of which is a garage situated at the far end of the L/H side of the garage block. This garage is apportioned to No.34 (the existing dwelling) therefore no "additional" space has been created, it has simply been re-assigned from an existing dwelling to the proposed. This conclusion has also been noted within the WSCC Consultation.

This contradicts Item 8 on the Architects own Design Principles, noted on Page 3 of the D&A Statement. I quote, *"The main design principles are, "Not to compromise the amenity space and integrity of No 34 Wakefield Way"*

By assigning a garage belonging to No 34 to the new dwelling, the proposal compromises the amenity space of the existing dwelling, i.e. leaving it with Nil parking provision.

There is also a further point to the proposed use of a garage as a parking space within this application. As per the WSCC Consultation, the garage in question is only 2.5m wide and 5.5m long. This is barely big enough for a standard size family vehicle. However, the Design and Access Statement submitted makes note that the garage will also be the "Bin Store" for three wheeled refuse bins along with space for two bicycles. I do not see how a car, three wheeled bins and two bicycles will fit into this garage. The floor space is simply not enough.

Secondly the area of hard standing in front of the garage cannot be assigned to any one property as it does not fall within the ownership boundaries of the existing dwelling.

I refer specifically to restrictive covenants stipulated in Section 2 of The First Schedule in the Transfer of Land document between Pennant Developments and the original purchaser of No. 34 Wakefield Way.

I quote "A right of way at all times and for all reasonable purposes with or without vehicle in common ALL other persons entitled to the like right over such portion as is not hereby transferred of the garage forecourt, batched black on the said plan leading to the said garage plot hereby transferred subject to the Transferee bearing a due proportion of the cost of repair and upkeep of the same."

Therefore, no portion of the forecourt area can be apportioned to any one property as its title belongs to all persons entitled under the same Schedule accompanying their deeds.

In short, no provision of any spaces has been provided for the new dwelling, therefore not meeting the regulatory 3 spaces as set down by the WSCC in their PDC.

CONSTRUCTION

The second reason of objection is with regards the planned means of access for the construction of the proposed development. With the site being inaccessible from any roadside location and having no sterile area for delivery of planned materials – all access would have to be from the rear of the property via the "shared" garage forecourt.

For an average three bed house the number and size of vehicles required would not only cause obstructions to all users of the garage forecourt area but also to other residents within Wakefield Way. It would also constitute a Health and Safety hazard with large vehicles having to try and negotiate the turn from Wakefield Way into the forecourt area.

Types and Sizes of Vehicles

Ready-Mix Concrete Lorries

Muck-Away Vehicles

Builder Merchants Lorries – Bricks, Aggregates etc.

Builders Works Vehicles

All the deliveries would have to negotiate the turn into the garage forecourt and all materials placed on the "shared" garage area meaning access to other residents garages would be restricted notwithstanding the fact that depending on the duration of the delivery -- the vehicle could be stuck in the forecourt area if any parking on the turn or in the garage area occurred whilst up at the far end. This in fact happened within the last month as a much smaller delivery vehicle to those mentioned above, was delivering goods to the refurbishment of No. 34. The vehicle had reversed up the far end of the garage block to deliver, during which time a resident had parked next to their house and the lorry could then not get out and was stuck for over half an hour.

To:

Mr Simon Davis
Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

From:

MR D STOREY + MISS C SPELLER
46 Wakefield Way,
Aldwick,
Bognor Regis,
PO21 3RS

Date: 7.10.19


Dear Mr Davis,

Re: AW/246/19/PL – Erection of 1 No. 2 Storey End of Terrace House at land adjacent to 34 Wakefield Way, Bognor Regis PO21 3RS

Please take this letter as our formal objection to the above mentioned planning application by Mr & Mrs Paul.

Our objection is based on the findings in the attached report that was undertaken by a resident following discussion between the residents of Wakefield Way. We fully support this report and agree wholly with the contents of it.

Yours sincerely,




Signe

Name: Daniel Storey Clair Speller

Contact Telephone

Email:



Mr Simon Davis,
Planning Department,
Arun District Council.

By Email

Reference: - AW/246/19/PL - Erection of 1 No. 2 Storey End of Terrace House

OBJECTION TO THE AFOREMENTIONED APPLICATION

Please take this document as formal objection to the proposal to build a two-storey house adjacent to the existing property; namely No 34 Wakefield Way.

The proposal is for the new house to sit in the garden belonging to No 34 Wakefield Way and fit between the boundary wall of the estate and attach to the existing property.

The objection is for the following reasons: -

PARKING

Background

Over the past ten years the parking has become an issue for all residents in the street, with inadequate areas for the quantity of vehicles per person now living in the street. Specifically, the dwellings that do not have an attached driveway (House No's 12-46)

When the estate was built originally in 1974, *nearly half (48 per cent) of all households in Great Britain did not have regular use of a car.

**(Office for National Statistics)*

Thus, the number of cars parking within the street would be circa 50% of the number of properties (18 Properties = 9 Vehicles). As of 3/10/2019 with two properties vacant the count of vehicles in these properties (12-46) is 26, an average of 1.4 Cars per Dwelling.

The current parking provision within the street is a parking layby that sits afront properties 12-20 which is 28m in length. If taking the Manual for Streets standard dimensions of a garage for a vehicle as the required width for a vehicle to park of 3m, then this layby would only fit 9 standard size vehicles.

However, the reality in this instance is that, if all residents were able to park "an acceptable distance" from each other then 12 cars would fit in this space.

This still leaves circa 17 cars (excluding visitors) seeking parking on the kerbside adjacent the footpaths alongside House No. 10&12 (2 Cars) and 48&50 (2 Cars), on the shared Garage Access (4 Cars). This mean that the remainder have no choice but to park on the L/H side of the road half on the footpath as there is inadequate provision.

Example of Parking – Images Taken 9pm 3/10/2019



Parking looking East from Wakefield Way down the shared driveway to garage compound
Parking on both sides leaving just enough room for a car to negotiate its way through



View looking North up Wakefield Way from pavement opposite garage compound --
Layby Full and Parking opposite on kerb



View North up Wakefield Way from road outside garage compound

Application

Reading through the application AW/246/19/PL -- made by Mr Ivon Blumer (*Agent*) on behalf of Mr and Mrs Paul (*Applicant*), a design and access statement has been provided to accompany the online application.

I refer specifically to IBA Drawings IBA/520/01, 02 & 03.

In paragraph 2 of the Design and Access Statement on Page 5 of the self-named document, I quote: *"Parking is provided on site, with one garage space and one parking space in front of the garage"*

According to the WSCC Consultation on the planning application the WSCC PDC requires a minimum of three parking spaces to be provided for this size dwelling in this location. According to the D&A Statement the proposal by the Applicant would only give 2.

It is our belief that neither of these two proposed spaces constitute a parking provision for the dwelling.

The first of which is a garage situated at the far end of the L/H side of the garage block. This garage is apportioned to No.34 (the existing dwelling) therefore no "additional" space has been created, it has simply been re-assigned from an existing dwelling to the proposed. This conclusion has also been noted within the WSCC Consultation.

This contradicts Item 8 on the Architects own Design Principles, noted on Page 3 of the D&A Statement. I quote, *"The main design principles are, "Not to compromise the amenity space and integrity of No 34 Wakefield Way"*

By assigning a garage belonging to No 34 to the new dwelling, the proposal compromises the amenity space of the existing dwelling, i.e. leaving it with Nil parking provision.

There is also a further point to the proposed use of a garage as a parking space within this application. As per the WSCC Consultation, the garage in question is only 2.5m wide and 5.5m long. This is barely big enough for a standard size family vehicle. However, the Design and Access Statement submitted makes note that the garage will also be the "Bin Store" for three wheeled refuse bins along with space for two bicycles. I do not see how a car, three wheelie bins and two bicycles will fit into this garage. The floor space is simply not enough.

Secondly the area of hard standing in front of the garage cannot be assigned to any one property as it does not fall within the ownership boundaries of the existing dwelling.

I refer specifically to restrictive covenants stipulated in Section 2 of The First Schedule in the Transfer of Land document between Pennant Developments and the original purchaser of No. 34 Wakefield Way.

I quote "A right of way at all times and for all reasonable purposes with or without vehicle in common ALL other persons entitled to the like right over such portion as is not hereby transferred of the garage forecourt, hatched black on the said plan leading to the said garage plot hereby transferred subject to the Transferee bearing a due proportion of the cost of repair and upkeep of the same."

Therefore, no portion of the forecourt area can be apportioned to any one property as its title belongs to all persons entitled under the same Schedule accompanying their deeds.

In short, no provision of any spaces has been provided for the new dwelling, therefore not meeting the regulatory 3 spaces as set down by the WSCC in their PDC.

CONSTRUCTION

The second reason of objection is with regards the planned means of access for the construction of the proposed development. With the site being inaccessible from any roadside location and having no sterile area for delivery of planned materials – all access would have to be from the rear of the property via the "shared" garage forecourt.

For an average three bed house the number and size of vehicles required would not only cause obstructions to all users of the garage forecourt area but also to other residents within Wakefield Way. It would also constitute a Health and Safety hazard with large vehicles having to try and negotiate the turn from Wakefield Way into the forecourt area.

Types and Sizes of Vehicles

Ready-Mix Concrete Lorries

Muck-Away Vehicles

Builder Merchants Lorries – Bricks, Aggregates etc.

Builders Works Vehicles

All the deliveries would have to negotiate the turn into the garage forecourt and all materials placed on the "shared" garage area meaning access to other residents garages would be restricted notwithstanding the fact that depending on the duration of the delivery – the vehicle could be stuck in the forecourt area if any parking on the turn or in the garage area occurred whilst up at the far end. This in fact happened within the last month as a much smaller delivery vehicle to those mentioned above, was delivering goods to the refurbishment of No. 34. The vehicle had reversed up the far end of the garage block to deliver, during which time a resident had parked next to their house and the lorry could then not get out and was stuck for over half an hour.

To:

Mr Simon Davis
Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

From: ZUKASENOSIŃSKI

ADRIANA KURCZAK

18 Wakefield Way,
Aldwick,
Bognor Regis,
PO21 3RS

Date: 09-10-2019

Dear Mr Davis,

Re: AW/246/19/PL – Erection of 1 No. 2 Storey End of Terrace House at land adjacent to 34 Wakefield Way, Bognor Regis PO21 3RS

Please take this letter as our formal objection to the above mentioned planning application by Mr & Mrs Paul.

Our objection is based on the findings in the attached report that was undertaken by a resident following discussion between the residents of Wakefield Way. We fully support this report and agree wholly with the contents of it.


Yours sincerely,

Sign: 

Name: ADRIANA KURCZAK

Contact Telephone: 

Email: 



RECEIVED

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, D.C.

LIBRARY

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY



AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, D.C.

LIBRARY

Mr Simon Davis,
Planning Department,
Arun District Council.

By Email

Reference: - AW/246/19/PL – Erection of 1 No. 2 Storey End of Terrace House

OBJECTION TO THE AFOREMENTIONED APPLICATION

Please take this document as formal objection to the proposal to build a two-storey house adjacent to the existing property; namely No 34 Wakefield Way.

The proposal is for the new house to sit in the garden belonging to No 34 Wakefield Way and fit between the boundary wall of the estate and attach to the existing property.

The objection is for the following reasons: -

PARKING

Background

Over the past ten years the parking has become an issue for all residents in the street, with inadequate areas for the quantity of vehicles per person now living in the street. Specifically, the dwellings that do not have an attached driveway (House No's 12-46)

When the estate was built originally in 1974, *nearly half (48 per cent) of all households in Great Britain did not have regular use of a car.

**(Office for National Statistics)*

Thus, the number of cars parking within the street would be circa 50% of the number of properties (18 Properties = 9 Vehicles). As of 3/10/2019 with two properties vacant the count of vehicles in these properties (12-46) is 26, an average of 1.4 Cars per Dwelling.

The current parking provision within the street is a parking layby that sits afront properties 12-20 which is 28m in length. If taking the Manual for Streets standard dimensions of a garage for a vehicle as the required width for a vehicle to park of 3m, then this layby would only fit 9 standard size vehicles.

However, the reality in this instance is that, if all residents were able to park "an acceptable distance" from each other then 12 cars would fit in this space.

This still leaves circa 17 cars (excluding visitors) seeking parking on the kerbside adjacent the footpaths alongside House No. 10&12 (2 Cars) and 48&50 (2 Cars), on the shared Garage Access (4 Cars). This mean that the remainder have no choice but to park on the L/H side of the road half on the footpath as there is inadequate provision.

Example of Parking – Images Taken 9pm 3/10/2019



Parking looking East from Wakefield Way down the shared driveway to garage compound
Parking on both sides leaving just enough room for a car to negotiate its way through



View looking North up Wakefield Way from pavement opposite garage compound –
Layby Full and Parking opposite on kerb



View North up Wakefield Way from road outside garage compound

Application

Reading through the application AW/246/19/PL – made by Mr Ivon Blumer (*Agent*) on behalf of Mr and Mrs Paul (*Applicant*), a design and access statement has been provided to accompany the online application.

I refer specifically to IBA Drawings IBA/520/01, 02 & 03.

In paragraph 2 of the Design and Access Statement on Page 5 of the self-named document, I quote *"Parking is provided on site, with one garage space and one parking space in front of the garage"*

According to the WSCC Consultation on the planning application the WSCC PDC requires a minimum of three parking spaces to be provided for this size dwelling in this location.

According to the D&A Statement the proposal by the Applicant would only give 2.

It is our belief that neither of these two proposed spaces constitute a parking provision for the dwelling.

The first of which is a garage situated at the far end of the L/H side of the garage block. This garage is apportioned to No.34 (the existing dwelling) therefore no "additional" space has been created, it has simply been re-assigned from an existing dwelling to the proposed. This conclusion has also been noted within the WSCC Consultation.

This contradicts Item 8 on the Architects own Design Principles, noted on Page 3 of the D&A Statement. I quote, *"The main design principles are, "Not to compromise the amenity space and integrity of No 34 Wakefield Way"*

By assigning a garage belonging to No 34 to the new dwelling, the proposal compromises the amenity space of the existing dwelling, i.e. leaving it with Nil parking provision.

There is also a further point to the proposed use of a garage as a parking space within this application. As per the WSCC Consultation, the garage in question is only 2.5m wide and 5.5m long. This is barely big enough for a standard size family vehicle. However, the Design and Access Statement submitted makes note that the garage will also be the "Bin Store" for three wheeled refuse bins along with space for two bicycles. I do not see how a car, three wheelie bins and two bicycles will fit into this garage. The floor space is simply not enough.

Secondly the area of hard standing in front of the garage cannot be assigned to any one property as it does not fall within the ownership boundaries of the existing dwelling.

I refer specifically to restrictive covenants stipulated in Section 2 of The First Schedule in the Transfer of Land document between Pennant Developments and the original purchaser of No. 34 Wakefield Way.

I quote "A right of way at all times and for all reasonable purposes with or without vehicle in common All other persons entitled to the like right over such portion as is not hereby transferred of the garage forecourt, hatched black on the said plan leading to the said garage plot hereby transferred subject to the Transferee bearing a due proportion of the cost of repair and upkeep of the same."

Therefore, no portion of the forecourt area can be apportioned to any one property as its title belongs to all persons entitled under the same Schedule accompanying their deeds.

In short, no provision of any spaces has been provided for the new dwelling, therefore not meeting the regulatory 3 spaces as set down by the WSCC in their PDC.

CONSTRUCTION

The second reason of objection is with regards the planned means of access for the construction of the proposed development. With the site being inaccessible from any roadside location and having no sterile area for delivery of planned materials – all access would have to be from the rear of the property via the "shared" garage forecourt.

For an average three bed house the number and size of vehicles required would not only cause obstructions to all users of the garage forecourt area but also to other residents within Wakefield Way. It would also constitute a Health and Safety hazard with large vehicles having to try and negotiate the turn from Wakefield Way into the forecourt area.

Types and Sizes of Vehicles

Ready-Mix Concrete Lorries

Muck-Away Vehicles

Builder Merchants Lorries -- Bricks, Aggregates etc.

Builders Works Vehicles

All the deliveries would have to negotiate the turn into the garage forecourt and all materials placed on the "shared" garage area meaning access to other residents garages would be restricted notwithstanding the fact that depending on the duration of the delivery – the vehicle could be stuck in the forecourt area if any parking on the turn or in the garage area occurred whilst up at the far end. This in fact happened within the last month as a much smaller delivery vehicle to those mentioned above, was delivering goods to the refurbishment of No. 34. The vehicle had reversed up the far end of the garage block to deliver, during which time a resident had parked next to their house and the lorry could then not get out and was stuck for over half an hour.

To:

Mr Simon Davis
Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

From:

48 Wakefield Way,
Aldwick,
Bognor Regis,
PO21 3RS

Date: 9/10/19

Dear Mr Davis,


Re: AW/246/19/PL – Erection of 1 No. 2 Storey End of Terrace House at land adjacent to 34 Wakefield Way, Bognor Regis PO21 3RS

Please take this letter as our formal objection to the above mentioned planning application by Mr & Mrs Paul.

Our objection is based on the findings in the attached report that was undertaken by a resident following discussion between the residents of Wakefield Way. We fully support this report and agree wholly with the contents of it.

Yours sincerely,

Signed




Name: Nicola Wardrop

Contact Telephone



Email





Mr Simon Davis,
Planning Department,
Arun District Council.

By Email

Reference: - AW/246/19/PL – Erection of 1 No. 2 Storey End of Terrace House

OBJECTION TO THE AFOREMENTIONED APPLICATION

Please take this document as formal objection to the proposal to build a two-storey house adjacent to the existing property; namely No 34 Wakefield Way.

The proposal is for the new house to sit in the garden belonging to No 34 Wakefield Way and fit between the boundary wall of the estate and attach to the existing property.

The objection is for the following reasons: -

PARKING

Background

Over the past ten years the parking has become an issue for all residents in the street, with inadequate areas for the quantity of vehicles per person now living in the street. Specifically, the dwellings that do not have an attached driveway (House No's 12-46)

When the estate was built originally in 1974, *nearly half (48 per cent) of all households in Great Britain did not have regular use of a car.

**(Office for National Statistics)*

Thus, the number of cars parking within the street would be circa 50% of the number of properties (18 Properties = 9 Vehicles). As of 3/10/2019 with two properties vacant the count of vehicles in these properties (12-46) is 26, an average of 1.4 Cars per Dwelling.

The current parking provision within the street is a parking layby that sits afroat properties 12-20 which is 28m in length. If taking the Manual for Streets standard dimensions of a garage for a vehicle as the required width for a vehicle to park of 3m, then this layby would only fit 9 standard size vehicles.

However, the reality in this instance is that, if all residents were able to park "an acceptable distance" from each other then 12 cars would fit in this space.

This still leaves circa 17 cars (excluding visitors) seeking parking on the kerbside adjacent the footpaths alongside House No. 10&12 (2 Cars) and 48&50 (2 Cars), on the shared Garage Access (4 Cars). This mean that the remainder have no choice but to park on the L/H side of the road half on the footpath as there is inadequate provision.

Example of Parking – Images Taken 9pm 3/10/2019



Parking looking East from Wakefield Way down the shared driveway to garage compound
Parking on both sides leaving just enough room for a car to negotiate its way through



View looking North up Wakefield Way from pavement opposite garage compound –
Layby Full and Parking opposite on herb



View North up Wakefield Way from road outside garage compound

Application

Reading through the application AW/246/19/PL – made by Mr Ivon Blumer (*Agent*) on behalf of Mr and Mrs Paul (*Applicant*), a design and access statement has been provided to accompany the online application.

I refer specifically to IBA Drawings IBA/520/01, 02 & 03.

In paragraph 2 of the Design and Access Statement on Page 5 of the self-named document, I quote *"Parking is provided on site, with one garage space and one parking space in front of the garage"*

According to the WSCC Consultation on the planning application the WSCC PDC **requires** a minimum of three parking spaces to be provided for this size dwelling in this location.

According to the D&A Statement the proposal by the Applicant would only give 2.

It is our belief that neither of these two proposed spaces constitute a parking provision for the dwelling.

The first of which is a garage situated at the far end of the L/H side of the garage block. This garage is apportioned to No.34 (the existing dwelling) therefore no "additional" space has been created, it has simply been re-assigned from an existing dwelling to the proposed. This conclusion has also been noted within the WSCC Consultation.

This contradicts Item 8 on the Architects own Design Principles, noted on Page 3 of the D&A Statement. I quote, *"The main design principles are, "Not to compromise the amenity space and integrity of No 34 Wakefield Way"*

By assigning a garage belonging to No 34 to the new dwelling, the proposal compromises the amenity space of the existing dwelling, i.e. leaving it with Nil parking provision.

There is also a further point to the proposed use of a garage as a parking space within this application. As per the WSCC Consultation, the garage in question is only 2.5m wide and 5.5m long. This is barely big enough for a standard size family vehicle. However, the Design and Access Statement submitted makes note that the garage will also be the "Bin Store" for three wheeled refuse bins along with space for two bicycles. I do not see how a car, three wheeled bins and two bicycles will fit into this garage. The floor space is simply not enough.

Secondly the area of hard standing in front of the garage cannot be assigned to any one property as it does not fall within the ownership boundaries of the existing dwelling.

I refer specifically to restrictive covenants stipulated in Section 2 of The First Schedule in the Transfer of Land document between Pennant Developments and the original purchaser of No. 34 Wakefield Way.

I quote "A right of way at all times and for all reasonable purposes with or without vehicle in common All other persons entitled to the like right over such portion as is not hereby transferred of the garage forecourt, hatched black on the said plan leading to the said garage plot hereby transferred subject to the Transferee bearing a due proportion of the cost of repair and upkeep of the same."

Therefore, no portion of the forecourt area can be apportioned to any one property as its title belongs to all persons entitled under the same Schedule accompanying their deeds.

In short, no provision of any spaces has been provided for the new dwelling, therefore not meeting the regulatory 3 spaces as set down by the WSCC in their PDC.

CONSTRUCTION

The second reason of objection is with regards the planned means of access for the construction of the proposed development. With the site being inaccessible from any roadside location and having no sterile area for delivery of planned materials -- all access would have to be from the rear of the property via the "shared" garage forecourt.

For an average three bed house the number and size of vehicles required would not only cause obstructions to all users of the garage forecourt area but also to other residents within Wakefield Way. It would also constitute a Health and Safety hazard with large vehicles having to try and negotiate the turn from Wakefield Way into the forecourt area.

Types and Sizes of Vehicles

Ready-Mix Concrete Lorries

Muck-Away Vehicles

Builder Merchants Lorries -- Bricks, Aggregates etc.

Builders Works Vehicles

All the deliveries would have to negotiate the turn into the garage forecourt and all materials placed on the "shared" garage area meaning access to other residents garages would be restricted notwithstanding the fact that depending on the duration of the delivery -- the vehicle could be stuck in the forecourt area if any parking on the turn or in the garage area occurred whilst up at the far end. This in fact happened within the last month as a much smaller delivery vehicle to those mentioned above, was delivering goods to the refurbishment of No. 34. The vehicle had reversed up the far end of the garage block to deliver, during which time a resident had parked next to their house and the lorry could then not get out and was stuck for over half an hour.

