

From: Paul Jackaman [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 July 2022 18:06
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Feedback on draft WNDP

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I advised Christine we would be on holiday when the 19th June Engagement Meeting was held and would submit any comments afterwards.

Policy BE 5 Residential Parking Spaces. I refer you back to my e-mail of 05/05/2022 and whilst the latest BE 5 iteration is an improvement on the previous version it still retains the basic defect of requiring all parking spaces to be sited within the curtilage of each property (n.b. the policy wording should read 'curtilage of' in two places).

As I pointed out in my e-mail of 05/05/2022, existing Policy A2 has the same defect which a Planning Inspector considered to be particularly onerous, contrary to both HDC's Standards and best practice in 'Manual for Streets' and lacking empirical evidence. (See that Inspector's July 2019 Appeal Report in 17/02620/FUL). He warranted some flexibility in relation to Policy A2 and, effectively, overrode it.

BE 5 contains exactly the same defects the Inspector noted and still has no empirical evidence to support it.

I understand the good intentions behind the 'within curtilage' requirement but I see it as one of those 'be careful of what you wish for' situations. For example, when the Parish Council addresses its hoped-for Urban Extension Site it may find, depending on the size of the site, that draft Policy BE 5's requirements for parking spaces within curtilage forces it to reduce the number of dwellings it can accommodate and/or reduce the size of gardens (see draft Policy BE 4 (e)).

Clearly, the wording of BE 5 needs to be less rigid and dogmatic to allow some flexibility so that the best and most efficient use is made of scarce building land. I suggest an extra sentence such as "Within curtilage' is the standard requirement and any request to deviate from that must be accompanied by site-specific evidence in support.'

The Steering Group/Working Group minutes of 09/05/2022 mis-represent my e-mail of 05/05/2022. It is not a question of either parking within curtilage or on the road; parking spaces can also be provided within site and still not be on the road. That arrangement is commonly used, quite often for visitor parking. I request my e-mail of 05/05/2022 and this e-mail be placed on the evidence base so the arguments made are on record for any interested parties to see.

Hart's revision of Parking Standards. The 'Technical Advice note on Cycle and Car Parking Standards' was not with the July Cabinet papers for approval, the due date is now shown as August 22nd.

Other Comments

- P24, Winchfield Court has 33 dwellings within its settlement boundary.
- A plea from Kerry, despite suggesting on a post-it that swift bricks be incorporated in all new homes there is no mention in the draft Plan. Could this be added to BE 4 please.

Kind regards,

Paul

From: Christine Strudwick [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 July 2022 13:12
To: 'Paul Jackaman'
Cc: [REDACTED] Winchfield Clerk
Subject: RE: Feedback on draft WNDP

Hi Paul,

Thank you for your comments, all of which had been noted. Suggested changes to the wording regarding parking policy had already been drafted but I think the suggestion you make in this e-mail is even better so I will propose that to the group and, subject to their agreement, will amend the draft plan to reflect the change before it goes for its 'health check' next week.

I had added a note to the master copy of Kerry's suggestion about swift bricks but as I hadn't re-worked that section yet I'm sorry it wasn't on the list of building design considerations I used on the information boards at last month's meeting.

I'm sure you will understand that this Plan is currently going through a lot of changes and maintaining version control to reflect all the changes is quite demanding.

Thanks
Christine

From: Paul Jackaman [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 July 2022 18:06
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Feedback on draft WNDP

I advised Christine we would be on holiday when the 19th June Engagement Meeting was held and would submit any comments afterwards.

Policy BE 5 Residential Parking Spaces. I refer you back to my e-mail of 05/05/2022 and whilst the latest BE 5 iteration is an improvement on the previous version it still retains the basic defect of requiring all parking spaces to be sited within the curtilage of each property (n.b. the policy wording should read 'curtilage of' in two places).

As I pointed out in my e-mail of 05/05/2022, existing Policy A2 has the same defect which a Planning Inspector considered to be particularly onerous, contrary to both HDC's Standards and best practice in 'Manual for Streets' and lacking empirical evidence. (See that Inspector's July 2019 Appeal Report in 17/02620/FUL). He warranted some flexibility in relation to Policy A2 and, effectively, overrode it.

BE 5 contains exactly the same defects the Inspector noted and still has no empirical evidence to support it.

I understand the good intentions behind the 'within curtilage' requirement but I see it as one of those 'be careful of what you wish for' situations. For example, when the Parish Council addresses its hoped-for Urban Extension Site it may find, depending on the size of the site, that draft Policy BE 5's requirements for parking spaces within curtilage forces it to reduce the number of dwellings it can accommodate and/or reduce the size of gardens (see draft Policy BE 4 (e)).

Clearly, the wording of BE 5 needs to be less rigid and dogmatic to allow some flexibility so that the best and most efficient use is made of scarce building land. I suggest an extra sentence such as "Within curtilage' is the standard requirement and any request to deviate from that must be accompanied by site-specific evidence in support."

The Steering Group/Working Group minutes of 09/05/2022 mis-represent my e-mail of 05/05/2022. It is not a question of either parking within curtilage or on the road; parking spaces can also be provided within site and still not be on the road. That arrangement is commonly used, quite often for visitor parking. I request my e-mail of 05/05/2022 and this e-mail be placed on the evidence base so the arguments made are on record for any interested parties to see.

Hart's revision of Parking Standards. The 'Technical Advice note on Cycle and Car Parking Standards' was not with the July Cabinet papers for approval, the due date is now shown as August 22nd.

Other Comments

- P24, Winchfield Court has 33 dwellings within its settlement boundary.
- A plea from Kerry, despite suggesting on a post-it that swift bricks be incorporated in all new homes there is no mention in the draft Plan. Could this be added to BE 4 please.

Kind regards,

Paul

From: Paul Jackaman [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 May 2022 16:02
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: The replacement WNDP, Residential Car Parking Spaces
Attachments: Extract,Appeal decision (22072019)20220505.pdf; Extract, Parking Provision Standards 2008,p1120220505.pdf; Extract, Parking Provision Standards 2008,p1220220505.pdf; Revision of NDP, comments 011020.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear All,

When I attended the last Community Engagement I asked for sight of the evidence which supports the proposed policy on car parking spaces.

I was told there is no evidence, that the Committee are 'flying a kite,' that they are hoping the new policy will not be thrown out when examined.

This is no way to proceed and would reflect badly on the Parish Council.

The current WNDP Policy A2 has already been found by a Planning Inspector to be '...derived from a survey of opinion in the parish rather than empirical evidence' and 'the requirement for an allocated visitor space within the curtilage of each dwelling is particularly onerous and contrary to the Council's standards and best practice in Manual for Streets'. See the extract from his report attached with this note in which he overrode Policy A2.

The proposed new policy is even more onerous (an additional parking space for a study!). Why is it being presented to the public when it is only an opinion unsupported by any evidence or facts?

The problem with current policy A2 is that it was based on an incorrect premise. The perception was that insufficient parking at the likes of Beauclerk Green and Edenbrook meant that the Local Plan parking standards were not working.

The facts are that Local Plan policy in place when permissions were granted for those two developments deliberately underprovided for parking spaces, in line with what was then National Policy. Hart recognised the problem and introduced its 'Parking Provision Standards' (copy of its summary attached) in 2008. Those provisions are still in place and, in my opinion, seem to have worked well.

I also attach a note relating to the WNDP which I sent 01/10/2020, in response to a maildrop request for ideas, in which I drew attention to the Planning Inspector's overruling of Policy A2.

To sum up my opinion regarding the proposed parking policy:

- It would result in homes not being built which are otherwise acceptable in planning terms.
- It would not make the best, and most efficient, use of scarce building land.
- It is unsupported by any evidence. WPC would be, knowingly and deliberately, trying to pull wool over the eyes of the examining inspector.
- It does not align with Hart's Parking Provision Standards.

I see from your meeting notes of 11/04/2022 that parking spaces will be discussed at your next meeting on 09/05/2022, and I hope this email will provide clarity for those discussions.

Kind regards,

Paul