

Appendix 4 – Summary of objection and officer’s comments

	Objector	Reason for objection	Comment
1	Property owner	Does not object to the provision of a disabled bay in principle, but expressed concern regarding the location and size of the proposed bay, and the impact on the number of available parking spaces.	<p>In accordance with our working practice, the disabled parking bay is proposed within the closest available parking space to the applicant's property, which is also the location that was recommended following a mobility assessment of the applicant by a member of our Adult Social Care department.</p> <p>It was noted from site inspections that two vehicles often park within the turning head adjacent to the location of the proposed bay. Although this road layout is intended to provide sufficient space to allow vehicles to turn around safely, it is inevitable that in the absence of any parking restrictions, such as double yellow lines, some residents will use this area for parking. The County Council does not have plans to implement parking restrictions within the turning head at this time, and the slightly longer 6.6m bay has been proposed to reduce the likelihood of a vehicle parked within the turning head preventing the applicant from accessing or leaving the proposed disabled parking bay in the layby.</p> <p>As the resident has suggested in their email, there are currently two parking spaces between the end of the cul-de-sac and the private driveway of no. 5 Wolfe Close. A 5 metre space (the standard recommended length of a single parking space) would be retained between the proposed 6.6 metre disabled parking bay and the private access of no. 5 Wolfe Close. As a result, we would not envisage that the length of the proposed parking bay will result in the loss of any existing parking spaces.</p>
2	Property owner	Requested clarification that the proposed parking bay will not obstruct access to their property.	As per the above comments, there is a 5 metre gap between the proposed 6.6m long advisory disabled parking bay and the dropped kerb for the resident’s driveway. There would therefore be sufficient room to accommodate a blue badge holder’s vehicle and an additional vehicle within the parking layby without encroaching upon the affected resident’s driveway. This was confirmed in a telephone discussion with the resident.

3	Property owner	No objection to the proposed disabled parking bay, and supports the application.	
4	Property owner	No objection to the proposed disabled parking bay	
5	Property owner	Supports the provision of a disable parking bay	
6	Property owner	No objection to the proposed disabled parking bay	