

## Appeal

Dear Planning

Ref Application 231479/DPP  
Appeal – Notice of Review

Please find below and attached my appeal/review request. All drawings and photos are downloaded from your public access site and unaltered, so nothing has been added.

My appeal has 4 points, based on the main problem of turning space and in particular that it has not been stated that the required turns (swept paths) are not possible, just that they are “convoluted manoeuvres resulting in repeat and excessive overhanging of the footway during internal turning movements...”

- 1) It is not clear to me why repeat and excessive overhanging of the footway (in other words driving across the garden path) is a problem. My appeal is that convoluted turns and crossing the footway are not a problem because to me they are no more difficult than getting out of a tight street parking space using full steering lock, which everyone knows how to do. Also, if crossing the footway once is ok then surely crossing the footway multiple times is also ok? Would removal of the footway (eg. re-surface the whole site with gravel, tarmac, setts) resolve this footway problem?
- 2) Based on my photos and simulations using a space of 8.7 m by 8.7 m, I believe turning is possible and also much easier than reversing in or out, which makes reversing in or out unlikely, rather than likely.
- 3) It seems my photos were not considered – they are submitted to show that turning 75 degrees and 90 degrees with full steering lock and one single swept curve in a space of 6.2 m is easy. I can label the photos more if needed.
- 4) It is not clear what my snapshot drawings may have missed.

Notes :

I believe I drew more turns than are actually needed (I used over cautious gentle turns) so the turns may well be simpler (less convoluted) than the turns submitted.

It does not seem that there is “one drawing” software available that can show the swept paths/turns that are easily possible with full lock (reverse and forward gears) and also changing steering lock while in reverse or forward gear (S-shaped swept paths/turns).

I have included all drawings, to show that most movements are simple forwards and reverses, and so the most important drawing may be the two “both parked” drawings along with the two “turning in 6 metres” photos.

## **Possible Plan ?**

If it helps, perhaps the following plan and conditions could be set at my cost;

- a) Confirm my turnings photos are correct
- b) If practical, confirm turns are possible on a test site with my car and cones to be the second car.
- c) Prepare internal site ground surface to your acceptable standard.
- d) Two metres of hedge to be removed and two metres of plinth lowered to make entry possible. Install an ACC approved temporary ramp and temporary H-marking (instead of dropped kerb) and confirm turning is possible and nothing has been missed. Second car on the site to be marked with cones so there is no risk of needing to reverse out during this trial, because the cones can be moved and turning with only one car on the site is definitely possible.
- e) If all is good then install dropped kerb.
- f) Contingency plan – remove temporary ramp, raise plinth, replant hedge.

Optional –

The inner/side hedge be replaced with a fence to give a little more space.

Two signs to be erected (one on pavement and one in driveway) along the lines of “reverse exit or reverse entry ~~invalidates insurance and~~ will lead to a dangerous driving prosecution – by order ACC”.

## Other objections

I will also try to address all the other objections

- 5) A fair proportion of the Argyll Crescent properties already have little or no hedge and my proposal is for only around 50% of hedge removal.
- 6) A lowered plinth (or other lowered replacement stone type ) for driving over barely changes the street scene at all (has the same look as a foot path entry just a little bigger).
- 7) Cars parked on the street or in front of a house have the same look. That is to say, it is still a car parked in front of a house, either way. As far as I know, other street residents have not objected to my application (street scene).
- 8) If grass-crete is used no drainage channel is needed I believe.
- 9) The metal roof drain channel will not be driven over if the dropped kerb is one metre or so away.
- 10) Larger cars (within reasonable limits) can still perform the drawn turnings and parking. Larger cars are minimally wider and I think that even a car of 5 m in length can enter a reduced 2.7 gap as would exist at the bay window if a larger car was used.
- 11) Drawings 1,2,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,15,16,17,18,19,20 are all simple forward and reverse movements so nothing has been missed by using snapshot drawings.
- 12) Convoluted turns are not a problem because to me they are no more difficult than getting out of a tight street parking space ie. full lock, which everyone knows how to do.
- 13) It is not clear why driving across the garden path multiple times is considered not safe.
- 14) Software – it is possible that software doing “one page drawings” for entry and exit is not capable of simulating full lock and gentle “s” shaped turns and my snapshots may be better. I would be quite surprised if any of the software you accept can simulate full lock turns. Please advise which software you accept. Maybe there are other ways than software to assess turning spaces.
- 15) Perhaps better than swept curve software are the two photos which show turning in 6 m with full lock. *These two photos do not seem to have been considered and confirm that the turns in the drawing are possible and easy.* I have tried to mark clearly in the photos which tyre tracks are which.

Kind Regards

Peter McBoyle