

## Draft Northamptonshire Parking Standards - Summary of Consultation Comments (22<sup>nd</sup> December 2015/8<sup>th</sup> February 2016)

Respondent	Summary of comments	Response to comments
Rushton Parish Council.	One of the reasons garages are not used for the intended purpose is that they are mostly used for storage - in the case of new houses because they are often built with inadequate storage space in the house. Need for sanctions to prevent lazy parking.	Comments noted – comments beyond intent of his document
Northampton Resident	I agree with the increase of garage size, that parking should be at the front or side of the property & in a well lit area. Streets should be wide enough to allow parking both sides with enough room for emergency vehicles to get through. This is not the case in many parts of Northampton, especially Northampton East, which results in residents parking half on the pavements.	Comments noted – no additional action needed.
Higham Ferrers Town Council	Generally the document is supported but need for more parking spaces for smaller properties and would like to see larger parking spaces specifically for vans	Comments noted – will consider additional parking for smaller dwellings and the possibility of van parking spaces.
Northamptonshire Police – Crime Prevention	Outlines the social issues that poor can lead to. Residential Parking - Supports not promoting rear parking courts. Guidance on what makes a safe parking area. Avoid tandem parking spaces. Communal parking - should always be well lit. HGV parking - should always be well lit, secure and convenient and have waste facilities. Cycle parking – amend should be ‘convenient to use and secure’ to must be. Cycle parking for dwelling should not involve having to pass through the dwelling to access it. Communal cycle parking for apartment block should within the block. If in the public realm then the cycle parking should be a	Comments noted and added to revised document

	lockable structure. Motorcycle parking anchor should an accredited security standard, such as 'sold secure'.	
Weedon Bec Parish Council	The document is clear, sensible and easy to read and really the only comment we have is regarding tandem parking which we feel does not work in principle, unless a longish space. Generally it should be counted as one space only.	Comments noted and additional text added with regards to the use of tandem parking.
Helmdon Parish Council	Document welcome. Document should become supplementary planning guidance for each district. Document unclear in parking requirements for single dwelling, hence would like to see specific recommendations.	Comments noted and the county council also hopes that the District and Borough council's will support this new document going forward. Parking standards for dwelling are related to the number of bedrooms the property has, and this is set out in the document under C3 use class: dwelling houses.
Highways England	Considers that the document has no impacts on the strategic road network, and therefore has no comments.	Comments noted – no additional action needed.
Burton Latimer Town Council	Supports document	Comments noted – no additional action needed.
Paulerspury Parish Council	Overall support and congratulations. Non residential car parking dimensions should have more space between bays.	Comments noted – will investigate the idea of more space between bays in communal parking areas.
Silverstone Parish Council	Single bedroom properties should have at least two car parking spaces. Rural areas should have more parking spaces due to the lack of public transport	Rural areas have higher private vehicle use and lower public transport use than the urban areas of the county but it would difficult to apply different parking levels in different location. Will consider the possibly of increasing the 1.5 parking space standard in the draft document to 2 spaces for revised document.

Chelveston Parish Council	Proposal welcome, especially the new standards, larger parking spaces and larger garage sizes	Comments noted – no additional action needed.
Tharpston Town Council	Improvement on previous car parking policies. Extensions and granny annexes need additional parking.	Extensions and granny annexes are often developed using permitted development rights making it difficult to enforce any additional parking capacity.
Development Management, Northamptonshire County Council	Educational developments – need for parking standard for part-time staff.	Part-time staff added.
Higham Ferrers Resident	Welcomes larger parking spaces and garages. Notes the need for a car outside of cities and that residents don't like parking in rear parking courts. Supports unallocated parking forming part of the street scene. 1 and 2 bed properties require more parking, as they are often occupied by 2 plus adult residents. Many residents have van so spaces for these vehicles should be included in the standards for residential developments.	Comments noted – will consider additional parking for smaller dwellings and the possibility of van parking spaces.
Raunds Town Council	Document should have standards for other use classes other than residential.	The document covers the full range of use classes in chapter 9
Travel Choices, Northamptonshire Highways	The document should make reference to trends within larger cities in relation to reduced car ownership.	Comments noted – however this trend has not reached Northamptonshire yet.
Access Officer, Northamptonshire Highways	Comment on chapter 5 – suggested rewording in support of Sheffield stands. Additional wording describing the design/location of cycle stands.	Comments noted – additional text will be added relating to the design and location of cycle stands.
Stanwick Parish Council	Proposal welcomed	Comments noted – no additional action needed.
Persimmon Homes	Comments focus on residential standards. Agree that rear parking are unpopular with residents and therefore not used. The increase driveway size is unjustified and unnecessary. Garage sizes are onerous to the point of effecting the viability of schemes. Other authorities have specified garages of 3m x 6m. The larger garage should only be included when the garage is allocated as part of the parking provision for the site. Parking standards for 4+ bed dwellings is high.	Comments noted..Garage size will remain as detailed as the garage must be large enough to park a car in, and not just used as a store. Tandem parking is being considered, but will only be used in specified situation. Visitor parking will remain as stated in

	<p>The document doesn't mention tandem parking, so request 2 tandem spaces for 2/3 bed dwellings and 3 tandem spaces for 4+bed dwellings.</p> <p>Visitors' parking is high, so would suggest 25% ratio of visitor spaces to dedicated spaces.</p>	<p>the draft document.</p>
<p>Northampton Borough Council</p>	<p>Chapter 3 -A policy that states that parking courts are not to be used – whilst it is understandable that parking courts are not that well used as curtilage or on street spaces, the fact remains that parking courts are occasionally necessary in order to deliver a development of the required number of dwellings. Suggest that this paragraph is reworded along the lines of “Parking Courts will be discouraged unless it can be demonstrated that curtilage or on street spaces cannot be delivered and the parking courts contain suitable security measures and lighting and with easy access to respect dwellings”.</p> <p>The introduction of parking standards for extensions is not appropriate. This is because a large extension can be constructed under the permitted development/prior notification procedures. These would proceed without any consideration of car parking issues and could potentially be larger than an extension requiring planning permission. The likelihood is that proposals would just be redrawn so that they don't include bedrooms (rooms would be annotated as things like studies and play rooms) to avoid having to provide additional car parking. Once approved, LPAs are unable to insist that rooms are not used as bedrooms.</p> <p>There is a change in stance proposed by NCC in that parking standards will now be “minimum” rather than “maximum” standards – perhaps it would be useful to have justification to substantiate this change.</p> <p>HIMO – in area where there is limited or no parking – will Parking Beat Survey be required normally?</p>	<p>Comments on rear parking courts will be revised to reflect comments from NBC.</p> <p>Comments with regards to extensions will be suitably amended.</p> <p>The change in stance by NCC with regards to parking standards now being a minimum rather than the maximum as set out in the previous parking standards document is explained in chapter 1. The explanation being that previously the authority had tried to manage/limit car ownership by restricting parking, this method has not been effective so is being replaced by ensuring that new development have a sufficient supply of car parking spaces.</p> <p>Parking Beat Surveys will be required where there is insufficient parking on site.</p>

	<p>Parking standards for C3 dwellings – requiring 3 spaces per dwelling for 4 bed properties seems a little onerous.</p> <p>Garage standards 3.3m wide would appear to be onerous, the Highway Standing advice currently specifies 3.2m, by large 3m would be sufficient to accommodate a car.</p> <p>Chapter 5 -Cycle parking does occasionally need to be addressed through conditions (such as outline applications).</p> <p>Chapter 6 -This needs to be strengthened to include guidance for where spaces for use by those with disabilities should be placed.</p> <p>Chapter 8 -Need greater precision as to the types of development that are likely to generate coach traffic.</p> <p>Chapter 9 -Requirements for Use Class A4 seem high – need justification on why the increase from 1 space per 25 sqm to 1 space per 5 sqm.</p> <p>Use Class C3 – Parking requirements for three/four+ bedroom dwellings are high. This provision is likely to reduce the number of dwellings that could be accommodated within a development. This could call into the question the viability of some schemes. (see comments above)</p> <p>Bus/Rail Stations – One space per full time member of staff is onerous. It is likely that there will be an element of shift working; however, all staff would need their own space irrespective of whether they are at work.</p> <p>Night clubs – These are likely to be in existing centres, which are likely to be well served by public transport. Very few people drive</p>	<p>The parking standards set out in chapter 9 will remain as in the draft document, as will the revised garage sizes.</p> <p>Additional guidance will be given on disabled parking.</p> <p>Development likely to generate coach travel will be included.</p> <p>Class A4 parking requirement will be reduced.</p> <p>Class C3 parking will remain as presented in draft document.</p> <p>Bus/Rail station - include a parking standard for part- time staff.</p> <p>Night clubs alter the parking standard to 1 space per full –time member of staff.</p>
--	--	---

	to night clubs.	
Daventry District Council	<p>Document needs better proof reading. Document wasn't placed on NCC's consultation register, so would suggest a further round of consultation.</p> <p>Core matters – the document gives to high priority to sufficient parking, without considering viability or good design. The focus on providing sufficient parking will discourage sustainable travel, and could harm character areas, and limit landscaping. Therefore the following approach is suggested:</p> <p>Rather than being expressed as minima, the standards be expressed as benchmark levels of provision, against which the actual expected requirements of each development should be considered. It should be clear that actual levels of parking provision required may be more or less than the standard, depending on the actual projected parking generation of a particular development (particularly as indicated in a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement).</p> <p>It would be beneficial to state expressly the aims of the standards, for example: "To support the provision of sufficient parking to meet the needs of each development without compromising the amenity of the surrounding area or highway safety, whilst supporting good design and sustainable travel." This would help in their informed application.</p> <p>The document would have more weight if the new the text supporting the new parking standards set out more justification.</p> <p>Other issue -In town centres and similar areas the document should recognise that it is not appropriate to suggest a fixed percentage of disabled/mobility spaces in each car park. Rather, the best approach is to locate the spaces required in the locations people with mobility impairments will find them most useful. This</p>	<p>The document underwent eight weeks plus consultation to a wide audience, so no further consultation is considered necessary.</p> <p>The document is about parking standards so deal with that issue not associated development pressures.</p> <p>The parking standards document set a guide for the parking required for a standard development, individual variations can be agreed with Highways Development Control where necessary.</p> <p>The aims of the parking standards document as present by DDC will be included in the Chapter 1 of the document.</p> <p>Some additional justification (text and photos) for the new parking standards will be included.</p> <p>Follow DDC example for distribution of disabled parking across a town centre.</p>

	<p>may result in some car parks wholly comprising disabled/mobility spaces, and other with none at all. Nor is a fixed percentage of overall spaces a particularly useful guide in this context. DDC regularly surveys the use of car parks in Daventry town centre, including the number of vehicles displaying a blue badge (whether or not in a disabled/mobility bay) and adjusted the provision of disabled/mobility spaces according to need and demand. The document could usefully commend this approach generally.</p> <p>The requirement to have disabled/mobility parking bays longer than standard bays is likely in most cases to be difficult to achieve and prevent efficient use of land, thereby (among other things) affecting development viability. Nor it is clear why longer bays are proposed. This suggestion should therefore be removed.</p> <p>The objections to parking courts have not be fully justified, and in places such courts form a useful form of development. The guidance should therefore be toned down, to instead identify that parking courts are (only) suitable when certain criteria are met (for example, overlooking, ease of access (or no potential for frontage parking), etc.)</p> <p>The motorcycle parking bay layout shown in Figure 9 might mislead readers into thinking such a large number of spaces need to be provided in a block. It is assumed this is not the intention.</p> <p>It needs to be clarified what floor area basis is used for calculations; the leading options would appear to be gross floor area or net floor area, but there are other options. Any of them would give different results.</p> <p>NCC needs to consider maintenance and other responsibilities for EV charging points on the highway. NCC taking on responsibility</p>	<p>Disabled parking bay dimension will remain as presented in the draft document.</p> <p>Wording around use of rear parking courts will be revised using suggested text from NBC as mentioned earlier.</p> <p>Figure 9 will be update re consultation response.</p> <p>The calculation in chapter 9, relates to Gross Floor Space, this will be updated in the revised document.</p> <p>On highway electric vehicle charging point information has been updated</p>
--	---	---

	<p>would doubtless be welcome, but is perhaps unlikely.</p>	
<p>South Northamptonshire District Council</p>	<p>More adaptability of parking standards for rural/architecturally sensitive areas.</p> <p>Street layby parking is resisted by LHA, but this document is promoting it.</p> <p>Residential visitor parking - clarity needed how/where this should be provided.</p> <p>Parking requirements should be met on drive or in a parking court and garages only seem as a bonus provision. New text to support this point included in consultation response.</p> <p>SNC does not support frontage parking; they only allow on – plot, side or rear. Hence, rear parking courts are needed.</p> <p>Page 5 – on street parking contradicts with what’s said on page 9, about not allowing allocated parking on street. Perhaps this should just refer to visitors parking.</p> <p>Disabled parking – not clear if the standards refer to private plots.</p>	<p>The parking standards document set a guide for the parking required for a standard development, individual variations can be agreed with Highways Development Control where necessary.</p> <p>On street/street layby parking is supported by NCC and providing the streets is designed appropriately as set out in the document.</p> <p>Parking standards table is guidance for the parking required.</p> <p>Text with regards to garages will be revised.</p> <p>Visitor parking will be provided across the development, on street or /and in communal parking areas.</p> <p>Wording around use of rear parking courts will be revised using suggested text from NBC as mentioned earlier.</p>

		<p>On street parking is only for use as unallocated parking.</p> <p>Disabled parking does not refer to private plots, will amend document to make that fact clear.</p>
<p>North Northants Joint Planning Comments</p>	<p>Welcome move away from maximum parking standards, and recognition that parking demand has to be met within the overall design of the site.</p> <p>Welcome in principle the requirement to incorporate visitor parking across development sites, as this is something we have struggled to achieve on some sites.</p> <p>Welcome emphasis on cycle parking in the document</p> <p>Welcome in principle the more generous dimensions for parking spaces, though this could be challenging in some layouts.</p> <p>Calculating demand - Para 39 of the NPPF states that in setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the accessibility of the development;</li> <li>● the type, mix and use of development;</li> <li>● the availability of and opportunities for public transport;</li> <li>● local car ownership levels; and</li> <li>● an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.</li> </ul> <p>How have these been dealt with in this parking guidance?</p> <p>The document should allow for different standards in conservation areas and heritage setting.</p> <p>Change the document from setting standards to offering guidance so that individual sites can be considered.</p> <p>Unallocated/On Plot provision – unallocated on street parking is the most effective way of providing parking – the new standards ought to encourage the use of unallocated parking first.</p>	<p>Opening supportive comments noted.</p> <p>With regards to para 39 of the NPPF, the highway authority have produced this document to aid delivery of sustainable communities – as having sufficient well designed parking improves street scenes and limits neighbour disputes.</p> <p>Northamptonshire as other areas of the county has high levels of car ownership, that are predicted to grow further in the next twenty years, hence having somewhere to park is important. The document indirectly deals with reducing high-emission vehicles by promoting parking standards for cycling and electric charging points.</p> <p>The parking standards document set a guide for the parking required for a standard development, individual variations can be agreed with Highways Development Control where necessary. Further reference to MfS will be made in chapter 1.</p>

	<p>Having parking in the right place is an important as having sufficient parking.</p> <p>Chapter1 - promote the role of MfS further</p> <p>Chapter 3 – More images of local example, which they can supply.</p> <p>Welcome discouragement of rear parking courts.</p> <p>Query what is meant by on plot in rear gardens</p> <p>Total loss of front gardens is a concern, should make reference to use of permeable front gardens/SUDS.</p> <p>Welcome accommodating residential parking on street but 10m long spaces for parallel parking seems excessive.</p> <p>Give examples of allocated vs unallocated parking spaces.</p> <p>Garages - welcome minimum dimensions.</p> <p>Concern that garages to be set back 5.5m, alternative is 0.5m which prevents parking in front of garage.</p> <p>Highway parking - not more than 4 spaces are provided in a row without landscaping and a tree between. This is partly to do with how the street appears, but also to provide for spaces between parked cars for pedestrians to cross so we would ask that this is included in the guidance.</p> <p>Avoiding people parking in turning heads. This is another common problem and it would be good to include measures that should be used to discourage this, such as having accesses off the turning head, reducing the need for turning heads through the provision of connected street networks, provision of trees/street furniture.</p> <p>Residential parking – explain the 10% disabled provision in residential development.</p> <p>Avoid tandem parking.</p> <p>Extension to existing houses – because of PD rights a blanket approach to extensions may not be achievable.</p> <p>HiMOs - The standard fails to reference taking into consideration 'current car parking arrangements' i.e. if existing 4 bed house with no car parking, then would HMO generate significantly more car parking?</p>	<p>Local images used in chapter 3.</p> <p>Reference to rear gardens removed.</p> <p>Will reference permeable surfaces for front gardens parking</p> <p>Comments relating to layout details will be included in the revise document as appropriate.</p> <p>Further explanation will be given with regards to disabled parking.</p> <p>Tandem parking currently not mentioned in the document. Comments with regards to extensions</p>
--	---	--

	<p>PD allows for MCOU from residential (C3) to HiMO for between 3 – 6 persons. This standard can only be enforced for Large HiMO's unless PD is removed and we query whether LPAs will be willing to do this, so we do not think this may be enforceable.</p> <p>Chapter9 - standards should become guidance, as many use class changes are permitted development.</p> <p>Concern that it is not realistic to apply these for A use classes in town centres.</p> <p>A3 transport café use seems onerous stating 1 lorry space per 2m<sup>2</sup>?? (Chapter 9) but at Chapter 10, this says 4m<sup>2</sup>. Given the typically remote location of transport cafes on major trunk routes / busy roads, cycle provision requirements seem quite high. What is the evidence base for the disabled parking requirement for transport café's given the nature of the use (for lorry drivers typically).</p> <p>The lorry standards do not include visitor space standards for lorries to park in on new industrial estates overnight or during early hours when some industrial uses are not yet open. This commonly results in lorries parking on service roads leading to these uses and can be problematic. Perhaps a standard should be considered</p> <p>Cycle parking - There may be opposition from developers to the increased cycle parking standard. It would be helpful to explain what percentage of the workforce would be able to cycle to work based on the cycle parking standards. The new office standard for instance allows for about 8 -15% of the workforce to travel to work by bike which reinforces that this is a reasonable standard. However, the requirement for cycle parking does not take into account the location of some sites so it might be harder to justify.</p>	<p>will be suitably amended. Comments with regards to HiMO will be suitably amended.</p> <p>Chapter 9 - consideration will be given to making the standards guidance.</p> <p>Parking standards for A use classes will remain as in draft document.</p> <p>A3 use class will be revised to provide a sensible and consistent response.</p> <p>.</p> <p>NCC wouldn't promote lorries parking in industrial estate over night – as this encourages littering and other social issues.</p> <p>The parking standards document set a guide for the cycle parking required for a standard development, individual variations can be agreed with Highways Development Control where necessary.</p>
--	---	--

<p>East Northamptonshire Council</p>	<p>Welcome move away from maximum parking standards, and recognition that parking demand has to be met within the overall design of the site. However, Policy 6 of Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan (RNOT) states an average maximum 2 car parking spaces per dwelling should be provided across the development. Therefore the new standards would be contrary to the Council's adopted local plan.</p> <p>Welcome in principle the requirement to incorporate visitor parking across development sites, as this is something that the Council have struggled to achieve on some sites.</p> <p>Welcome emphasis on cycle parking in the document</p> <p>Welcome in principle the more generous dimensions for parking spaces, though this could be challenging in some layouts.</p> <p>Officers have concerns that the new parking guidance would be contrary to Paragraphs 30 and 39 of NPPF and also Policy 8 of the new North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (NNJCS).</p> <p>The Council believes that other (sustainable) modes of transport should still be promoted in accordance with the principles set out in national and regional policies.</p> <p>Would this guidance replace Standing Advice as this is not clear?</p> <p>Chapter 1 – promote MfS more</p> <p>Chapter2 – further links to national policy, and NNJCS.</p> <p>Chapter 3 – more illustrations</p> <p>Welcomes discouragement of rear parking courts</p> <p>Query what is meant by on plot parking in rear gardens</p> <p>Loss of front gardens is a concern</p> <p>Welcome residential parking being allocated on street, explain further - what street width.</p> <p>Welcome minimum garage dimensions</p> <p>Garages should in some cases have no set back from the highway</p> <p>Concerns that increase parking standards will effect the vitality of site.</p> <p>Some concerns that this documents does not recognise that area,</p>	<p>The parking standards document sets standards across the county, therefore NCC will be using this document not those in existing plans/documents.</p> <p>With regards to para 39 of the NPPF, the highway authority have produced this document to aid delivery of sustainable communities – as having sufficient well designed parking improves street scenes and limits neighbour disputes.</p> <p>Northamptonshire as other areas of the county has high levels of car ownership, that are predicted to grow further in the next twenty years, hence having somewhere to park is important. The document indirectly deals with reducing high-emission vehicles by promoting parking standards for cycling and electric charging points.</p> <p>Further reference to MfS will be made in chapter 1.</p> <p>Will increase links to local/national policy.</p> <p>Local images used in chapter 3.</p> <p>Reference to rear gardens removed.</p> <p>Will reference permeable surfaces for front gardens parking</p> <p>Garages need to be set back from highway so that there is a space utility.</p> <p>Increase parking may effect viability, but may also enable the properties to</p>
--------------------------------------	--	---

	<p>housing mix and tenure could have an impact on parking provision, MfS has an useful spreadsheet, which helps to calculate parking requirements depending on size of the property and tenure, it would be helpful if this could be included, for example Irthlingborough is known for low car ownership.</p> <p>HiMO – lack of clarity what the requirement would be as not listed in the table, also under the Use Class Order HiMO can be classed as C3© (if up to 6 people) or C4 (if more than 6 people are occupying the same building), surely this would affect the parking requirements.</p> <p>Chapter 5 - Welcome requirement to incorporate the cycle parking into an application, however this could affect validation or determination of the application and cause additional delays. LPAs are already under pressure from central government to comply with the determination targets.</p> <p>Chapter 6 - Welcome the increase in disabled parking standards, however will this affect all residential schemes, even fairly small sites? This could affect small residential developments in rural areas. The location of these parking spaces should also be considered as often they are not located in the most convenient location.</p> <p>Class C2 Hospital – there is no requirement for staff parking? Residential education establishments – further/higher education – no requirements for vehicle or cycle parking Class D1 Education- primary/ secondary – should there be a provision for visitor parking and pick up/ drop off bays ? Education further/ higher – lack of requirement for visitor parking</p>	<p>have a higher value/ sell for a higher value. This document presents a standard guide to parking standards, local individual refinements can be discussed with highways development control staff as necessary.</p> <p>Comments with regards to HiMO will be suitably amended. Cycle stands where including in the previous parking standards document, so the time need to agree them would be similar.</p> <p>Disabled parking does not refer to private plots, will amend document to make that fact clear.</p> <p>Specific parking standards will be clarified / updated as consultation response.</p>
--	---	---