

EXECUTIVE BOARD – 11<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2006

Parking Standards, TAs and TPs Supplementary Planning Document

Comments arising from Area Committees

Note that the Chairs of South East Area Committee and East Area Parliament decided not to include the Parking Standard SPD as an agenda item.

Committee	Councillor	Comment	Response (draft)
CAC 2 <sup>nd</sup> Aug 06	Keen	<b>Para 91</b> – front garden parking on corner plots can be dangerous, particularly where accessed from two different roads on the junction. Would help for SPD to introduce some control to these arrangements.	OLP Policy CP.1(c) states that development must be acceptable in terms of access, parking & highway safety. Paragraph 93 of the SPD states that the Council will resist proposals where the only feasible location for car parking would make the proposal unacceptable on design grounds. Therefore do not consider any further elaboration is necessary.
	Keen	Would like to see something in the SPD which helps Members to refuse applications which do not provide enough parking, particularly with respect to new flats and conversions. Should be at least 3 cp spaces per 2 x 2 bed flats. Stronger controls should be set out in the SPD.	The OLP sets out <u>maximum</u> parking standards for residential dwellings, which complies with national guidance PPG3 and PPG13, and guidance set out in the RTS, all of which support maximum restraint-based standards. The OLP allows up to 2 spaces for 2-3 bed dwellings on smaller developments, depending on existing densities and context. The SPD clarifies that likely car ownership, and opportunities to reduce overall parking, should be considered in determining appropriate parking provision, which supports making the best use of land and seeking not to encourage car ownership. This should be subject to supporting information on parking pressure on existing streets. Do not therefore consider any change is appropriate.
NAC 3 <sup>rd</sup> Aug 06	Fooks	Notes cumulative impact of smaller development, and wonders if contributions should be sought towards mitigation.	Paragraph 21 of the SPD states that if the cumulative impact of minor residential development has not been addressed, the Council may seek a contribution towards improving public transport, or parking controls, or both. No further elaboration considered necessary.

	Fooks	<b>Paragraph 80</b> – supports more use of underground parking for new residential development.	Support noted. Underground parking for residential is likely to be most appropriate for higher density urban-central development. Reference may be made to EP publication ‘Car Parking – What Works Where?’
	Fooks	<b>Paragraph 101</b> – notes concern over new hardstanding for parking, and favours porous surfacing for parking.	Paragraph 101 sets out that sustainable drainage measures will normally be required for parking of 3 or more spaces.
	Fooks	<b>Paragraph 92</b> – Council should ‘insist’ not ‘expect’ compliance with Guidance Note on Front Garden Parking.	The guidance note referred to is not a formally adopted planning document, and is not referred to in the OLP. It may therefore be construed as unreasonable to ‘insist’ on compliance with the Guidance Note specifically. <b>Suggest substituting “will be expected to” with “should” in paragraph 92.</b>
	Fooks	It is important to ensure some visitor parking for low-car development.	Visitor parking for low-car or car-free housing may be problematic, as such developments will normally require exclusion from the CPZ. The issue is best addressed on a case-by-case basis, taking into account time-limited or charged spaces in the vicinity which may be available for visitor use. However lack of visitor parking associated with the development should not necessarily be a reason for refusal of planning permission.  <b>Suggest addition of a further criteria in box following para 84: “Has the issue of visitor parking needs been considered?”</b>
	Goddard	<b>Paragraph 137:</b> request clarification on what types of development would be suitable for a cycle hub.	Paragraph 137 states that a cycle hub may be suitable where there is good potential for use by a range of users, such as the City centre or large urban employment sites. There is no specific reference to cycle hubs in the OLP, therefore would be inappropriate to set any threshold or specific criteria. Consider no change necessary, as the paragraph can only highlight good practice.
<b>CSWC 8<sup>th</sup> Aug 06</b>	Pressell	<b>Paragraph 52:</b> urge better and more enforcement of RTP’s.	The SPD cannot go beyond the OLP policies. It would therefore not be appropriate to include detailed requirements relating to RTPs submitted as part of the planning process. Suggest no change.

	Pressell	Reference should be made to the need to ensure removal of abandoned bicycles.	This issue is one of ongoing management, which may be tied in with TP development. However it is too specific for inclusion in SPD – it may be unreasonable to ask for this as a general TP requirement (particularly where TP is outcomes-based). No change suggested.
	Pressell	<b>Paragraph 92:</b> request that Guidance Note on Front Garden Parking is updated to refer to porous surfacing.	<b>SPD Appendix 5 to be amended to encourage use of sustainable drainage for domestic parking.</b>
	Pressell	Need to clarify what protection afforded to trees in the street, which might otherwise be removed to make way for parking.	Will pass on comments to Tree Officer. However consider specific reference to trees is too detailed, and may confuse as most trees & shrubs within domestic curtilage are not subject to any protection under planning law.
	Pressell	<b>Paragraph 76:</b> the County Council should exclude car club vehicles from residents' parking permit charging.	The County Council is responsible for administering and charging for controlled parking, it would therefore not be appropriate to include this in the SPD. (Committee Chair has noted the request to write to the County Council on this matter.)
	Pressell	<b>Paragraph 97:</b> this section needs strengthening, such that the City Council will expect most new developments to be designated Home Zones.	The formal designation of a Home Zone (whether new build or retrospective) requires the approval of the County Council as local highway authority. This will normally require compliance with certain criteria, such as function of the street within the road hierarchy, predicted traffic flows, and specific design criteria (see "Home Zone Characteristics for New Housing Developments" (Oxon. CC) and Govt Circular 2/2006 on Home Zone regs). It may be counter-productive to seek formal Home Zone status in every case, as the City Council cannot reasonably refuse applications which do not meet all the required Home Zone standards. This approach may also lead to formulaic 'off-the-peg' residential design.  <b>Suggest re-wording paragraph 97 to read: "The City Council will support formal Home Zone development where the necessary design and highway criteria are met. ALL new access roads and streets should</b>

			<p><b>incorporate some elements of a Home Zone. These should include: ...”</b></p> <p><b>Agree – insert new sub-section as paragraphs 88 and 89 to state policy on garages.</b></p> <p>Consider this is too specific a requirement for SPD, and is unlikely to be carried through in reality in implementing SPD. Could be encouraged through travel plans or other OLP policies (e.g. CP.23 where a proposal falls within an AQMA, or CP.15 – Energy Efficiency).</p> <p>Noted – see previous comments and suggested change.</p> <p>Regulations on preparing LDDs make clear that SPDs can only expand on or supplement adopted DPDs or saved local plan policies, and should not be used to introduce new policy that should be subject to an independent examination in public. No change to any of the standards can therefore be made.</p> <p>Noted – see previous comments and suggested change.</p> <p>Noted re surfacing – see previous comments and suggested change. Consider positioning of wheelie bins not relevant enough to include in SPD – Policy CP.10(c) in the OLP deals specifically with this. No change suggested.</p> <p><b>Suggest additional wording to paragraph 138:</b>  <b>“The City Council will support the development of cycle centres and cycle hubs for employment-generating and mixed-use developments, <u>particularly at locations where they can be integrated with other travel modes.</u>”</b></p> <p>Public comment noted.</p>
	Pressell	<b>Appendix 6:</b> Reference to garages being less preferred should be made in main body of SPD.	
	Pressell	Should make provision for electric vehicles in new development (e.g. charging points).	
	Price	Supports Cllr Pressell's comments relating to Home Zones.	
	Price	Appendix 4 of OLP – cycle parking standard for schools is woefully inadequate. Would like to see this standard revised.	
	Armitage (County Councillor)	Support previous comments on Home Zones – strengthened policy would also reflect Council's aspiration for a City-side 20 mph zone to be introduced.	
	Armitage	Support Cllr Pressell's comments re front garden parking. Also need to take account of wheelie bins – consider practical ways of dealing with these in conjunction with parking.	
	Armitage	<b>Paragraph 138:</b> We should clarify that cycle centres / hubs need to be integrated with other modes of transport. Need to explicitly favour modal integration.	
	Tony Joyce (member of	Should strengthen SPD relating to underground parking for residential, as helps to preserve amenity space and avoid	

	public)	overdevelopment, and eases on-street pressure. However should not be used solely to achieve higher density development	
<b>NEAC 15<sup>th</sup> Aug 06</b>	Simon Hunt (member of public)	Welcome reference to secure and sheltered cycle parking. However cycle parking standard of 1 space per 5 staff is inadequate – should be 1 to 3 as in Cambridge.	Regulations on preparing LDDs make clear that SPDs can only expand on or supplement adopted DPDs or saved local plan policies, and should not be used to introduce new policy that should be subject to an independent examination in public. No change to any of the standards can therefore be made.
	Sinclair	Asked whether there are any Home Zones in Oxford, given County Council's abandonment of the Stapleton Road scheme.	Home Zone design principles are beginning to be seen on the ground in Oxford (e.g. former Bus Depot site, Cowley Road), and the SPD supports this aim.
	Clarkson	Would like to see more cycle parking designed with women in mind, as it is sometimes difficult to use the standard size stand for women's bicycles.	The SPD sets out the Council's requirement for good quality cycle parking for all new development, and advises that Sheffield style stands are usually the most appropriate (in line with County Council policy). Standard Sheffield stands are generally appropriate for all cycle frame sizes, and are the recommended option from many best practice sources. Therefore suggest no change.
	Tall	<b>Paragraph 93:</b> questioned what " the City Council's planning powers" were with respect to front garden parking, given PD rights for domestic dwelling houses.	These PD rights apply only to dwelling houses. This SPD will also apply to flats (including conversions), which do not enjoy the same PD rights, with changes to on-plot parking subject to planning control. The wording also acknowledges the potential option of considering Article 4 Declarations to remove this PD right, although this has not as yet been investigated by the Council. It further acknowledges the possibility of future changes to the GPDO with respect to front garden parking.
	Rundle	The section dealing with TPs is worded in fairly vague and woolly terms, an issue which falls jointly to City and County Councils. Could do with some clarification.	Comment noted. The process of securing TPs is still evolving, however the SPD is intended to reflect best practice and ensure discussions are held with and between City and County officers. However no specific change has been requested, and none is therefore suggested.

