

BRENTWOOD BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

PARKING STANDARDS: DESIGN AND GOOD PRACTICE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

REGULATION 18(4)(b) REPRESENTATIONS STATEMENT

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008

Brentwood Borough Council published a Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on 'Parking Standards: Design and Good Practice' for public consultation for a six week period between 5 January and 16 February 2011, pursuant to Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.

The Parking Standards document provides quality advice and guidance on the provision and role of parking within residential, commercial and leisure areas in Essex. A fundamental change included in the new standards is a move to minimum standards for trip origins (residential parking) and maximum standards for trip destinations (for example, commercial, leisure and retail parking), acknowledging the fact that limiting parking availability at trip origins does not necessarily discourage car ownership and can push vehicle parking onto the adjacent public highway, diminishing the streetscape and potentially obstructing emergency and passenger transport vehicles.

Copies of the consultation documents were made available for public inspection during normal opening hours at the following locations:

- (i) Town Hall, Ingrave Road, Brentwood
- (ii) Information Centre, 44 High Street, Brentwood
- (iii) Brentwood Library, New Road, Brentwood
- (v) Shenfield Library, Hutton Road, Shenfield, Brentwood
- (iv) Ingatestone Library, High Street, Ingatestone

Copies of the document were also available to view on the Council's website at www.brentwood.gov.uk and available free of charge from Planning Services at the Town Hall, Ingrave Road, Brentwood.

Copies of the draft SPD were sent to specific and general consultation bodies, including Parish Councils, local interest groups and business representative bodies. A list of contacts on the Local Development Framework mailing list were advised of the consultation and a notice was advertised in the local newspaper.

Eight representations were received on the draft Parking Standards SPD as set out below. Following consideration of the representations the Council resolved to adopt the SPD without modification at the meeting of the Policy, Performance & Resources Board on 9 March 2011.

Vehicle Parking Standards Draft SPD Consultation Response Summary

Ref. Number: VPS1	Contact Name: David Churchill	Organisation: Icen Projects
Summary of Comment: The parking standards seem to be rolling out to most ECC authorities so it comes as no great surprise. However, there is one concern that has been raised with them relating to the space sizes, particularly relating to the garages. Is BBC intending to maintain a little flexibility in their application?	Officer Response: From the evidence gathered for the revised document (e.g. survey, car dimensions, etc.) it is clear garages need to be bigger if people are to use them to park a car. If garages are to be relied on to provide sufficient off street parking then we need to ensure that they of a suitable specification.	Proposed Action: None
Ref. Number: VPS2	Contact Name: Dave Taylor, Station Manager	Organisation: Brentwood Fire Station
Summary of Comment: As a fire officer I have been involved in the consultation process on a number of projects and have commented about access for the fire service, due to the time that I have been with Essex fire I have seen a number of these developments built. While we can only ask for access in accordance with the Approve Document B it has become clear over this period of time that this would provide us with the required access. However there is no provision for how people park on these roads. Also given the density of the housing this matter is usually proliferated.	Officer Response: The new standards are a response to the problems of on-street parking and the implications for highway safety and access referred to. Minimum residential parking standards will help to alleviate these problems.	Proposed Action: None

<p>Areas that are causing us access problems at the moment are, the new developments in and of off St James Way, Sawyers Grove,</p> <p>Further to all of the above numbering and layout of the new developments also cause us problems in locating incidents.</p>		
<p>Ref. Number: VPS3</p>	<p>Contact Name: Rio D'Souza</p>	<p>Organisation: Highways Agency</p>
<p>Summary of Comment: The HA actively support the Shared Use Policy and would wish to see development approvals that continue to promote the policy. It is noted the Council intends to adopt minimum parking standards for residential developments. The HA would encourage the Council to seek to reduce maximum/minimum standards where there are good levels of car parking enforcement available coupled with high levels of accessibility.</p> <p>Where the Council considers the potential substantial modal shift is clearly demonstrated by the Transport Assessment/Statement and Travel Plans, reduced standards are applied,</p>	<p>Officer Response: Noted</p>	<p>Proposed Action: None</p>

<p>the Council should seek to require developer contributions to support the development of controlled parking zones, the enforcement of parking restrictions and car-free living the provision of public transport and other measures to reduce inappropriate on-street parking.</p>		
<p>Ref. Number: VPS4</p>	<p>Contact Name: Martin Harrop</p>	<p>Organisation: Croudace Strategic Limited</p>
<p>Summary of Comment: As a residential developer we are of course fully aware of the content of Essex County Council's 'Parking Standards' Design and Good Practice published in September 2009.</p> <p>In general terms we support the principle of applying minimum rather than maximum car parking standards in respect of 'origin' sites. However we recognise that there will be instances where reduced provision might be appropriate given the nature of a particular scheme or the sustainability credentials of a given location. We note that departures from the recommended standards will need to be justified within a Transport Assessment or similar document.</p>	<p>Officer Response: Bay sizes are based on observation and dimensions of manufactured cars, allowing room to open doors to enter/exit vehicle.</p> <p>Preferred bay size should be used as standard. In exceptional circumstances the minimum bay size may be used.</p> <p>Most modern houses do not have as much storage as older dwellings.</p> <p>From the evidence gathered for the revised document (e.g. survey, car dimensions, etc.) it is clear garages need to be bigger if people are to use them to park a car.</p> <p>If garages are to be relied on to</p>	<p>Proposed Action: None</p>

<p>We are of the opinion that the Preferred car parking bay size of 5.5m x 2.9m is excessive and our experience has shown that bays measuring 5.0m x 2.5m perform perfectly adequately.</p> <p>Similarly we consider that a Minimum Garage size of 7.0m x 3.0m is excessive and that the dimensions appropriate for garages to qualify as a parking space should be reduced to 6m x 3m (as applied by local authorities elsewhere).</p>	<p>provide sufficient off street parking then we need to ensure that they of a suitable specification.</p>	
<p>Ref. Number: VPS5</p>	<p>Contact Name: Tracey Mahoney</p>	<p>Organisation: EEDA</p>
<p>Summary of Comment: No Comments</p>	<p>Officer Response: Noted</p>	<p>Proposed Action: None</p>
<p>Ref. Number: VPS6</p>	<p>Contact Name: Sue Bull</p>	<p>Organisation: Anglian Water</p>
<p>Summary of Comment: No Comments</p>	<p>Officer Response: Noted</p>	<p>Proposed Action: None</p>
<p>Ref. Number: VPS7</p>	<p>Contact Name: Katharine Fletcher</p>	<p>Organisation: English Heritage</p>
<p>Summary of Comment: We do not wish to comment in detail on the SPD. Parking provision can have significant heritage impacts; for instance, underground parking may affect archaeological remains, while householder parking provision may result in the removal of boundary walls</p>	<p>Officer Response: Noted. The Council consults with officers of Essex County Council on conservation and archaeological issues as appropriate under a SLA.</p>	<p>Proposed Action: None</p>

<p>and the loss of neighbourhood character. We trust that you will seek the advice of your conservation staff and the county archaeological service, as appropriate.</p>		
<p>Ref. Number:VPS8</p>	<p>Contact Name: Aimi Middlehurst</p>	<p>Organisation: Ingatestone & Fryerning Parish Council</p>
<p>Summary of Comment: The Parish Council felt in general the proposed document is far too prescriptive and unnecessarily long.</p> <p>The idea of minimum standards for residential properties as outlined in the document would be supported by the Parish Council.</p> <p>There should be no maximum standards for destinations, only guides or indicators for parking places that may be required for particular activities and locations. This will provide greater flexibility and hopefully result in more sensible judgements. Section 4, page 51 the Parish Council would suggest changing the heading in the tables under Vehicle from Maximum to Guide or Suggested.</p> <p>As reported in the document, people will</p>	<p>Officer Response: Whilst the Government has recently amended guidance in 'PPG13: Transport' to delete the requirement that residential parking standards should be expressed as maximums it remains that parking standards for destinations need to be "maximums", in order to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport.</p>	<p>Proposed Action: None</p>

<p>use cars in increasing numbers for the foreseeable future. The proposal for minimum parking places at origins which was actually the case many years ago is long overdue and, therefore, it is not logical to be too prescriptive on parking restrictions to destinations which people need to visit.</p>		
--	--	--