

**Vehicle Parking
Standards
Supplementary Planning
Document**

Consultation Statement

November 2018

Contents

Introduction	3
Public consultation 2018.....	3
Consultation responses.....	3
Appendix 1 – List of consultation respondents.....	4
Appendix 1 Summary of consultation responses and amendments made to the SPD	5

Introduction

The Maldon District Vehicle parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document provides additional detailed guidance to landowners, developers, Registered Providers and the community on the Council's approach to vehicle parking provision within new development. Once adopted, the Maldon District Vehicle Parking Standards SPD will become a material consideration in making decisions on planning applications.

Public consultation 2018

The Council's Planning & Licencing Committee approved the draft Vehicle Parking Standards SPD for public consultation on 5 June 2018. The public consultation commenced on 14 June to 26 July 2018

The consultation material was available online and hard copies were available at the Council offices for the duration of the public consultation, with the opportunity for the public to speak to relevant officers on request. The consultation documents were also available public libraries within the District.

13. In addition to the above, the consultation was publicised as follows:

- Direct notification of the consultation by email/letter to 1143 individuals and organisations on the LDP consultation mailing list.
- Public Notice published in the Maldon & Burnham Standard on 14 June 2018
- Link to the consultation documents from the Current Consultations page on the MDC website

Consultation responses

15 responses were received to the public consultation; these included responses from statutory consultees, Parish Councils, Local Authorities and Individuals.

Appendix 1 of this statement provides a list of the respondents.

A summary of representations received to the public consultation and the Council's responses to these comments are in Appendix 2. These amendments and additions to the SPD are as set out in the report to P&L Committee dated 6 September 2018

A final draft of the SPD was recommended for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document (to Full Council) by P&L Committee on 6 September 2018 with subsequent approval by Full Council at its meeting on 8 November 2018.

Appendix 1 – List of consultation respondents

Name / organisation

- Highways England
- Equality and Human Rights Commission
- Historic England
- Port of London Authority
- Chelmsford City Council
- Essex County Council
- Burnham-on-Crouch Town Council
- Wickham Bishops Parish Council
- Cllr E Bamford
- T Kelly
- M Wood
- L Wright
- A Wood-Hill
- R Pipe
- B Hollis

Appendix 1 Summary of consultation responses and amendments made to the SPD

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
VPS001	Councillor E L Bamford		Table 17 page 47 & Page 53	<p>For a motorbike space 1 in 25 spaces is used; for electric car charge point 1 in 20 spaces is used</p> <p>Assumption that more people will want to use an electric charging point for a car rather than a smaller space for a motorbike is not proven as yet. Many public car parks have spaces used by one motorbike because there are no actual motorbike spaces. This is very frustrating for car drivers to find a whole car parking space taken by a motorbike. More young people are now using motorbikes, the assumption that more people will use electric cars may be incorrect. My suggestion is that the ratios should be the same 1 in 20 spaces.</p>	<p>The Department for Transport (DfT) statistical release <i>Vehicle Licencing Statistics: Annual 2017</i> shows that in the last 20 years, the numbers of motorbikes / powered two wheelers has grown from 0.8m to 1.2m (equivalent to an increase of 20,000 vehicles pa nationally) . This equates to 3.2% of all licensed vehicles in Great Britain (as at end of 2017 there were 37.7m vehicles in total). In 2017, 3.7% of all new vehicles registered were motorbikes. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/699229/vehicle-licensing-statistics-2017.pdf</p> <p>This shows that providing motorbike parking at the ratio of 1 space to 25 car parking spaces (4%) (which is in addition to the car parking provision) is appropriate.</p> <p>This additional information will be added to the evidence based section on page29:</p>	<p>Expand para 83 as follows:</p> <p><u>The DfT statistical release <i>Vehicle Licencing Statistics: Annual 2017</i> shows that in the last 20 years, the numbers of motorbikes / powered two wheelers has grown from 0.8m to 1.2m (equivalent to an increase of 20,000 vehicles pa nationally). This equates to 3.2% of all licensed vehicles in Great Britain (as at end of 2017 there were 37.7m vehicles in total). In 2017, 3.7% of all new vehicles registered were motorbikes.</u></p> <p><u>Therefore, providing motorbike parking at the ratio of 1 space to every 25 car parking spaces (4%) (which is in addition to the car parking provision) is appropriate.</u></p> <p>(Hyperlink added as footnote: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/699229/vehicle-licensing-statistics-2017.pdf)</p>

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
					The SPD is to guide the shape of future development; it cannot be retroactively applied to existing developments or car parks. The SPD by requiring spaces for motorbikes should reduce the need for them to be parked in car parking bays, as sufficient dedicated motorbike parking will be provided in new developments.	No change to the standard is necessary.
VPS002	T Kelly	Individual	Residential parking	Seeks clarification on the issue of providing parking e.g. new house or similar. In times past, parking permission used to come with a provision indicating that vehicles should be able to 'move off in forward gear'.-so much so that getting a 'turntable' installed was mooted. In view of the current situation where about 90% of residents arrive home and drive straight onto their premises, but on leaving have to REVERSE back out onto the highway in most cases, which can be problematic as far as approaching traffic is concerned. Somehow, some sort of 'advice' should be promulgated that it would be 'best practice' to "get ready to go when you arrive". That advice is equally relevant in Supermarket parking bays, as ,if you park 'ready to go' but the cars next door have just driven	For residential and non-residential development the safe manoeuvring within the site and safe access and exit for commercial / service vehicles and emergency vehicles is a recognised requirement in the SPD (para 125-130). However, it is not within the scope of this SPD to set out how drivers should park.	No change

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
				straight in, again it is difficult to get a clear sighting other than by nosing out; very, very slowly.		
VPS003	M Wood	Individual	Table 13 page 39	My only comment concerns Medical Centres where only staff and consulting rooms feature in the requirements. Where a pharmacy is incorporated the parking need is significantly increased as is evident from the two centres in Maldon.	Where a pharmacy is within the same development as a medical centre, the car parking requirement for each element would be assessed separately (ie pharmacy as A1 use, medical Centre as D1) with the results added together to reach the overall parking requirement.	Add note in Table 13, page 39 and Table 20 as follows: <u>Where different uses are proposed as part of the same development (eg a pharmacy within a medical centre development) the car parking requirement for each element will be assessed separately (ie pharmacy assessed as an A1 use; Medical Centre assessed as a D1 use) with the results added together to reach the overall parking requirement for the development.</u> No change to the standard is necessary
VPS004		Highways England	All	This will not materially affect the A12 or any other part of the strategic road network, we therefore have no further comments to make on the proposed policy.	Noted	No change
VPS005	L Wright		Para 76 Page 27	Town centre car parks and On street parking (it goes together) NO, there is NOT sufficient parking for visitors. I walk across the White Horse car park almost every day. So often cars are driving round and round looking	The concerns are noted. This SPD deals with the provision of car parking in new developments. The operation of the town centre car parks is beyond the remit of this SPD.	No change

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
				<p>for spaces. It IS TOO expensive. Hence roads such as Wentworth Meadows are constantly used: at night by residents from adjacent roads, and by day dentists, bankers and other workers. If these workers to parked in the car parks, as they should, then there would be even fewer spaces for visitors.</p> <p>Council employees can park for free, WHY?</p>		
VPS005	L Wright		Para 76 Page 27	<p>Connectivity Residents of the London boroughs get subsidised train travel. Here, we have to BUY a senior rail card and then get a small reduction. So I rarely go to London. The only relatively frequent bus service is to Chelmsford so I drive anyway.</p>	<p>The limited availability of rail and bus services in the District is a recognised issue, and is why the Council has not opted to have zones for car-free housing in this SPD (para 39). The issue of subsidised travel is beyond the remit of this SPD</p>	No change
VPS005	L Wright		Table 10 Page 36	<p>Number of parking spaces per dwelling - Yes I agree with the first part.</p> <p>But NO, to no requirement town centre in-fills parking. The above requirements should also be used for town centre in-fills. These are just the dwellings that are clogging up the town centre. Yes, we do need residential accommodation in the town centre but WITH parking.</p>	<p>It is not always possible to provide car parking for residential development in town centres. For example, some conversions to residential uses in town centres do not require planning permission, and therefore the Council has no control over the development including whether or not car parking is provided. It may also be appropriate to allow underused space above shops to become residential, even if there</p>	No change

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
					is no opportunity for car parking on site. New build dwellings in town centres are required to provide at least 1 car parking space per dwelling.	
VPS005	L Wright		Table 13 Page 38	Class A2 "Outside of town centre locations" Please tell me where are the banks and building societies that are outside the town centre location!?	The parking standards are based on Use Classes. Use Class A2 covers a broad range of financial and professional services, including banks and building societies.	No change
VPS005	L Wright		Page 49 Para 161/2	School drop off. Whilst I think that children should walk to school, it is an impossible task. Free transport is not available and bus charges add up for parents. So it's inevitable that working parents will drive their children, causing traffic jams and additional dangers outside schools. It is extremely unlikely that a new secondary school will be built. There is so much talk of selling the hospital to make way for housing; why not sell off the Plume (Upper & Lower) for housing and build a purpose built school, instead of the ramshackle split site that exists.	This is an identified issue, which is why school parking is included in the SPD. The provision of new hospital / schools facilities is beyond the remit of this SPD.	No change
VPS006		Equality and Human Rights Commission	Whole SPD	No Comment. Advice on the application of the Public Sector Equality Duty is provided.	Noted	No change-

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
VPS007		Wickham Bishops Parish Council	Whole SPD	The Council supports the proposed policies	Noted	No change
VPS008	A Wood-Hill		Para 155-162 pg 49 School's Parking	<p>I'm commenting because parking outside Great Totham School makes the road impassable at certain times of the day and restrictive for much of the day. I expect it is the same at most schools as they seem to serve areas beyond just the local children.</p> <p>The document is only commenting on new planning applications for schools, whereas a proper policy would be to apply the same standards, so far as is possible, to existing schools as well.</p> <p>Paragraph 157 should be applied to all existing schools, regarding staff and visitor parking together with drop off. Where it is clear that there is a continual issue the council should work to find a solution, providing additional parking land or park and ride schemes, or making roads one way.</p>	It is not possible to retrofit parking standards on developments that are already built and are experiencing parking difficulties. However, future developments can better accommodate parking, and give greater consideration to design, layout and usability of parking spaces, to ensure local areas are safer, more functional and attractive.	No change
VPS0009		Chelmsford City Council	Table 10	It is noted that the document sets out the minimum parking standards for residential parking to ensure appropriate levels of parking are provided, this is supported.	Noted	No change

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
VPS009		Chelmsford City Council	Para 23	It is stated that in preparing the SPD other Councils' vehicle parking standards (including Chelmsford's Interim Residential Parking Guidance) has been reviewed (paragraph 23). CCC published an Interim Residential Parking Guidance in 2015, to align Chelmsford's standards with those used by Essex County Council and to allow lower parking requirements for development within 800m of Chelmsford train station. The Pre-Submission Local Plan Policy MP5 Parking Standards requires all development to comply with the Essex Parking Standards – Design and Good Practice (2009) or as subsequently amended. This paragraph should be amended to reflect the current status in Chelmsford.	Agreed, the paragraph will be updated.	Amend para 23 as follows: The majority of the Local Planning Authorities in Essex use the ECC/EPOA Vehicle Parking Standards (2009) <u>For example, the Chelmsford City Council Pre-Submission Local Plan Policy MP5 Parking Standards requires all development to comply with the Essex Parking Standards – Design and Good Practice (2009) or as subsequently amended.</u> In the past Vehicle Parking Standards have been prepared on an Essex Wide basis. However, there is no movement to prepare Essex wide standards and so <u>some a number of</u> Districts are preparing their own standards, including Maldon. For example, Uttlesford District adopted the ECC/EPOA Vehicle Parking Standards with modifications in 2013, recognising that the rural nature of Uttlesford justified a higher level of car parking provision. Chelmsford City Council published an Interim Residential Parking Guidance in 2015, which sought to align Chelmsford's standards with those used by Essex County Council and to allow lower parking requirements for development within 800m of

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
						Chelmsford train station. Each local authority has an obligation to cooperate with one another and take into account each other authority's plans.
VPS009		Chelmsford City Council	Page 14	Reference is also welcomed to the recently released Essex Design Guide (2018) which refers to the EPOA <u>Essex Parking Standards</u> .	Noted	None
VPS010		Historic England	Whole SPD	As a result of the number of consultations we are currently receiving, we regret that we are unable to comment specifically at this time.	Noted	None
VPS011		Port of London Authority	Whole SPD	No comment	Noted	None
VPS012		Essex County Council	Figure 2 pg 10	Reference to Local transport plan policy 8 is supported.	Noted	None
VPS012		Essex County Council	Figure 2 pg10	Recommend inclusion of Development Management Policies – policy DM10 Travel Plans.	Agreed	New section on the relevant ECC Development Management Policies added to the Essex Context section. See end of this document for the proposed wording.
VPS012		Essex County Council	Para 155	Reference to the Sustainable Modes of Travel Strategy is supported	Noted	None
VPS012		Essex County Council	Para 25	Recommend an amendment to the references to the Essex Minerals Local Plan (2014) and the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plans (2017), for consistency.	Agreed, the references to the Minerals and Waste Local Plans will be revised.	The LDP along with the <u>Essex Minerals Local Plan (2014)</u> , the <u>Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan (2017)</u> and made Neighbourhood Plans form the Development Plan for the

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
						District.'
VPS012		Essex County Council	Table 10 pg 36	Minimum residential parking standards is acceptable to ECC.	Noted	None
VPS012			Non-residential parking standards page 37 onwards	Table 13 (pages 38 – 40) appears to have misinterpreted NPPF, para 106, and replaced 'maximum' with 'minimum' car parking requirements for non-residential uses. ECC, as highway authority, considers paragraph 106 requires any development proposal to have to demonstrate its own 'operational requirements' for car parking within the context of site location, and the consideration of factors identified in paragraph 105.	<p>NPPF para 106 clearly states that '<i>Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport.</i>'</p> <p>In Maldon District there is not the 'clear and compelling' evidence that would support the application of maximum standards. Therefore, if the SPD were to set maximum standards it would not be NPPF compliant. Further, if maximum standards were set, this could inhibit the proper planning for development if it had higher operational requirements for car parking than the standards allowed.</p> <p>Para 117 of the SPD provides flexibility for non-residential development: 'More or less parking than these standards may be justifiable and acceptable where other material</p>	Add ' <u>the development's operational requirements</u> ' to the list of considerations that will be taken into account in para 117.

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
					considerations are taken into account...' to this list of considerations will be added 'the development's operational requirements.'	
VPS012		Essex County Council	Non-residential parking standards page 37 onwards	<p>Any development proposed with reduced parking provision, and where there are no suitable on-street restrictions, the applicant should be required to undertake a parking beat survey, as part of any planning submission. Such surveys identify on-street and off-street parking trends, which can be used to determine lengths of stay, capacity, and usage of available parking spaces. They can also be used to measure the use of parking permits and pay and display parking bays, as well as measuring parking demand and stress in controlled and uncontrolled areas.</p> <p>The output of such surveys help demonstrate the local level of on-street parking and how development proposals' impact can be assessed accordingly.</p>	This provides helpful guidance for developers. A new paragraph will be added after para 117, to include these points.	<p>New paragraph after para 117: <u>For non-residential development proposed with reduced parking provision, and where there are no suitable on-street restrictions, the applicant may be asked to undertake a parking beat survey, as part of any planning submission to support their proposal. Such surveys identify on-street and off-street parking trends, which can be used to determine lengths of stay, capacity, and usage of available parking spaces. They can also be used to measure the use of parking permits and pay and display parking bays, as well as measuring parking demand and stress in controlled and uncontrolled areas. The outputs of such surveys help demonstrate the local level of on-street parking and how development proposals' impact can be assessed accordingly.</u></p>
VPS012			School parking pg 49	The ECC Developer's Guide (2016) , Section 4.2 Site Suitability (page 22/23) outlines the preferred approach of the County Council to the layout of education and community	Add a new paragraph after para 158 to include reference to the Developers' Guide. Add a link to the ECC Developer's Guide in the further information section.	<p>Add the following text after para 158:</p> <p><u>Development proposals should have regard to the Essex County Council Developers'</u></p>

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
				<p>facilities. Appendix D provides exemplar layouts for education and community facilities, highlighting the key issues of reducing school run traffic and providing safe drop off space.</p> <p>The Guide discourages schools from providing on-site space for parents to drop children off by car for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The school site area guidelines reflect the space required for education use and it is not appropriate to set aside significant areas for other purposes;</i> • <i>Schools should not be expected to manage or maintain facilities which may give rise to an insurance liability in the event of accidents and</i> • <i>Bespoke drop off facilities can attract additional school run traffic and concentrate vehicle movements in a particular location, leading to an unpleasant or unsafe environment.</i> <p>The preferred approach by ECC is to maximise the opportunities for safe drop off around the school perimeter, utilising the visitor parking space that the</p>		<p><u>Guide to Infrastructure Contributions (2016)</u>. This outlines (at section 4.2) the preferred approach of the County Council to the layout of education and community facilities. Appendix D to that guide provides layouts for education and community facilities, highlighting the key issues of reducing school run traffic and providing safe drop off space.</p> <p>Further information: <u>The Essex County Council Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions Revised Edition 2016</u> - https://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Development-in-Essex/Documents/Developers-guide.pdf</p>

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
				development is required to provide. The immediate area around school entrances should, where possible, be traffic free to prevent a disproportionate level of traffic that could cause inconvenience to other road users. Such pedestrianised areas also function as a space for parents and younger siblings to congregate safely at the beginning and end of the school day and thereby encourage a sense of community. Such spaces should be well connected to walking and cycling routes to make alternative modes of travel attractive.		
VPS012		Essex County Council	School parking pg 49	Consequently, ECC recommends reference in paragraph 129 encouraging drop off- pick up points `near the main entrance' and paragraph 162 `within the school grounds' is not supported, and should be removed from the document.	Paragraph 129 relates to developments that attract large numbers of people (not just schools). The section relating to drop-off/pick-up points will be amended to exclude schools. The last sentence in para 162 will be deleted.	Para 129 amend the final sentence as follows: <u>Except for schools, in addition, drop-off and pick up points should be provided near the main entrance and can be in the form of shared space with other development.</u> Add new footnote: <u>ECC does not encourage the provision of drop-off/pick-up points near the main entrance or within schools grounds. See the Essex County Council Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions Revised Edition 2016 -</u>

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
						https://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Development-in-Essex/Documents/Developers-guide.pdf Delete final sentence from para 162: Drop off areas can be in the form of shared space with other development or within the school grounds.
VPS012		Essex County Council	School parking document Table 13 pg 39, Appendix 2 pg p60	<p>The EPOA Parking Standards Design and Good Practice (2009), Parking Standards for Use Class D1: Non-residential Institutions (page 66) includes different standards to those in the consultation.</p> <p>ECC considers it is very difficult to keep track over time of the number of staff employed at a school, and this changes regularly over time. Furthermore, does the reference to `teaching staff` actually refer to `whole time equivalent directly employed staff`, otherwise the number of required car parking spaces would be `over inflated`, and not be supported by ECC.</p> <p>ECC recommend the draft Standards be amended to refer to the measure contained in the EPOA Standards of `1 space per</p>	<p>It is recognised that basing staff car parking on pupil numbers is easier to apply. However, the ratio preferred by ECC would result in restricted car parking provision for schools staff in a district with relatively poor access to public transport. In the case of existing schools, applying this ratio (1 staff space per 15 pupils) could result in between 25-40% of staff having to park off site, in surrounding residential roads.</p> <p>The issue of parking problems in and around existing schools is a particular concern raised by other consultees to this consultation. The ECC approach could exacerbate the existing situation and perpetuate it for new schools. Although the standard in this SPD is more generous than the ECC</p>	Amend table 13 and appendix 2 standard for schools (primary & secondary education) to: 1 space per <u>Full Time Equivalent (FTE)</u> teaching staff; plus 2 spaces per 3 <u>FTE</u> non-teaching staff, or individual assessment/ justification

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
				<p>15 students for staff', as this is much easier to apply.</p>	<p>standard, it still does not provide 100% parking for staff. The MDC standard is based on a review of best practice.</p> <p>For clarification, the standard is amended to make it clear that it applies to Full Time Equivalent staffing numbers.</p>	
VPS012		Essex County Council	Appendix 2 pg 60	<p>Under 'Operational' requirements reference is made to the provision of bus pick up points regarding primary schools. The travel of primary aged pupils to schools by a dedicated bus service is limited given the smaller catchment areas of such schools, along with the strategy to encourage more walking and cycling trips through active travel, aiding the health and fitness of those pupils.</p> <p>Consequently, ECC recommend reference to 'bus pick up points' for primary schools is deleted</p>	<p>Although fewer primary pupils than secondary pupils travel to school by bus, in rural areas, where primary schools have wider catchment areas and there may not be safe walking routes to school along country roads, it is likely that a proportion of children will qualify for home to school transport. Therefore it is reasonable to require provision of a bus pick-up point.</p> <p>There is flexibility within the standards for dealing with the operational requirements of individual developments. For example, for commercial and passenger carrying vehicles para 128 states 'applicants/ developers must demonstrate that the proposed parking / drop-off and pick-up points will be sufficient for the planned level of activity.' Therefore, if a proposal for a primary school does not provide a bus pick-up / drop off point and this is supported by</p>	No change to the standard.

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
					evidence, then the requirement in para 128 would be met.	
VPS012		Essex County Council	Para 33 & 34	<p>The contents of paragraphs 33 & 34 are repeated.</p> <p>Para 33 should also refer to the new Beaulieu rail station being planned at North Chelmsford , which will provide an additional alternative to residents in Maldon District.</p>	<p>Agreed, paragraphs 33 and 34 contain the same information. Para 33 will be deleted.</p> <p>Reference to the planned new rail station at Beaulieu will be added to para 34.</p>	<p>Delete para 33 entirely.</p> <p>Amend para 34: Residents living in Maldon/Heybridge, which does not have a station, and the north of the District are more likely to use the nearest mainline stations outside of the District at Hatfield Peverel, Witham and Chelmsford. <u>The planned new rail station at Beaulieu in North Chelmsford, will provide an additional option for accessing rail services from the north of the district.</u> South Woodham Ferrers and Wickford provide alternative stations to those in the South of the District. However, all require car journeys and bus access is limited</p>
VPS012		Essex County Council	Para 36 PG 16	Reference should also be made to the provision of internal services within Maldon/Heybridge, and in particular enhancements provided by the new Garden Suburbs at North Heybridge and South Maldon. These will provide links from these new developments to the town centre through the extension of the existing bus network (internal and wider connections) and the provision of new routes.	Agreed, para 36 will be expanded.	<p>Add the following text to para 36:</p> <p>There are limited bus services available in the District. Maldon, Heybridge, Southminster and Burnham-on-Crouch have regular bus services to Chelmsford. Regular bus services to Colchester and Witham are available from Maldon and Heybridge. <u>Internal bus routes through Maldon/Heybridge will be improved through enhancements</u></p>

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
						provided by the new <u>Garden Suburbs at North Heybridge and South Maldon</u> . These will provide <u>links from these new developments to the town centre through the extension of the existing bus network (internal and wider connections) and the provision of new routes</u> . In the main settlements, the majority of homes are within a 640m walk (approximately eight minutes) 9 of a regular bus service.
VPS012		Essex County Council	Parking bay sizes para 88 and table 9 pg 35	Paragraph 88 states that the preferred parking bay size has been increased in the SPD to 2.9m x 5.5m, to align with that in the EPOA Essex Vehicle Parking Standards (2009) and the Essex Design Guide (2018), and is supported.	Noted	None
VPS013		Burnham-on-Crouch Town Council		Burnham Town Council discussed the main changes proposed in the SPD; our resolution was to support them.	Noted	None
VPS013		Burnham-on-Crouch Town Council	Page 35	Agree with wider parking spaces.	Noted	None
VPS013		Burnham-on-Crouch Town Council	Table 10 Page 36	Agree with the removal of maximum number of parking spaces on a new development.	Noted	None
VPS013		Burnham-on-Crouch Town Council		Parking is a huge district wide problem and serious consideration and provision needs to be provided with developers being held to account	Noted	No change

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
				for delivery.		
VPS014	R Pipe		Pg 31	Too late with this parking, as several estates were designed with too little space eg Elm Farm Heybridge, which is cluttered with cars.	This is a recognised issue. It is not possible to retrofit parking standards on developments that are already built and are experiencing parking difficulties. However, future developments can better accommodate parking, and give greater consideration to design, layout and usability of parking spaces, to ensure local areas are safer, more functional and attractive.	No change
VPS014	R Pipe		35	Need to recognise that many children also have their own cars not only the parents.	The previous SPD had maximum standards for residential car parking provision – the new SPD now has minimum standards.	No change
VPS014	R Pipe		38	Have failed badly to provide sufficient spaces in Maldon for visitors, shoppers and workers. Disgraceful that no new spaces have been created since 2001.	There have been limited opportunities for creating additional visitor/ shopper/ worker car parking spaces within Maldon town centre.	No change
VPS014	R Pipe		40	On street parking is necessary for shopping, especially in the Maldon lower high street. A suggestion put forward by the Planning Dept. to pedestrianise the lower high street wouldn't work because of access to Maldon East car park, emergency vehicles, buses, and loss of yet another 23 spaces for parking in the street.	Noted	No change
VPS014	R Pipe		49	No mention of the benefit of uses school parking spaces when not required by the schools.	The SPD relates to car parking provision in new developments. The operation of existing car	No change

Reference	Name	Organisation	SPD Section	Summary of comments	Officer Response	Change to SPD
					parks, whether public or private, is outside the remit of this SPD.	
VPS015	B Hollis		Whole SPD	It seems you have thought of all the issues that concerned me, namely numbers, size of spaces as cars are very much larger, and recognition that most houses have more than one car. Very smart to think of future proofing with ducting on new developments to take new style chargers.	Noted	No change
VPS015	B Hollis		Parking on roads	To expand on the issue of safety, parking on roads are a hazard to pedestrians and bikes. Some new developments (eg Wickford) the new roads are far too narrow, with unsighted bends. As part of the parking regs, can you suggest a decent width of road for new developments? Fambridge Road with parking, is not a good sized road! I realise parked cars slow traffic, but feel unsighted drivers is a bigger hazard.	Road widths are beyond the remit of the SPD. Although the vehicle parking standards cannot be applied retrospectively to existing development, they should reduce the necessity for people living in new developments, to park on nearby roads.	No change

Other changes as a consequence of amending the SPD:

- Paragraph, figure and table numbering will change once the amendments have been applied to the SPD.

Other changes required as a result of changing Government policy:

- Revise paragraphs 19-21 and Figure One to take into account the publication of the National Planning Framework (July 2018).
- Add a section on the Government's Road to Zero Strategy (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

19. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018 ~~was published in 2012 and~~ sets out the government national planning policy for the preparation of development plans and determining planning applications. ~~In 2018 the Government launched consultation on a revised NPPF, which is due to be published in the Summer 2018.~~ 20. The guidance on car parking in the ~~consultation draft revised~~ NPPF updates that in the 2012 NPPF, to recognise the changes in car technologies, specifically providing for plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.

21. The previous Vehicle Parking Standards SPD was written at a time when maximum car parking standards were advocated by Government. The ~~consultation~~ NPPF clearly states that maximum standards should only be set where there is a clear justification for doing so. Therefore the vehicle parking standards in this SPD are not expressed as maximums. This also recognises the availability of public transport in the District and the reliance on private vehicles for accessing employment and everyday services.

Figure 1 Extract from the ~~draft~~ National Planning Policy Framework on vehicle parking.

102. Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that: *[inter alia]*

- b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;
- c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;
- e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.

104. Planning policies should: *[inter alia]*

- d) provide for high quality walking and cycling networks and supporting facilities such as cycle parking (drawing on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans);

105. If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account:

- a) the accessibility of the development;
- b) the type, mix and use of development;
- c) the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
- d) local car ownership levels; and
- e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.

106. Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport (in accordance with chapter 11 of this Framework). In town centres, local authorities should seek to improve the quality of parking so that it is convenient, safe and secure, alongside measures to promote accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.

110. Within this context, applications for development should: *[inter alia]*

- a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality

- public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;
- b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;
- d) allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and
- e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations

Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (2018) National Planning Policy Framework <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

[new text]

The Road to Zero Strategy

As set out in the NO₂ Plan¹, the government will end the sale of new conventional petrol and diesel cars and vans by 2040. By then, it is expected that the majority of new cars and vans sold to be 100% zero emission and all new cars and vans will have significant zero emission capability. By 2050 the aim is that almost every car and van will be zero emission.

The Road to Zero Strategy (July 2018)² outlines how the government will support the transition to zero emission road transport and reduce emissions from conventional vehicles during the transition. The strategy is long term in scope and ambition to 2050 and beyond. It covers road vehicles from motorcycles to 44 tonne heavy goods vehicles (HGVs).

One of the key elements of the Strategy is creating a fit for purpose infrastructure network: The infrastructure network needs to be easy for current and prospective drivers to locate and use, as well as being affordable, efficient and reliable. As part of this, the Strategy actively encourages the provision of smart charging points at homes and work places, and increasing the network of publicly accessible charging points.

Figure 2: Road to Zero Strategy Policies relevant to the Vehicle Parking Standards SPD:

Road to Zero Policies

We will reduce emissions from the vehicles already on our roads by:

4. Taking steps to accelerate the adoption of fuel-efficient motoring by company car drivers, businesses operating fleets, and private motorists

We will support the development of one of the best electric vehicle infrastructure

27. Taking powers through the Automated and Electric Vehicles Bill to ensure:

- that chargepoints are available at motorway service areas and large fuel retailers;
- that chargepoints are easily accessed and used across the UK. This includes powers to provide a uniform method of accessing public chargepoints and refuelling points; make certain information publicly available in an open and transparent format and set reliability standards; and
- that chargepoints are smart ready by giving government powers to set requirements prohibiting the sale or installation of chargepoints unless they meet certain requirements.

We will support the development of one of the best electric vehicle infrastructure networks in the world by:

28. Ensuring the houses we build in the coming years are electric vehicle ready. It is our intention that all new homes, where appropriate, should have a chargepoint available. We plan to consult as soon as possible on introducing a requirement for chargepoint infrastructure for new dwellings in England

¹ Defra & DfT (2017). UK plan for tackling roadside nitrogen dioxide concentrations (The NO₂ Plan)(online). Available at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/air-quality-plan-for-nitrogendioxide-no2-in-uk-2017

² Department for Transport, 2018, *Road to Zero* (online) Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/724391/road-to-zero.pdf

where appropriate.

29. Future-proofing our streets. We want all new street lighting columns to include charging points, where appropriately located, in areas with current on-street parking provision.

32. Reviewing the provision of residential chargepoint infrastructure for those who have communal parking facilities, or do not own their own home, as part of the Law Commission's work to review and reinvigorate the commonhold tenure in England and Wales.

34. Consulting in summer 2018 on a proposal to increase the height limit for the Permitted Development Right in England for the installation of electric vehicle chargepoints in designated off-street parking spaces.

35. Ensuring local planning policies incorporate facilities for charging electric vehicles via the National Planning Policy Framework.

36. Consulting on amending Building Regulations to require relevant charging provision in new non-residential buildings.

Department for Transport (2018) *Road to Zero Strategy*

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/reducing-emissions-from-road-transport-road-to-zero-strategy>

Further information:

Department for Transport (9 July 2018) *Government launches Road to Zero Strategy to lead the world in zero emission vehicle technology* <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-launches-road-to-zero-strategy-to-lead-the-world-in-zero-emission-vehicle-technology>

- **New section on ECC Development Management policies** added on page 10 of the SPD (see consultation response VPS012)

Essex County Council Development Management Policies (2011)

These policies reflect the balance between the need for new housing and employment opportunities, the regeneration and growth agenda, and protecting the transport network for the safe movement of people and goods and have the following aims:

- Protect and maintain a reliable and safe highway infrastructure.
- Improve access to services in both rural and urban locations.
- Offer where possible alternative travel options to the private car.
- Support and enhance public transport provision.
- Address the impact of commercial vehicles on the highway network and communities.
- Support the aims and objectives of the County Council as the Highway Authority

Figure xx Relevant Essex County Council Development Management Policies (2011)

Policy DM10 Travel Plans

The Highway Authority will require the provision of a Travel Plan and monitoring fee as part of any development proposal that meets the following criteria:

- i. all non-residential development proposals with 50 employees or more;
- ii. any education establishment development which increases the number of either pupils or staff will be required to provide a School Travel Plan;
- iii. all new residential dwellings will require the provision of a Residential Travel Information Pack.

Essex County Council Development Management Policies (2011), available at:

https://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Development-in-Essex/Documents/Development_Management_Policies.pdf

Further information:

ECC information for developers: <https://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Development-in-Essex/Pages/Developer-information.aspx>

Local Policy Context

- **Addition of LDP policy D2 to Figure 5** – to rectify an omission - Maldon District Local Development Plan Extracts relating to car parking standards, as this supports sustainable transport methods (such as cycling) and the provision infrastructure for electric vehicles.

Policy D2 Climate Change and Environmental Impact of New Development

All development must minimise its impact on the environment by incorporating the following principles: [*inter alia*]

6. Minimising all forms of possible pollution including air, land, water, odour, noise and light. Any detrimental impacts and potential risks to the human and natural environment will need to be adequately addressed by appropriate avoidance, alleviation and mitigation.

9. Maintain and enhance local air quality in accordance with national objectives

10. Seek to reduce the need to travel, particularly by private vehicle, by encouraging sustainable transport methods, and providing flexibility in the development to enable home working or similar facilities.

Policy context

3.17 National air quality objectives are largely based on European legislation within the 2008 Ambient Air Quality Directive, which became law in England through the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010. The Regulations provide limits for major air pollutants that impact public health, such as particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, certain toxic heavy metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. Further ceilings on pollutants have also been developed through the National Emission Ceilings Regulations 2002. Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) are used by DEFRA to manage areas with air pollution.

