



**North Hertfordshire District Council**  
**Supplementary Planning Document**

Vehicle Parking at New Development

**September 2011**

## Contents

1.	Introduction and Policy Context	3
	Policy	3
	North Hertfordshire District Council Parking Strategy	5
2.	North Hertfordshire Context and Evidence Base	7
	Car Ownership Levels	7
	Hitchin	8
	Letchworth	8
	Royston	9
	Baldock	9
	Great Ashby	9
	The Use of Garages and Visitor/Unallocated Parking	9
	Wider Evidence	11
3.	Design and Layout of Parking Spaces	12
	Disabled Parking Provision	12
	Powered Two Wheelers	13
	Cycle Parking	13
	Commercial Vehicles	14
	Coaches	14
	Electric Vehicle Charging Points	14
4.	Residential Parking Standards for Class Use C3 – Dwelling Houses	16
5.	Non Residential Parking Standards	19
	Parking Standards for Class Use A	19
	Parking Standards for Class Use B	21
	Parking Standards for Class Use C – Excluding C3	22
	Parking Standards for Class Use D	23
	Parking Standards for Class Use Other	25
	Accessibility Zones	26
6.	Transport Assessments	27
7.	Travel Plans	28
8.	Section 106 Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy	29

## Appendices

1	Policy Background	30
2	Sources of Information	32
3	Accessibility Zones	33
3.1	Hitchin	33
3.2	Letchworth	34
3.3	Baldock	35
3.4	Royston	36
4	Travel Plan Checklist	37

COUNCIL (10.11.11)

## List of Tables

2.1	Levels of Car Ownership	7
3.1	Disabled Parking Standards	13
4.1	Residential Parking Standards	17
5.1	Non-Residential Parking Standards – Class Use A	19
5.2	Non-Residential Parking Standards – Class Use B	21
5.3	Non-Residential Parking Standards – Class Use C – Excluding C3	22
5.4	Non-Residential Parking Standards – Class Use D	23
5.5	Non-Residential Parking Standards – Class Use Other	25
5.6	Non Residential Accessibility Zones – Percentage Reduction from Standards.	26

## **1. Introduction and Policy Context**

- 1.1 This document is a review of the 2006 Supplementary Planning Document, Vehicle Parking Provision at New Development. It has been updated to reflect recent national policy changes and follows the review of North Herts District Councils Parking Strategy 2009 – 2016.
- 1.2 In addition, the emerging revised Core Strategy identifies that up to 2031, sufficient land will be released to accommodate growth in the district, plus additional employment and retail land. Accommodating this growth requires the provision of appropriate parking that meets the Councils long term vision of North Herts as a 'vibrant place to live and prosper'.

### **Policy**

- 1.3 The move to a new planning system during 2006 shifted responsibility for determining parking standards to individual planning authorities whilst new guidance indicated local circumstances should be taken into account when setting parking standards. There are now three main national policy documents providing guidance with relation to parking standards at new developments:
- Planning Policy Guidance 13 – Transport
  - Planning Policy Statement 4 – Economic Growth
  - Planning Policy Statement 3 - Housing
- 1.4 In addition, July 2011 saw the draft publication of the National Planning Policy Framework. Reflecting earlier statements made by Greg Clark, Minister of State for Decentralisation, it is stated that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development through all decision making. It went on to say that planning policies and decisions should take into account local circumstances and the effective use of land.
- 1.5 By establishing a local evidence base on which these standards are developed, taking into account factors relating to car ownership and local accession mapping as well as experience of previous developments in the district it is felt this SPD is as up to date with emerging policy as it can be. Any further significant policy developments will result in appropriate revision of the document.
- 1.6 The Local Transport Plan for Hertfordshire also contains specific guidance on parking provision at new development which is further detailed in Roads in Hertfordshire. The document states that parking for residential development should reflect the local circumstances of the development and where appropriate the parking policy of the district council. Further information on the Local Transport Plan Policy is detailed throughout the document where relevant.
- 1.7 Despite some concerns with regards to minimum parking standards for residential development, it is now widely recognised that limiting parking availability at trip origins does not necessarily discourage car ownership and can push vehicle parking onto the adjacent public highway. This can

**COUNCIL (10.11.11)**

diminish the streetscape, potentially obstructing emergency service and passenger transport vehicles as well as having a negative impact on existing residents and businesses parking.

- 1.8 Therefore a fundamental change included in these revised standards is a move to a minimum set of parking standards for trip origins (residential parking) whilst retaining maximum standards for trip destinations (for example commercial, leisure and retail parking). This acknowledges that whilst parking has a role in promoting sustainable travel choices in most locations, demand management through parking is most appropriate at the trip destination rather than at the trip origin (i.e. at the home).
- 1.9 This new approach is entirely consistent with current government guidance such as the 2011 updated Planning Policy Guidance 13 whilst still taking the principles of PPS3 and PPS4 into account. Essex County Council have lead the way with this change with the publication of Parking Standards: Design and Good Practice and some of the detail in this document is based on evidence contained in the Essex County Council guide.
- 1.10 This policy will seek to provide adequate parking provision at the home without compromising travel choice in favour of sustainable modes for journeys or over-providing parking in such a way as to encourage car ownership. In addition it will also provide some commentary on design guidance, making reference to Essex County Councils Parking Standards Design and Good Practice and Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide published in January 2011. A full list of supporting documents and literature is provided in Appendix 2.
- 1.11 The standards form a consistent basis for discussion between developers and planners, allowing greater certainty when planning applications are submitted thus reducing the time taken to determine this aspect of it. In addition this document also looks at the provision of disabled parking, cycle parking, powered two wheelers and electric vehicle infrastructure.
- 1.12 It contributes to the Council's key three themes as follows:
  - **Town centres**  
To include the delivery of the town centre strategies, support to our town centre partnerships and preserving/enhancing the street scene.  
*Any new development in town centres will not compromise current parking provision and help promote the economic vitality and viability of the town. Good accessibility to town centres from new development outside the centre will also be provided.*
  - **Sustainable development**  
Challenging development within our green belt and ensuring that any development which does take place is sustainable in the long term.  
*Provision of new housing and employment in and around our existing towns will place additional pressures on parking*

COUNCIL (10.11.11)

*facilities and this SPG will enable the Council to find the best way for providing for and managing this demand.*

- **Green issues**

To include development of our climate change strategy, retention and enhancement of green spaces and increasing recycling facilities.

*This guidance seeks to ensure all new development, residential and employment promotes sustainable travel through both appropriate parking provision and consideration of more sustainable modes.*

### **North Hertfordshire District Council Parking Strategy**

- 1.13 North Hertfordshire Parking Strategy 2009-2019 follows several years experience of managing on-street parking enforcement and demand for additional parking controls. As the provision of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's) and the number of brownfield sites developed within urban areas have increased, the pressure for parking space in CPZs from new developments has intensified. The Council considers that all new development should, as far as possible, be self sufficient in providing for future occupiers' parking insofar as there should be no unacceptable residual demand for parking in CPZs from new development.
- 1.14 Some residual parking on existing streets may be acceptable but where it is considered to add pressure to existing residents' and businesses' parking provision, new development will be required to provide for its own parking and possibly provide a financial contribution towards protecting existing residents' and businesses' parking.
- 1.15 Where new roads are adopted and off-street parking is provided in new development, the Council will work with developers and Hertfordshire County Council to ensure that the detailed design of new development does not create unnecessary parking overspill onto existing streets, especially in areas where there is pressure for parking space. The Council will consider the availability of existing on and off street parking space in determining planning applications.
- 1.16 In cases where residents of new development can be included in the existing CPZ, the developer will be expected to pay for all the works to amend Traffic Regulation orders and any physical works that may be required.
- 1.17 Increasingly new developments in urban areas have been provided with at least one allocated parking space although car ownership per household may be higher and there may be limited space for visitors so there is demand for on street parking. Policy 24 within the parking strategy is related specifically to new development and taken into account in this SPG.

**COUNCIL (10.11.11)**

**Policy 24 – Parking at new developments and existing Controlled Parking Zones**

The Council will adopt and regularly review a Supplementary Planning Document 'Parking Standards at New Development' on parking policy and standards for new development. The Council will consider the need for including residents of new developments in existing CPZs on a case by case basis. As general guidance the following will be considered:

- 1) The amount of off-street parking provided formally or informally in the new development
- 2) The extent to which the parking standards used in the new development comply with 'Parking Standards at New Development' guidance
- 3) The availability of existing road space for additional residential parking
- 4) Any constraints on a development site that may have restricted the provision of parking (e.g. need to retain Listed Buildings)
- 5) The potential for imposing a limit on the amount of permits provided per household for new developments
- 6) Any other issues for example Planning Conditions or Legal Agreements that may prevent or restrict the issuing of permits.

## 2. North Hertfordshire context and evidence base

- 2.1 North Hertfordshire has a population of just over 122,000. It is a predominantly rural district however three quarters of the population live in the four urban areas of Baldock, Hitchin, Letchworth and Royston, the remainder in Knebworth and the rural parishes around the towns. The district is in a two-tier local government area and is served by North Hertfordshire District Council (planning authority and who manage on and off street public parking) and Hertfordshire County Council the highway authority). Most of the area also has a third tier, comprising parish or town councils.
- 2.2 A wider parking review of these towns is ongoing and as part of this SPD a number of case studies have been identified which clearly demonstrate problems that have arisen from developments where previous parking standards were applied.

### Car ownership levels

- 2.3 A national census was carried out in early 2011, however it is unlikely that data available in relation to car ownership will be available for some time. This SPG is therefore still based on 2001 census data relating to car ownership and will be amended as and when 2011 census data becomes available.

Table 2.1 Levels of Car Ownership

Area	Percentage of households (with number of cars or vans)					Cars or vans	
	None	One	Two	Three	Four +	2001	1991
England	26.8	43.7	23.6	4.5	1.4	1.11	
East of England	19.8	44.1	28.3	5.9	1.9	1.27	
Hertfordshire	17.7	42.0	31.6	6.6	2.2	1.34	
North Herts	18.9	43.0	30.2	6.0	2.0	1.3	1.17

- 2.4 Table 2.1 shows that North Herts has higher than the national and regional average level of car ownership although it is slightly lower than the Hertfordshire level. It has also risen since the 1991 census, a trend which is expected to continue. Should this growth be the same as that experienced from 1991 to 2011 (11%) then car ownership will increase on average to 1.44 per unit, this is supported by our local evidence base survey (see APP 3) which indicates average car ownership at properties surveyed to be 1.41 per dwelling. This means that continuing to constrain origin based parking without consideration of increase in car ownership will lead to further cases of development overflow onto local on street parking.
- 2.5 Whilst the Department for Communities and Local Government Residential Car Parking Research document suggests a variance as much as a 0.5 fewer cars in non owner occupied households, within
- COUNCIL (10.11.11)**



Hertfordshire there is little evidence when looking at census data that levels of vehicle ownership for general needs social rented housing are significantly lower than that for market or intermediate housing. Discussions with Hertfordshire Police indicated that locally short term car ownership is prevalent and whilst may not show up in official figures, verge and kerb parking is a common problem in areas of social housing. In addition in mixed tenure schemes, reduced levels of parking for affordable housing can exacerbate any visual differences between the market and sub-market of a development.

### **Town Reviews**

- 2.6 NHDC is currently undertaking a rolling programme of in depth parking reviews in the main four towns of the district. It is therefore outside the scope of this SPD to carry out a full assessment of work that is already programmed. However should the reviews bring specific issues to light relevant to this guidance the document will be amended accordingly. A smaller local evidence base has been developed through carrying out a household questionnaire of 640 dwellings across the district. A response rate of 30% was achieved for this and findings have been used to inform this document.

### **Hitchin**

- 2.7 Hitchin is the busiest town in terms of parking demand. With future plans for significant development in Hitchin town centre the availability of parking will need to be considered carefully so as to ensure the vitality and viability of the town is supported without seriously undermining its environment. It is considered essential that any redevelopment that entails a loss of publicly available spaces is replaced by additional provision from either developers or public provision.
- 2.8 Consultation as part of the previous parking standards and Urban Transport Plan highlighted a number of local concerns in Hitchin including a need for additional parking:
- On the edge of town
  - At the rail station
  - On the older residential estates
  - For motor cycles
  - For ambulant disabled
  - In the town centre
- 2.9 In addition other issues identified include:
- Verge parking
  - A need for better signage
  - Residents parking schemes
  - Better quality car parks.

### **Letchworth**

- 2.10 Letchworth is a medium sized town with a uniquely spacious and green layout, the result of its Garden City origins. It has a similar development

**COUNCIL (10.11.11)**

potential as Hitchin although currently has greater parking capacity. A number of issues highlighted within Letchworth as part of previous parking standard development and the Urban Transport Plan include:

- Car parking charges
- Residential parking issues
- A need for more parking serving the railway station
- A need for more short stay parking

### **Royston**

- 2.11 Royston is a small market town with a compact centre with a lack of central on-street parking provision for shoppers. Off street provision is quite good with some spare capacity. Parking issues remain based on commuter parking and intrusion into residential streets around the centre.

### **Baldock**

- 2.12 Baldock is a fairly small market town, parking provision is thought to be reasonable overall although the supply is affected by the on street market on Wednesdays and there is some conflict between various users. There is some pressure on residential areas within walking distance of the train station and town centre employment that needs to be considered for any future development.

### **Great Ashby**

- 2.13 Great Ashby is an important case study when reviewing parking standards for new development in North Hertfordshire. The significant under-provision of parking on the estate as well as design and layout of garage provision (for example insufficient space in front of a garage leading to blocked pavements) had lead to significant problems in the area.
- 2.14 A review of parking across a number of developments in the district is underway and will be reported as part of an evidence base to support this SPD at a later date.

### **The use of garages and visitor/unallocated parking**

- 2.15 It is recognised that despite being an important design feature of residential developments, garages are in many cases being used for other purposes or are not a suitable size to accommodate a modern, family size vehicle. Roads in Hertfordshire (Jan 11) states that:  
“research shows in some developments, less than half the garages are used for parking cars and that many are used primarily for storage or have been converted to living accommodation”. This has been investigated further in the local evidence base report that accompanies this document.
- 2.16 Additional factors such as the availability of other spaces, including on street parking and the availability of separate cycle and other storage influence whether residents use the garage for parking a vehicle.

**COUNCIL (10.11.11)**

- 2.17 Research on parking in new developments was carried out by Warwickshire County Council in February 2007. As part of a survey respondents that own a garage were asked how often they use the spaces within it. Only 38% of respondents who own a single garage report that they use it on a regular basis, while 56% report that the seldom or never use their single garage. These figures are similar to national research undertaken by Department for Communities and Local Government which concluded that only approximately 40% of garages are used for parking.
- 2.18 The local evidence base supports this with 42% of those surveyed with a garage using it to park their vehicle, at least occasionally. Of those that had a garage and didn't use it 52% stated that it was too small to accommodate their vehicle.
- 2.19 Previously a garage has counted towards parking provision even if it is unsuitable in size, adding increasing pressure on on-street parking. For this reason only garages above 7.0m x 3.0m (internal dimension intended for a single car plus some storage) will be considered as a parking space and whilst it cannot be insisted upon that residents use it for this purpose, its provision at this size means it is adequate should they chose to do so and will be counted within the provision for that dwelling.
- 2.20 Consideration must also be given to accessing the garage. In a number of instances the garage has not been set back a full vehicle space, on occasion half a space, resulting in residents parking their vehicle in front of their garage and blocking the footway.
- 2.21 In order to account for the potential under-use of garages, even when they are of an appropriate size the minimum standard for visitor/unallocated parking will range between 0.25 and 0.75 per dwelling, where the lower standard is acceptable for schemes without garaging and the higher standard applies where all dwellings have garages. Negotiation of an appropriate level of visitor/unallocated spaces will occur, depending on the proportion of dwellings with garages. This also allows the development to accommodate the rise in car ownership throughout the lifetime of the dwellings.
- 2.22 Where garages are provided en bloc, the above internal dimension sizes and assumptions about usage apply. More detailed consideration will be given to design that promotes security and convenience of access to garages blocks to determine whether garages en bloc are to be counted towards the overall supply for a development.
- 2.23 The Council would prefer design of grouped parking for residential developments to be in smaller, surface parking areas (with allocated parking where appropriate) rather than garages en bloc. Good natural surveillance must be incorporated in all designs and certified quality garage doors must be a minimum requirement. This approach is more likely to be used for parking than garages, provides flexibility of use and offers greater opportunities to consider with urban design issues.

**COUNCIL (10.11.11)**

### **Wider evidence**

- 2.24 As well as local case studies looking at the impact of parking standards a wide range of national research has also taken place. The CABA 2005 study, 'What Home Buyers Want' detailed how those living in developments designed according to the principles of PPG 3 had a high degree of frustration and frequent complaints about inadequate parking.
- 2.25 In particular on street parking created a number of frustrations with many surveyed complaining that streets were too narrow for parking and there was a lack of space for visitors or two car households. In addition the report details how car ownership is expected to continue to grow until 2021, with emerging technological developments in electric or hydrogen fuelled non polluting vehicles increasing the pressure as the environmental impact of emissions from car use reduces.
- 2.26 According to the CABA study the need to find acceptable forms of higher density living that can allow for more innovative parking solutions is acute. With the lifespan of new homes, new developments will be required to accommodate the likely persistence of continued rising car ownership. Given the high level of discontent already in evidence, a parking policy which ignores this future growth could be considered unviable.
- 2.27 This local and national evidence combined provides justification for change away from maximum parking standards in residential development to the minimum standards now to be applied at the scale set out in this SPD.

### **3. Design and Layout of Parking Spaces**

- 3.1 Car parking areas should make a positive contribution to the design and setting of a development. When negotiating housing layouts planners are increasingly constrained in relation to issues around transport infrastructure and the conflict this can sometimes bring about when promoting good design and layout. Consideration to issues such as turning heads for ever larger service vehicles such as refuse collection the specific need for kerbside collection whilst allowing sufficient space for soft landscaping and public/private open space are just one of the issues that need to be considered. Access for emergency services must also be considered.
- 3.2 Developers are encouraged to refer to a number of publications available providing detailed advice and guidance on this, namely the Manual for Streets published in 2007. In addition the Essex County Council 2009 Parking Standards, Design and Good Practice Guide provides comprehensive guidance for both residential and non residential parking options for all types of vehicle and more recently Road in Hertfordshire: A design Guide (Jan 2011) details key principles to be considered when designing car parking. Car parking design and layout will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The dimension and location requirements for parking bays, driveways and turning areas shall be in accordance with the guidance in Manual for Streets in paragraphs 8.3.48 to 8.3.54.
- 3.3 The use of sustainable drainage systems must also be considered. Building Futures, an Advisory Sustainable Development Guide, was published by Hertfordshire County Council in 2006 and contains a chapter on Water which should be referred to for additional advice on the use of sustainable drainage systems and (semi) permeable surfacing.

#### **Disabled parking provision**

- 3.4 Under the Equality Act 2010 it is the responsibility of site occupiers to ensure adequate exclusive provision is made for the needs of people with disabilities to provide access in a socially inclusive way. Disabled parking provision is to be included in the overall vehicle parking provision with the bays extending beyond the standard minimum with a 1.2m strip of additional width to be provided along each side creating a total minimum bay size of 3.6m x 6m.
- 3.5 Disabled bays should be well lit and signed or marked with lines and the International Symbol for Access with the safety zone/aisle between the bays marked with hatchings. Dropped kerbs should be provided where necessary and pedestrian routes to and from car parks should be free from steps, bollards or steep slopes, ideally as close as possible to the entrance of the building but at least within 50m.

COUNCIL (10.11.11)

Table 3.1 Disabled parking standards

Car park use	Car park size	
	Up to 200 spaces	Over 200 spaces
Employees and visitors to business premises	Individual bays for each disabled employees plus 2 bays or 5% of total capacity, whichever is the greater	6 bays plus 2% of total capacity
Shopping and recreation	3 bays or 6% of total capacity, whichever is the greater	4 bays plus 4% of the total capacity

- 3.6 Further guidance can be obtained from the Department for Transport's Traffic Advisory Leaflet 05/95 Parking for Disabled People and Inclusive Mobility, both available from [www.dft.gov.uk](http://www.dft.gov.uk).

### Powered two wheelers

- 3.7 The emphasis on parking provision for powered two wheelers is based on meeting the needs of the user with their use regarded as beneficial in replacing single occupancy car trips. Secure parking for powered two wheelers should be considered on its merits in every instance, taking into account the needs associated with the type of development proposed.
- 3.8 Sites should be protected from the elements and provide a means for securing the vehicle such as rails, hoops or posts. While individual bays are not generally marked out a footprint of 2.0m x 0.8m should be allowed for each vehicle.
- 3.9 Further guidance can be found in the Department for Transport's Traffic Advisory Leaflet 02/02 Motorcycle Parking ([www.dft.gov.uk](http://www.dft.gov.uk)) as well as Powered Two Wheelers – The SMART Choice in Local Transport Plans.

### Cycle parking

- 3.10 Provision of well-located, safe and secure cycle parking is a key factor in encouraging people to cycle as an alternative to using the private car. Standards for cycle parking that differentiate between long and short stay so that the appropriate type of provision is made are crucial.
- 3.11 Factors to consider include:  
Short term cycle parking:
- 'Sheffield' style parking loops for short stay use
  - Must be well lit
  - Conveniently located within a short distance of the building entrance and where possible, offer a real advantage over the nearest available car parking space
  - Allow for natural surveillance

COUNCIL (10.11.11)

- Be sited away from bin stores (or other features that may deter use) and:
- Be clearly signed on non-residential developments.

Long term cycle parking, all of the above plus:

- Cycle lockers and or more secure cycle parks are better for long stay use
- Should offer better weather and security protection
- Suitable facilities within the destination building should be offered such as lockers, showers or other changing facilities.

- 3.12 NHDC previous employee cycle parking guidance was based on the standard of provision on “full time staff equivalents”. In many cases this has proved unsuitable with developers in some cases not knowing the specific end use of the building or likely number of employees. The minimum standard has, in some cases, moved to a Gross Floor Area (GFA) basis with any further provision to be determined through development of a travel plan for the site and mode choice targets.

### **Commercial Vehicles**

- 3.13 Commercial vehicles are regarded as those vehicles delivering goods to or removing goods from premises. It is recognised that any vehicle/lorry parking requirements are likely to be very specific to the operation in question.
- 3.14 The onus is therefore placed on the developer, to analyse the proposed development’s own requirements in terms of the numbers and types of commercial vehicles visiting their premises. They should demonstrate that any development proposal includes sufficient commercial vehicle provision to meet requirements for loading, unloading and turning and is clearly marked as to avoid being utilised as an overflow parking area for cars. In particular commercial developers must have regard to any on street parking restrictions as it should not be assumed that on-street loading is possible.

### **Coaches**

- 3.15 Those uses likely to generate coach traffic should provide appropriate off street facilities for the stopping, setting down and picking up of passengers, together with the manoeuvring of such vehicles. The onus will be on the developer to demonstrate that an appropriate level of provision is made to satisfy likely levels of usage. Layouts requiring coaches to reverse in or out of a site will not be acceptable.

### **Electric vehicle infrastructure**

- 3.16 While improvements to the internal combustion engine will continue to reduce vehicular emissions of carbon dioxide and air pollutants over the next few decades, it is generally agreed that the adoption of new vehicle technologies will be required to achieve emission targets. Of the potential candidates, there is growing consensus that electric vehicles (EVs) are the best near-to market low-emission vehicular technology.

**COUNCIL (10.11.11)**

- 3.17 In 2009 the government announced funding up to £230million would be allocated to incentivise the market uptake of electric vehicles. As from 2011 a rebate of between £2000 and £5000 is available on all new vehicles purchased alongside a mass market launch. Provision of infrastructure is critical to the adoption of these vehicles to alleviate range anxiety and visibility of such charging points will also generate consumer interest and confidence. The Government's strategy for electric vehicle charging provision names the home as the primary location at which owners will charge their vehicles.
- 3.18 The Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan also promotes the provision of electric vehicle infrastructure in line with national policy stating it will "support the provision of infrastructure and facilities to enable and encourage use of electric and electric hybrid vehicles".
- 3.19 Provision of highly visible infrastructure at non residential developments will help to generate consumer interest and aid in the confidence of those considering the purchase of an EV. However such provision must not disrupt the aesthetic values of the location or the free flow of the traffic.
- 3.20 Any guidance on parking provision at new developments based on car ownership trends in the future must therefore take increased levels of EV ownership into account and provision of charging facilities at both origin and destination. Further information on provision of Electric Vehicle Infrastructure can be found at:  
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/olev/infrastructure/>



- 4. Residential Parking Standards for use Class C3: Dwelling houses**
- 4.1 This SPD states, in Table 4.1 below, the minimum parking required for residential development. It is not the purpose of this policy to seek to address car ownership but rather how people choose to travel which is influenced by parking provision at the destination. This approach encompasses family houses, including houses occupied by up to six residents living together as a single household with or without care being provided for residents. **The norm is that minimum parking provision will be met in all cases.**
- 4.2 Flexibility is built into the standards. However, any exceptions to the minimums **MUST** be accompanied by a strong evidence case with specific reference to considering car ownership and visitor parking demand for the potential lifetime of the development.
- 4.3 As the standards are minimum there are fewer divisions of the class with the presumption that developers will not wish to compromise housing density for increased parking provision. The standards for 3 or 4 bedroom dwellings are the same as 2+ bedrooms with a minimum of 2 spaces per dwelling.
- 4.4 A balance must be sought between parking provision and high quality landscaping and open space on schemes that are dominated by larger units and not having these layouts over provided by car parking. Minimum residential standards should not compromise quality and design of layout by over provision of parking.
- 4.5 Design must allow for all types of vehicles, e.g. emergency vehicles, refuse vehicles, etc, to use roads without giving rise to safety or operational concerns. Equally parking should not be located in such a way as to compromise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and the mobility impaired.
- 4.6 Consideration has been given to retirement dwellings which are becoming an increasingly popular style of development. For this type of development the standard is a minimum of 1 space per dwelling, with room for negotiated reduction dependant on robust evidence put forward by the developer and the location of the development in reference to its position within the accessibility zones. This allows the standard to be applied more flexibly, varying from site to site, depending on its location and available parking and transport facilities nearby.

## Residential Parking Standards

Table 4.1 Residential parking standards

Class Use	Car Parking Standard	Minimum Cycle parking Standard
<b>C3</b>		
<b>1 bedroom</b>	1 Space per dwelling <b>Minimum</b>	
<b>2+bedrooms</b>	2 spaces per dwelling <b>Minimum</b>	

(The above standards will also require visitor/unallocated parking as set out below to be added . Garages will be counted towards meeting the standards only if they are at least 7m x 3m measured internally. Reductions will be considered only in exceptional circumstances e.g. very small scale conversion of buildings for small number of residential units in town centre)

<b>Retirement developments</b> (e.g. warden assisted independent living accommodation)	1 space per dwelling <b>Minimum</b>	1 Space per 8 units (visitors)
<b>Visitor/unallocated</b>	Between 0.25 and 0.75 spaces per dwelling (rounded up to nearest whole number), with the lower standard being applied where there are no garages in the proposed scheme and the higher standard applied where every dwelling in the scheme is to be provided with a garage.	If no garage or secure area is provided within curtilage of dwelling then 1 covered and secure space per dwelling in a communal area for residents plus 1 space per dwelling for visitors

(For the above two standards reduction considered where

1. Alternative publicly available off-street parking is available within 2 minutes walk of site
2. Where visitor parking arising from small scale (i.e. infill) development can be accommodated on-street without compromising highway safety, the amenity of existing residents or the ability for businesses to operate.
3. Relevant evidence is submitted by the applicant that supports a reduction in standard which considers existing and future car ownership and likely visitor demand)

- 4.7 The Department for Communities and Local Government Residential Car Parking research document suggests a variance as much as 0.5 fewer cars in non owner occupied households. Within Hertfordshire there is little evidence that levels of vehicle ownership for social rented housing are significantly lower than that for market or intermediate housing. In addition, in mixed tenure schemes, reduced levels of parking for affordable housing can exacerbate any visual differences between the market and sub-market of a development.
- 4.8 Applications for new residential development must seek to promote walking, cycling and public transport and in doing so developers may make a case for negotiating the provision of parking below the minimum standard. Clear evidence must be provided that residents and visitor parking demand will not exceed the parking provided OR that alternative short and long stay daytime and evening parking will be readily available to future residents and visitors. The developer should identify examples of this evidence from other developments or locations in similar circumstances to those found in the district. The Council does not consider, however, that residents will chose not to own cars if they live within the most accessible areas or corridors.
- 4.9 Where the development is proposed within or adjacent to an existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), the council will only consider issuing permits to new residents and businesses where there is capacity to absorb the additional demand. Where the CPZ is already at capacity, all parking must be contained within the site. Applicants should determine the availability of CPZs to absorb any parking prior to the submission of any application. The start point should be for the development to be self sufficient in providing parking to meet its needs.
- 4.10 A number of existing properties, notably flats above shops in main town centres, are not able to provide car parking facilities for residents. Car free development may be considered where development is:
- The extension or alteration or re-use of an existing building with no access to parking
  - The reversion of a previously converted property to its original residential use, including flats above shops
  - The provision of residential accommodation on a small town centre site that may not otherwise come forward for development
  - Where arrangements are made to share an existing car park within the vicinity of the site that can accommodate development.
- 4.11 Consideration must still be given to how parking for residents and their visitors can be accommodated during both daytime and evening and that this is both practical and reasonable in use.

**COUNCIL (10.11.11)**

## 5. Non residential parking

### Parking Standards for Use Class A

5.1 Vehicle Parking standards for non residential development remain as maximum provision.

Table 5.1 Non residential parking standards – Class Use A

Class Use	Maximum Car parking Standard (includes visitor spaces)	Minimum Cycle parking standard
<b>A1 – Retail Foodstores</b>		
Small food shops up to 500m <sup>2</sup> gfa	1 space per 30m <sup>2</sup> gfa	
Food supermarkets exceeding 500m <sup>2</sup> rfa but less than 2,500m <sup>2</sup> rfa	1 space per 18m <sup>2</sup> gfa	
Food superstores/hypermarkets exceeding 2,500 m <sup>2</sup> rfa	1 space per 15m <sup>2</sup> gfa	
Food retail parks	To be decided in each case on individual merits (shared parking and an overall reduction in provision, taking into account linked trips on site)	
<b>A1 – Non food retail</b>		
Non-food retail warehouses with garden centres	1 space per 25 m <sup>2</sup> gfa	
Non-food retail warehouses without garden centres	1 space per 35 m <sup>2</sup> gfa	
Garden centres up to 4,000 m <sup>2</sup> gfa	1 space per 25 m <sup>2</sup> gfa	
Garden centres exceeding 4,000 m <sup>2</sup> gfa	to be decided in each case on individual merits	
Non-food retail parks where individual land use components are known	to be decided in each case on individual merits (shared parking & an overall reduction in provision, taking into account linked trips on site)	
Non-food retail parks where individual land	1 space per 40 m <sup>2</sup> gfa (shared parking)	

COUNCIL (10.11.11)

use components are not known		
<b>A2 – Financial and professional services</b>		
Banks, building societies, estate agents, betting shops	1 space per 30m2 gfa	1 space per 100sqm for staff plus 1 space per 200sqm for customers
<b>A3 – Food and Drink</b>		
Restaurants/ cafes	1 space per 5 m2 of floorspace of dining area plus 3 spaces per 4 employees	
Fast food drive thru restaurants	1 space per 8 m2 gfa	
Roadside restaurants	1 space per 4 m2 of floorspace of dining area plus 3 spaces per 4 employees	
Transport cafe	1 lorry space per 3.5 m2 gfa plus 3 spaces per 4 employees	1 space per 100sqm for staff plus 1 space per 200sqm for customers
<b>A4 - Drinking Establishments</b>		
Public houses/bars	1 space per 3 m2 of floorspace of bar area plus 3 spaces per 4 employees	1 space per 100sqm for staff plus 1 space per 100sqm for customers
<b>A5 – Hot food takeaways</b>		
Hot food takeaway shops (excluding fast food drive thru restaurants)	1 space per 3 m2 of floorspace of public area plus 3 spaces per 4 employees	1 space per 100sqm for staff plus 1 space per 100sqm for customers

## 5.2 Parking Standards for Use Class B

Table 5.2 Non residential parking standards – Class Use B

<b>Class Use</b>	<b>Maximum Car parking Standard (includes visitor spaces)</b>	<b>Minimum Cycle parking standard</b>
<b>B1 – Business</b>		
B1 (a) Offices	1 space per 30 m2 gfa	
B1 (b) Research and Development, High-tech/B1 (c) Light industry	1 space per 35 m2 gfa	
<b>B2 - General Industry</b>		
General Industry	1 space per 50 m2 gfa (lorry provision to be checked against benchmark standards)	1 space per 250 sqm for staff plus 1 space per 500 sqm for visitors
<b>B8 – Storage and distribution</b>		
Wholesale distribution, builders merchants, storage	1 space per 75 m2 gfa (lorry provision to be checked against benchmark standards)	
Mixed B1/B2/B8 (unless heavily orientated to B8) for use where individual land use components are not known	1 space per 40 m2 gfa (lorry provision to be checked against benchmark standards)	

### 5.3 Parking Standards for Use Class C (excluding C3 Dwelling houses)

Table 5.3 Non residential parking standards – Class use C (excluding dwelling houses)

Class Use	Maximum Car parking Standard (includes visitor spaces)	Minimum Cycle parking standard
<b>C1 – Hotels and Hostels</b>		
Hotels	1 space per bedroom (including staff accommodation) plus 1 space per manager plus 2 spaces per 3 staff minus spaces related to staff bedrooms plus 1 space per 5 m <sup>2</sup> dining area plus 1 space per 3 m <sup>2</sup> bar area plus 1 space per 5 m <sup>2</sup> public area in conference facility plus 1 space per 6 m <sup>2</sup> of public area in exhibition hall plus a minimum of 1 coach parking space per 100 bedrooms	1 space per 5 staff plus 1 space per 10 bedrooms
Hostels	3 spaces per 4 units	1 space per 3 units
<b>C2 – Residential institutions</b>		
Institutions/homes with care staff on premises at all times (excluding nursing homes, hospitals, residential schools, colleges or training centres)	1 space per 5 residents' bed spaces plus 1 space per 2 staff (non resident); parking for resident staff to be based on general needs standard	
Elderly persons residential & nursing homes (Category 3)	0.25 spaces per resident bed space; parking for resident staff to be based on general needs standard	
Hospitals	1 space per 0.5 beds or to be decided on individual merits (including a full transport assessment & proposals in a travel plans); special hospitals must be considered individually	1 space per 4 staff visitors to be considered on case by case basis referring to travel plan
Education – halls of residence	1 space per 2 full-time staff plus 1 space per 6 students (but with linkage to travel plan where appropriate)	1 space per 5 staff plus 1 space per 3 students

COUNCIL (10.11.11)

## 5.4 Parking Standards for Use Class D

Table 5.4 Non residential parking standards – Class Use D

Class Use	Maximum Car parking Standard (includes visitor spaces)	Minimum Cycle parking standard
<b>D1 – Non residential institutions</b>		
Public halls/places of assembly (excluding D2)	1 space per 9 m <sup>2</sup> gfa or 1 space per 3 fixed seats plus 3 spaces per 4 staff members	
Community/family centres	1 space per 9 m <sup>2</sup> gfa plus 1 space per full-time staff members or equivalent	
Day centres	1 space per 2 staff members plus 1 space per 3 persons attending or 1 space per 9 m <sup>2</sup> gfa	
Places of worship	1 space per 10 m <sup>2</sup> gfa	
Surgeries & clinics	3 spaces per consulting room plus 1 space per employee other than consulting doctors/dentists/vets	1 space per 4 staff plus 1 space per consulting room
Libraries, miscellaneous cultural buildings	1 space per 30 m <sup>2</sup> gfa of freestanding development (otherwise assessed on merits)	1 space per 4 staff plus visitor parking on individual merit
Miscellaneous cultural Buildings	2 spaces plus 1 space per 30 m <sup>2</sup> of public floorspace	1 space per 4 staff plus visitor parking on individual merit
Educational establishments (including residential) schools,	1 space per full-time member of staff plus 1 space per 100 pupils plus 1 space per 8 pupils over 17 years old plus 1 space per 20 pupils under 17 years old	1 space per 5 staff plus 1 space per 3 students
further education	1 space per full-time member of staff plus 1 space per 5 full-time students	

COUNCIL (10.11.11)



nursery school / playgroups	1 space per full-time member of staff plus 1 space per 4 pupils	1 Space per 5 staff plus one space per 10 child places
<b>D2 – Assembly and Leisure</b>		
Places of entertainment/leisure parks for use when individual land use components are known	to be decided in each case on individual merits: parking for individual land use components should be based on the standards set out in this Guidance, but with an overall reduction in provision to reflect linked trips on site (all parking should be shared and an overall reduction of 25% should form the starting point for discussion)	
Places of entertainment/leisure parks for use when individual land use components are not known	1 space per 15 m2gfa (shared parking)	
Cinemas (including multiplexes)	1 space per 3 seats	1 s/t space per 20 seats 1 long term space per 10 staff
Swimming pools	1 space per 15 m2gfa	
Tennis/badminton	4 spaces per court	
Ice rinks	1 space per 12 m2gfa of rink	
Fitness centres/ sports clubs	1 space per 15 m2gfa	
Ten pin bowling	4 spaces per lane	1 s/t space per 3 lanes or rink plus 1 s/t space per 25 spectator seats plus 1 l/t space per 10 f/t staff
Outdoor sports grounds with football pitches	20 spaces per pitch	
Outdoor sports grounds without football pitches	50 spaces per hectare	
Golf course	100 spaces plus 50 overflow (18 holes) 9 holes at 50% of above	5 spaces per 9 holes or 20/30 tee driving range pro rata

COUNCIL (10.11.11)

## 5.5 Parking Standards for Use Class Other Sui Generis Users

Table 5.5 Non residential parking standards – Class Use Other

<b>Class Use</b>	<b>Maximum Car parking Standard (includes visitor spaces)</b>	<b>Minimum Cycle parking standard</b>
<b>Motor trade</b>		
Showroom car sales	3 spaces per 4 employees plus 1space per 10 cars displayed	
Vehicle storage	3 spaces per 4 employees plus 2spaces per showroom space or provision at rate of 10% annual turnover	
Hire cars	3 spaces per 4 employees plus 1space per 2 hire cars based at site	
Ancillary vehicle storage	3 spaces or 75% of total if more Than 3 vehicles	
Workshops	3 spaces per 4 employees plus 3spaces per bay (for waiting & finished vehicles) in addition to repair bays	
Tyre & Exhaust	3 spaces per 4 employees plus 2spaces per bay	
Parts stores/sales	3 spaces per 4 employees plus 3 spaces for customers	
Car wash/petrol filling station	3 spaces per 4 employees plus 3 waiting spaces per bay or run in to row of bays (additional parking is required where a shop is provided)	
Taxi mini cab hire	1 space per fte staff member permanently deployed at registered base site plus 1 space per 5 registered vehicles	
<b>Passenger transport facilities</b>		
Rail stations	To be decided in each case on individual merit	5 spaces per peak period train
Bus stations	To be decided in each case on individual merit	2 spaces per 100 peak period passengers
<b>Other</b>		
<b>Nightclubs</b>	1 space per 50sqm	1 space per 4 staff
<b>Recycling centre</b>	1 space per fte and drop off/waiting facilities for users	1 space per 4 staff plus customer on individual merit

COUNCIL (10.11.11)

<b>Caravan parks</b>	1 space per pitch plus 1 space per fte staff	1 space per 5 pitches
----------------------	--	-----------------------

### Accessibility zones

5.6 Non residential accessibility zones have been identified in the Districts main towns based access to key services including GP's, schools, retail centres by public transport is considered. Maps of these zones are attached in Appendix 3. They are provided by way of evidence to indicate locations of best accessibility by public transport. These maps are also relevant to considering residential parking in Class C3 albeit only in exceptional circumstances.

5.7 These zones represent the degree of restraint to be applied to new development within each zone type. Within each range the higher percentage represents the smallest acceptable reduction in provision.

5.8 The ranges are as follows:

Table 5.6 Non residential Accessibility Zones

<b>Zone type</b>	<b>Car parking provision allowed</b>
1	0 – 25% of unfettered demand
2	25 – 50% of unfettered demand
3	50 – 75% of unfettered demand
4	75 – 100% of unfettered demand

## **6. Transport Assessments**

- 6.1 In some circumstances the traffic generated by a new development will require a Transport Assessment to be submitted as part of the planning application. Full guidance on the transport assessment process is available at:  
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/transportassessments/guidanceonta>  
with additional information in Roads in Hertfordshire.
- 6.2 Transport assessments will be required for the following size and types of development:
- Residential development in excess of 25 units (50 for retirement dwellings)
  - Retail development of more than 2000m<sup>2</sup>
  - Development in classes B1, B2 or B8 of more than 2000m<sup>2</sup> and
  - Developments for sports centres, leisure facilities, golf courses and practise ranges.
- 6.3 In addition to the development types listed above, Transport Assessments should also be produced:
- Where traffic levels to and from the proposed development are likely to exceed 5% of the two way traffic flow on the adjoining highway from which it takes access
  - Where traffic congestion exists or will exist within the assessment period; and
  - In sensitive locations such as adjacent or close to traffic lights or roundabout junctions.
- 6.4 Design and Access statements will need to be submitted to cover the majority of developments and parking is a key aspect that must be covered.
- 6.5 In some cases parking arising from development will require measures to be put in place to manage the impact of parking on the public highway. This includes physical protection against parking (i.e. on verges) or protection via Traffic Regulation Orders against short/long stay parking at inappropriate locations (i.e. at junctions, in locations that may conflict with pedestrian movements). All parking management required as a result of new development must be provided by the developer and should have regard to the Council's Parking Strategy and other parking management in the area.

## **7. Travel Plans**

- 7.1 Travel plans are an integral part of the Transport Assessment process with PPG 13 promoting their use as a means of providing people with a greater range of travel choices in favour of more sustainable modes thus reducing the number and impact of single occupancy car journeys. Travel plans are now part of mainstream transport policy and NHDC will require the submission of a robust travel plan on all major non residential developments and on significant new developments before granting planning permission or discharging the associated condition. The travel plan must contain details on how the plan's effectiveness will be monitored.
- 7.2 A travel plan will also be sought on other schemes where the achievement of modal shift in favour of sustainable modes is considered to be particularly necessary.
- 7.3 The travel plan should demonstrate a thorough understanding of the likely transport movements of a new development and deliver a range of measures and incentives to facilitate the use of more sustainable modes. This can include a range of measures from hard infrastructure such as cycle storage provision or softer measures such as travel information and marketing materials.
- 7.4 A full travel plan checklist is available in Appendix 4.

- 8. Section 106 contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**
- 8.1 Ensuring that new development contributes to the cost of meeting the infrastructure needs of the resulting community has been traditionally dealt with through planning obligations entered into under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. NHDC has a Planning Obligations SPD which sets out the process in which landowners are currently expected to contribute financially or 'in kind' to improvements or new infrastructure required as a result of their development.
- 8.2 It seeks to address the cumulative impact of development by setting a standard charge for each item of infrastructure which directly relates to the size and number of dwellings. It seeks to address the cumulative impact of development by setting a 'standard charge' for each item of infrastructure which directly relates to the size and number of dwellings. This tariff based approach was encouraged by Circular 5/05: Planning Obligations.
- 8.3 Since adoption of the SPD the previous Government introduced reform to the planning obligation system through the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in the Planning Act 2008. One of the main differences between the current planning obligations regime and CIL is that CIL does not require a contribution to be directly related to the infrastructure needs arising from the specific development.
- 8.4 Further information on the CIL process is available in the emerging NHDC Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Until the adoption of a fully scrutinised CIL, generalised transportation contributions will not be sought for strategic highway, community and other desires. The document will be therefore amended as and when CIL is formerly adopted by the council.

## **Appendix 1**

### Planning Policy Guidance 13 - Transport

PPG13 sets out to better integrate planning and transport to encourage more sustainable travel choices, promote accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling and to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. Prior to 2011 it also required local authorities to set maximum parking standards for both residential and non residential dwellings thereby limiting the number of parking spaces in an attempt to encourage the use of alternative modes of travel.

Since the introduction of this policy and maximum parking standards at the origin of a journey i.e. home, a number of problems have been observed with regard to the liveability of these areas. Parking standards in new developments have proved in some cases to be insufficient to cater for the level of car ownership, as stated it is parking availability at the destination of the journey that affects modal choice whilst availability at the origin end has not always been shown to affect car ownership.

In the future car ownership levels are expected to continue to rise, with advances in vehicle technology seeking to address many of the climate change issues. For a number of reasons policy has therefore been moving towards removing the maximum standards requirement at trip origin and using local evidence to determine appropriate levels of parking at new developments.

On January 2 2011, PPG 13 was amended to reflect this and Government formally removed the maximum standards at origin requirement with local authorities able to take decisions on parking requirements based on local circumstances to the benefit of their communities.

This guidance takes full account of this change in policy and will be using a range of local evidence to determine residential parking standards.

### Planning Policy Statement 4 - Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth

Policy EC8 within PPS4 addresses the requirement for maximum parking standards for non residential development and to deliver more sustainable development whilst reducing the need to travel, especially by car and respond to climate changes.

It stipulates that Local planning authorities should, through their local development frameworks, set maximum parking standards for non-residential development in their area, ensuring alignment with the policies in the relevant local transport plan and, where relevant, the regional strategy. Local planning authorities should not set minimum parking standards for development, other than for parking for disabled people.

In addition it addresses the need to make provision for adequate levels of good quality secure parking in town centres to encourage investment and maintain their vitality.

**COUNCIL (10.11.11)**

### Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing

This policy statement indicated that proposed development should take a design-lead approach to the provision of car parking space, “that is well integrated with a high quality public realm and streets that are pedestrian, cycle and vehicle friendly”.

Furthermore, it states that “Local Planning Authorities should, with stakeholders and communities, develop residential parking policies for their areas, taking account expected levels of car ownership, the importance of promoting good design and the need to use land efficiently”

*Taking all this into account, this guidance seeks to provide minimum parking standards for residential development with further advice on good design principles and maximum parking standards for non residential development that encourage sustainable travel choices to be made.*

### Local Policy

Hertfordshire County Council has recently published its third Local Transport Plan in March 2011. Urban Transport Plans have either been adopted or are in the process of being reviewed for each of the urban areas. County Council policy on parking provision at new development is set out in the former Structure Plan Policy 25: Car Parking which was supplemented by a SPD on parking Provision at New Development, adopted in 2000. In lieu of any further guidance available at this time, non residential parking standards detailed in this document and used elsewhere throughout the county remain based on this HCC guidance.

Revised parking guidance is expected from the County in the future, upon publication of this guidance some further revision to this SPD may occur.



## **Appendix 2 Sources of Information**

North Herts District Council Parking Strategy 2009

[www.north-herts.gov.uk/nhdc\\_parking\\_strategy\\_2009-2020.pdf](http://www.north-herts.gov.uk/nhdc_parking_strategy_2009-2020.pdf)

Essex County Council Parking Standards Design and Good Practice

[www.rochford.gov.uk/PDF/planning\\_parking\\_standards\\_design\\_and\\_good\\_practice.pdf](http://www.rochford.gov.uk/PDF/planning_parking_standards_design_and_good_practice.pdf)

Roads In Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide

[http://www.hertsdirect.org/envroads/roadstrans/transplan/infdev/roadsinherts/..](http://www.hertsdirect.org/envroads/roadstrans/transplan/infdev/roadsinherts/)

Department for Communities and Local Government: Car Parking Research

[www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/residentialcarparking](http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/residentialcarparking)

Warwickshire Parking Review

[www.warwick.gov.uk](http://www.warwick.gov.uk)

CABE What Home Buyers Want

[www.cabe.org.uk/publications/what-home-buyers-want](http://www.cabe.org.uk/publications/what-home-buyers-want)

Manual for Streets

[www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/manforstreets](http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/manforstreets)

Building Futures – Advisory Sustainable Development Guide

[www.hertslink.org/buildingfutures](http://www.hertslink.org/buildingfutures)

DfT Traffic Advisory Leaflets – 05/95 Parking for Disabled People & 02/02  
Motorcycle Parking

[www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roads/tpml/tal/](http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roads/tpml/tal/)

Powered Two Wheelers – The SMART Choice in Local Transport Plans

[www.motorcycleguidelines.org.uk](http://www.motorcycleguidelines.org.uk)


Travel Plans and the Planning System

<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/travelplans/tpp/>


**COUNCIL (10.11.11)**

## Appendix 3 Non Residential Zonal Maps

### 3.1 Hitchin




### 3.2 Letchworth



COUNCIL (10.11.11)

Supplementary Planning Document  
Vehicle Parking at New Development

### 3.3 Baldock



COUNCIL (10.11.11)

### 3.4 Royston



COUNCIL (10.11.11)

## **Appendix 4 Travel Plan Checklist.**

Does the TP consider the policy background? Including (as appropriate):

Background documents and issues:

- Climate change/C02 emissions/air and noise pollution
- Health issues – obesity, stress, effect of vehicular emissions, etc.
- Are You Doing Your Bit “A Travel Plan Resource Pack for Employers”
- HTCOA “Developing a Green Travel Plan: A Guidance Note”
- DETR “A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone”
- DETR “School Travel Strategies and Plans”
- Social Exclusion Unit “Making the Connection: Final Report on Transport and Social Exclusion”

Planning policy documents:

- PPG13: Transport
- Local Plan / Local Development Framework policies
- Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents
- Parking standards
- Local Transport Plan
- Local Area Transport Plans
- For larger developments (e.g. a business park) applicants should also be aware of DfT's various good practice guidance (available from [www.dft.gov.uk](http://www.dft.gov.uk))

Does the TP evaluate the existing situation? Including (as appropriate)

- Descriptions of pedestrian and cycle routes available to (within close proximity of) the site
- Descriptions of cycle facilities already made available either in the immediate area or as a condition of development e.g. racks, showers, lockers and crossings
- Descriptions and frequencies of available bus routes
- Details of nearest train stations and route availability / frequency
- Details of nearest services and facilities

Does the TP provide baseline data (e.g. through a staff survey)? Including (as appropriate)

- Analysis of employee / customer catchment area
- Analysis of existing or predicted travel patterns to / from the site including modal choice
- Analysis of latent demand and factors that would encourage modal shift

Does the TP consider a suitable range of initiatives or provide reasoned justification as to why initiatives cannot be pursued in the location? Including (as appropriate)

Promotional measures

- Appointment of a TP co-ordinator
- Public transport publicity (including display of timetables, provision of link to intalink website <http://www.intalink.org.uk/> from all PC desktops etc)
- Working with bus, train and community transport operators on possible initiatives or marketing
- Car share database
- Promotional material relating to walking / cycling
- Staff meetings and updates

## Incentives

- Season ticket loans / discounts
- Bike purchase loans / subsidies
- Regular visits by bike doctor
- 'Cycle buddy' scheme (or similar)
- Payment of cycle mileage rates (at equal or preferential rates to car mileage)
- Remote working/home-working with attendant ICT link-ups and dial-ins

## Provision

- Secure bike storage / lockers / showers (if not already a condition of the development)
- Pool cars / car club
- Pool bikes (including folding bikes)
- Bus or minibus to / from key destinations
- Parking spaces reserved for car sharers and / or disincentives for single occupancy car drivers i.e. charging
- Dedicated motor cycle parking provision
- On- or off-site improvements to reduce the need to travel or facilitate the use of alternative modes (or Section 106 contributions to allow these to be implemented).
- Additional schemes / measures appropriate to the development type proposed
- Consideration of mobility issues

Does the TP set a range of targets, and are these targets measurable (e.g. based on numbers / percentages rather than aspirational)? Could include (as appropriate)

- % reduction in single occupancy car journeys
- Number / % of journeys as a passenger in a car
- Number / % of journeys by modes other than the private car (broken down into journeys by bike, foot, public transport)
- Subscribers to the car share database
- Use of pool cars / office bikes / staff bus / car club vehicles (as provided)
- Number of season tickets purchased with the aid of a loan / subsidy
- Number of bikes purchased with the aid of a loan / subsidy
- Staff / resident awareness of the Travel Plan and initiatives
- % of staff homeworking / number of days spent homeworking

Does the TP recognise the benefits of implementation?

- Benefits employer / employees: Health (physical and mental well being), retention, less sickness leave, ISO9000 benefits, better neighbours etc
- Wider benefits: Reduced congestion, less pollution / CO2 emissions, wider environmental benefits

Does the TP make provision for monitoring and review?

Does the TP contain penalty measures in the event that agreed targets are not met?

**COUNCIL (10.11.11)**