

Parking & Highway Layout in Development Supplementary Planning Document

Public Consultation

Issues raised from the Public Consultation & how these have been taken into account in the SPD



Planning and Regeneration Services, 2011

Adopted 18th July 2011

Striving for Excellence

Number	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Comments relate to para(s)	Comments/Issues raised	How the issues raised have been taken into account in the SPD.
Question 1	Mr Lindley Owen	PCT	1.3	<p>"Carefully manage the growth in traffic" sounds like cautious good sense, but the rest of the section is all about encouraging walking (and cycling) more. If more people switch to walking and cycling instead of driving short journeys, it won't need 'managing', carefully or otherwise. National motor traffic rates are in decline, as high fuel prices influence decisions around marginal trips and modal choice. Resource constraints on motorised transport will increase because of peak oil, the high cost of sustainable alternatives to fossil fuel, and technological alternatives to travel.</p>	<p>Comments noted. A section has been added to the document, which sets out the objectives of the SPD, at para 3.3 to: "Promote and prioritise criteria which encourages sustainable travel" and to ensure that "Development promotes inclusive, safe and convenient access for all highway users".</p> <p>Managing growth in traffic is a key priority for the Council, in line with key outcomes in Strategic Objective 4 of the Poole Core Strategy. It is reflected in the Local Transport Plan (adopted April 2011). The emerging Poole Site Specific Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) also sets out in the pre-text to Policy DM8: Demand Management that development should promote walking and cycling.</p>

Question 1	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways Agency	General comments:	<p>Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the above consultation document. In addition to the submission, the Agency has previously provided comments on a number of stages of the Poole LDF Core Strategy, as well as attending the Examination in Public in November 2008. The Agency has also provided comments on a significant number of other Development Plan Documents within the Borough of Poole, and the comments below should be considered within the context of the Agency's role and our previous comments. It should also be noted that the following comments are not exhaustive and we may wish to provide further input as the Council's LDF evolves. The Agency's response to the Site Specific Allocations and Development Management policies, submitted in October 2010, expressed a desire to be consulted in the preparation of the Parking SPF and we are therefore grateful for this early opportunity to comment. Strategic Road Network Context In assessing the Parking and Development Layout SPD, the Agency needs to be satisfied that any proposed development within the Borough of Poole takes account of the impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN). In Poole, the Agency's interest relates to potential impacts on the A31 to the north of Poole and the A35 to the west. On this basis, we seek to encourage development that effectively integrates transport and land use planning with a focus on sustainable transport provision. Both the A31 and the A35 have significant capacity and operational problems that need to be resolved before future growth can come forward. The Agency has undertaken strategic level modelling of the SRN which shows that under existing conditions, the section of the A31 directly east of Wimborne Minster, between Merley and the A348 junction of West Moors, is operating in excess of capacity. By 2026 congestion to the east of Wimborne Minster is expected to intensify, compounded by the impact of seasonable traffic peaks. It should also be noted that the Inspector's report following the examination in public into the Poole Core Strategy highlighted that the A31 is at capacity and will be unable to accommodate additional traffic without improvements being made (Inspectors Report para 4.80). The following comments are informed by the existing capacity and operational constraints in order to enable that the impact of future development on the SRN is fully considered. The Agency would expect emerging policies to be</p>	<p>Promoting safe, sustainable and convenient access is a key priority in the Poole Core Strategy and is reflected in corporate aspirations to improve the efficiency of public transport. Emerging Delivering Poole's Infrastructure Development Plan Document sets out the planning policy framework for development to deliver infrastructure required to support growth. Transport networks comprising pedestrian facilities, roads, public transport improvements and cycleway all form part of this infrastructure. Developer contributions will be collected through the emerging Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule and will complement short, medium and long term measures set out in Local Transport Plan 3 (2011).</p> <p>The Parking & Highway Layout in Development SPD was published for consultation in December 2010, before the revised PPG13 was issued in January 2011. The SPD has been amended to recognise these revisions – see para 4.6. “Optimum” parking provision for residential and commercial development is set out in Tables 3 and 4.</p>
---------------	---------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--	---

				<p>guided by, in particular, the South East Dorset Multi Modal Transport Study (SEDMMTS) and the protocol identified within the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the relevant local authorities and the Highway Agency. The Agency is strongly supportive in principle of an SPD to guide developers and landowners on the requirements for parking and layout when designing a scheme. The Agency believes that provision of car parking directly impacts travel choice, and Department for Transport (DfT) Circular 02/2007 Planning and the Strategic Road Network identifies (at para 33) that parking control is a key demand management technique available to reduce traffic generation associated with new development. In addition to Circular 02/2007, parking and layout aspects of new development be guided by the provisions of the DfT's Guidance on Transport Assessment (GTA) and Good Practice Guidelines: Delivering Travel Plans through the Planning Process. The 2001 version of Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13) Transport has recently been revised to reflect changes to parking guidance (paras 49-56). While the objectives in developing and implementing policies on parking generally remain as previously stated, the revised version requires that "policies in development plans should set levels of parking for broad classes of development" deleting the reference in this context to maximum standards. Additionally, the previous guidance that "there should be no minimum standards for development" has been deleted. It is understood that the Parking and Development Layout SPD was published for consultation in December 2010, i.e. before the issuing of the revised PPG13 in January 2011 (the PPG13 extract given in Appendix A is from the 2001 version). It will therefore be essential for the SPD to be updated to accord with the revised national guidance. For ease of reference, the agency's comments in response to the Parking and Development Layout document are set out to reflect the structure of the SPD, and are as follows:</p>	
Question 1	Mrs Joan Jarvis	None	General Comment	The above SPD is welcomed and should contribute largely to improving development in Poole	Comment noted.
Question 1	Mr Christopher Allenby	Poole Old Town Conservation Group	General Comment:	Our overall conclusion with this Consultation document is we find that the general premise of the document is that the plan follows the agreed Poole Core Strategy 2009; this document would therefore receive our support.	Comment noted.

Question 1	Mr Christopher Allenby	Poole Old Town Conservation Group	1.1 - 1.4	<p>1.1 Agreed. It is crucial that the need to provide parking is balanced with achieving active streets that feel safe to use and support sustainable attractive residential and commercial development.</p> <p>1.2 Agreed. Car parking spaces may be integrated within a high quality public realm and streets are pedestrian and cycle friendly.</p> <p>1.3 Agreed. In Poole there is a significant emphasis on the Town Centre, the Regeneration Area linked by the Twin Sails Bridge, and other accessible locations to deliver new development. It is important to Poole's future success that development creates quality places that are responsible to the needs of local residents and visitors.</p> <p>1.4 Defined parking zones as guidance for future development is excellent, only if these guidelines are adhered to.</p>	Comments noted.
Question 1	Mr G Eves	PFA Consulting (representing Talbot Village trust)	General comments:	<p>This response has been prepared on behalf of Talbot Village Trust by PFA Consulting and Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners. The Trust's principal concerns are in relation to the potential implications that the emerging policy guidance will have on any future development of the Trust land, in particular the area of Talbot Village and Bournemouth University. These comments are therefore confined to matters in the consultation document which may relate specifically to that area of concern. First, as a matter of general comment, a very short time after this consultation document was published the Government announced revisions to PPG13 which relates specifically to national policies on parking. There will therefore need to be a number of changes to the draft SPD where it refers to PPG13 to reflect the revised PPG - this response does not detail those particular requisite changes.</p>	<p>The Parking & Highway Layout in Development SPD was published for consultation in December 2010, before the revised PPG13 was issued in January 2011. The SPD has been amended to recognise these revisions – see para 4.6. In addition, the “Optimum” parking provision for residential and commercial development is set out in Tables 3 and 4 in line with findings of the local evidence base.</p>
Question 1	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	Paragraph 2.3	<p>I have no faith that "localism" will deliver a "planned community". Those with the most time to spare make comments and therefore, shape the policy are not the stakeholders who will be expected to deliver or not, as the case may be!</p>	<p>Copies of the SPD document were sent to stakeholders and individuals who have been involved in the consultation process on the Borough of Poole Local Development Framework. This comprised a wide variety of consultees including statutory consultees, specific</p>

					consultation bodies, art groups, citizens groups, environmental groups, health and safety groups, historic environment groups, leisure & recreation societies, residents groups and associations, bodies representing different ethnic and religious groups, churches, disability forums, bodies representing the business community and wider stakeholders. The responses received are a fair representation across these individuals, groups and organisations.
Question 1	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory		<p>I have no instructions to do so and they therefore, represent my own personal views.</p> <p>I have been told that all of the South East Dorset Transportation Contributions Scheme money so far collected has been allocated to the Twin Sails Bridge. Whilst wishing to support this project, I could not justify the money received in respect of applications for development which are remote from the bridge, as it would not, in my opinion, be in accordance with the tests set out in Circular 05/2005.</p>	This comment is outside of the scope of the Parking & Highway Layout in Development SPD – it does not express how transport contributions set out in the SEDTCS, are spent.
Question 1	Spatial Planning	Dorset County Council	General comments:	<p>Thank you for inviting Dorset County Council to comment on this Supplementary Planning Document. The details of the standards for the area are a matter for the Borough of Poole to determine and so it is not relevant for the County Council to comment on these. However, I am asked to congratulate the Borough on the layout and structure of SPD. It is in line with national guidance such as Manual for Streets and Manual for Streets 2. It is also founded on the sound and extensive evidence base provided by the Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Residential Car Parking Study (BPDRCPs). The Borough is also to be congratulated on taking forward this evidence study, in so much as it applies to the Poole local area, into the SPD. It is noted that Ministerial Statements issued January 2011 and a letter from the DCLG dated 14th January have caused some degree of confusion over policy issues in respect of parking. Whilst the SPD as drafted is correctly explicit about the national planning policy base for the SPD, it may be prudent to include a rebuttal in the final SPD to statements issued by Government in this respect. I am sure that the Borough is well briefed already on the details of the statements but I attach an</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Parking & Highway Layout in Development SPD was published for consultation in December 2010, before the revised PPG13 was issued in January 2011. The SPD has been amended in line with these revisions – see paragraph 4.6. In addition, the “optimum” parking provision for residential and commercial development is set out in Tables 3 and 4, in line with findings of the local evidence base.</p>

				internal DCC briefing note about the subject as supportive referencing. On this occasion, I suggest if you have any queries, please contact Stephen Hardy (tel: 01305-221650 email: s.p.hardy@dorsetcc.gov.uk).	
Question 1	David Willey	Bournemouth University	General Comments	We act on behalf of Bournemouth University who provides a range of education facilities at its Talbot Campus. The university generally welcomes the approach to managing parking across the borough set out in the consultation document and welcomes the principle of a special parking zone for the university and the Arts University College Bournemouth (AUCB) at Talbot Campus.	Comment noted.
Question 1	Mr David Williams	The Planning Bureau Ltd (Representing McCarthy & Stone)	General Comments	On behalf of my Client, McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd, I provide comments below on the consultation document Parking and Development Layout SPD. McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd are the market leader in the provision of private specialised accommodation for older people with over 30 years experience providing over 40,000 homes designed to address the specific needs of older people., McCarthy and Stone develop sheltered housing and assisted living/extra care developments and so are in a very knowledgeable position to comment upon parking in relation to sheltered housing and other forms of accommodation for the ageing population.	Comment noted. It is the Poole Core Strategy which sets out at strategic objective 2, the importance of the right mix of homes to serve Poole's needs. Key outcomes include meeting the needs of an ageing population. The detail and criteria set out in policy PCS7 of how models of care will be expected to be delivered include car parking provision.
Question 1		McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd.	Q1.	The use of the word "optimum" level of car parking is used throughout the document in suggesting a level of car parking for each type of use and accessibility zone. What is not clear is how this will be implemented and more importantly whether the Council similarly treat this as a minimum parking level for the relevant document come what may?	The revisions in PPG13 (2011) require local authorities to better ensure that parking provision meets local needs and removes the necessity for centrally imposed guidance requiring "maximum" parking levels. The local evidence base which supports this SPD suggests that (particularly residential parking) should be appropriate to its location and type. Parking standards have been developed and the optimum level set out in the Tables, to meet that particular pattern of car ownership. As such, the SPD sets out the Borough of Poole's approach to parking and highway layout in development schemes. As it forms part of the Local Development Framework, it is part of a package or suite of documents to deliver the objectives of the Poole Core Strategy and emerging

					<p>Development Plan Documents.</p> <p>The SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications received by the Council. It will be used by Development Management officers and the Council's Planning Committee to determine planning applications. The summary of the document has been amended at paras 1.3 and 1.4 to clarify these points.</p>
Question 1	Mr David Jobbins	Savills (representing Gallagher Estates)	GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this emerging supplementary planning document (SPD). As you will be aware, Gallagher Estates and the Lands Improvement Holdings are currently working on proposals to bring forward the development of the former Poole Power Station site, which is integral to the Council's regeneration and development strategy. The provision of parking as part of this scheme will be critical to the success of the proposals and it is essential that the Council's policies provide guidance whilst being sufficiently flexible to ensure the effective delivery of this and other key regeneration schemes in the Borough. We therefore wish to comment as follows on this draft document. Firstly it is notable that the publication of the consultation document preceded the announcement on 3rd January 2011 of the publication of revised PPG13. That announcement and the revisions to this PPG were specifically intended to place car parking guidance in the hands of local decision makers and to promote the local assessment of parking requirements. As stated in the announcement "Councils will have the freedom to decide how many parking spaces they want to see in new development in their area. The new rules will ensure local authorities can choose what sort of new housing developments they want in their communities, rather than having homes where the choice on parking provision has been restricted by central government. We would presume the SPD will be updated to reflect these changes, acknowledging that in many respects the Council's approach to "optimal" parking standards based on survey work already anticipates the Government's localism approach. The use of the term "optimal" suggests an inherent flexibility that can and should be exercised in response to the circumstances of any specific</p>	<p>The Parking & Highway Layout in Development SPD was published for consultation in December 2010, before the revised PPG13 was issued in January 2011. The SPD has been amended and updated in the introduction and Appendix A in accordance with the revised national guidance. Changes made to paragraph 4.6 and Fig 1 – Influences Shaping the Parking and Highway Layout in Development SPD. The "Optimum" parking provision for residential and commercial development is set out in Tables 3 and 4, in line with findings of the local evidence base.</p> <p>The Parking & Highway Layout in Development SPD is a guidance document and its contents are a material consideration in the determination of planning applications received by the Council and be used by Development Management Officers and the Council's Planning Committee. This is stated at para 1.4.</p>

				development project, taking account of the scheme's design, housing mix and other relevant factors. It should also be stressed that the SPD comprises guidance, not a mandatory requirement.	
Question 1	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways Agency	Paras 1.3 and 1.4	The Agency strongly supports the priorities and assumptions identified, which reflects the strategic objectives of the Council's adopted Core Strategy.	Comment noted.

Question 1	Mr Dave Nash	Urban DNA	Detailed Comments The comments below follow the order and section numbering of the draft SPD.	<p>The front cover images are poor as they seem to 'show case' large communal car parking areas rather than multi-functional 'places' with integrated parking of the type that ought to be promoted. The impression being given is that parking is a singularly important design issue (i.e. paragraph 1.1 "accommodating parked vehicles has become a key function of many streets" and "Parking Layout is a fundamental element of urban design"). That contradicts policy PCS5 which indicates that it is but one of a number of design / planning issues. Furthermore Manual for Streets (MfS) has been selectively quoted (para 2.3 of MfS indicates that streets have 5 principle functions including place, movement, access, parking and accommodating utilities) and it is the place function (local distinctiveness, visual quality and propensity to encourage social activity) that is fundamental to a richer more fulfilling environment. The car parking arrangements: good practice guidance from Car Parking: What Works Where (paragraph 8.3.36 of MfS) indicates some fundamental principles - the design quality of the street is paramount, there is no single best solution to providing car parking, the street can be a very good car park etc. It will be a retrograde step if (to excuse the pun) parking becomes the 'design driver' for development in Poole. Paragraph 1.2 indicates that the SPD sets out a range of measures to promote safe, sustainable and convenient access and reflects the design quality agenda of Manual for Streets. Unlike the current Parking Guidelines SPG, 2004 (paragraph 2.2) there are no objectives set out to clarify the Council's proposed approach. This is a fundamental failing of the draft SPD. On further reading it becomes apparent that the draft SPD sets out: parking standards based on undefined 'optimum levels' not maximum standards deletes the accessibility criteria for non-residential car parking' and proposes parking spaces and garages larger than now. This does not reflect a sustainable design-led agenda and appears to make compliance more onerous and more costly at a time when the development industry should be supported.</p>	<p>The images have been changed to better reveal the theme of the SPD.</p> <p>The SPD forms part of the Local Development Framework which will be used in conjunction with the suite of policies in the Core Strategy and emerging policies in Development Plan Documents.</p> <p>The role of the SPD is to complement existing and emerging policy in the LDF. The introduction in the SPD has been amended to clarify the function of a street and that parking can have an impact on people's lives in terms of accessibility and safety.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended and a clearer structure in terms of its role and objectives. Amendments have been made in Part 3 of the revised SPD.</p> <p>The Parking & Highway Layout in Development SPD was published for consultation in December 2010, before the revised PPG13 was issued in January 2011.</p> <p>The "optimum" parking provision for residential and commercial development set out in Tables 3 and 4 is based upon the findings of the evidence base, identified in Part 5 of the SPD. It is necessary to increase the size of a parking space to ensure that there is sufficient space to accommodate modern cars which, due to safety features, tend to be bulkier and wider.</p>
---------------	-----------------	-----------	--	--	---

Question 1	Mr Paul Barlow	Sainsbury's Supermarket	GENERAL COMMENTS	We write concerning your recently published draft Parking and Development Supplementary Planning Document. On behalf of our client, we have considered in detail the above document and wish to make the following representations.	
Question 1	Mr Dave Nash	Urban DNA	Headline Comments.	<p>Terms of Reference. The Borough of Poole Agents and Developers Working Group represent the development industry and are stakeholders who collaborate with the Council (through quarterly meetings and as a consultee group when required) in order to improve the practice and outcomes of Spatial Planning and Development Management within the Borough as follows: As a critical friend to review proposed policy and procedural changes. As a safeguard to ensure development viability is taken into account. To ensure consistency and fairness To promote high quality sustainable development. To optimise the delivery and implementation of development. To provide a source of information and feedback to assist the monitoring and management of policy and development implementation</p> <p>Headline Comments on the Draft SPD. The Draft SPD is unsound, its intent is unclear, there are shortcomings in the evidence base and hence the SPD is not justified and it is not likely to be effective in practice for the following reasons: It is not clear what Core Strategy policy this SPD seeks to amplify and why The draft SPD has many statements but no definitive message - how is this document furthering spatial planning from the Core Strategy and/or the quality of Development Management practice/outcomes? There is no Sustainability Assessment to accompany the SPD as per PPS12 para. 4.39-4.42 procedure or assessment of alternatives It is not obvious how the evidence base within Section 3 of the document or the Appendices have influenced the proposed locally set parking standards and the parking zone boundaries and what these proposals will do, if anything, to support the Core Strategy spatial approach (reflected in policy PCS5 and the Key Diagram), encourage more sustainable modes of travel, or support the delivery and quality of new development The evidence base referred to in section 3 is partial and needs to include (inter alia): the Borough of Poole Characterisation Study 2010, The Urban Design Compendium, Building for Life and Car Parking: What Works Where If this is a design tool there should be an assessment as to how the draft SPD fits with the design and character objectives from those documents and other policies in the Core Strategy and clarification about design priorities, and If this is a new spatial planning tool the boundaries of the parking zones need to be reviewed (not just repeated from historic designations) and extended to include other busy arteries</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The influences shaping the SPD are clearly set out in Figure 1 on page 10 and sets out national policies and guidance, Local Plan and Core Strategy policies and the Policy Evidence Base for the SPD.</p> <p>The document has been amended to explicitly state the intention of the SPD - page 2 of the document states that it will provide "guidance and greater detail on parking provision to help implement Core Strategy policies....." and to "support Policy DM8: Demand Management in the emerging Site Specific Allocations and Development Management Policy Development Plan Document".</p> <p>The SPD has been amended. Part 3. details the role, objectives and structure of the document to sufficiently explain what it seeks to amplify in the Poole Core Strategy and links this to key outcomes on Table 2 on page 15.</p> <p>The SPD does not require a Sustainability Appraisal as this has been carried out for the higher level policies that it supports in accordance with PPS12: 4.42 i.e. The Poole Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations & Development Management Policies. The Sustainability Appraisals for these documents are on the Borough of Poole website.</p>

				<p>within walking distance of both a local centre and a high frequency public transport stop' (PCS5(i)(d)) as that appears to be missing from the Parking Zones Map at Appendix D. The Parking Zones Map should feature in the main document if it is a spatial planning tool. The document does not seem to look holistically at how the design of parking within developments can enhance the built environment and there seems very little joined up thinking on the use of sustainable transport measures.</p>	<p>The SPD is justified as it is founded on a robust and credible evidence base. It will help implement Core Strategy policies, as set out on page 2 of the SPD.</p> <p>Table 1(at page 5) has been inserted to set out key design guidance documents to assist agents, developers and applicants in applying high quality urban design principles into parking schemes.</p> <p>The scope of the SPD is proportionate to its role as a guidance document within the LDF and is intended to be used in conjunction with the suite of policies in the Core Strategy and emerging policies in Development Plan Documents.</p>
Question 2	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	Paragraph 2.4	<p>Giving in to the motor car will not effect a change in the way that people travel, contrary to paragraph 2.8 of the document.</p>	<p>Noted. Hence there is a balance to be struck between the need for parking provision and achieving high quality design, safe attractive public realm and pedestrian/cycle friendly streets. This has been clarified in Part 2 of the SPD.</p>

<p>Question 2</p>	<p>Mr Lindley Owen</p>	<p>(2.3) There is an important omission in the strategies which influence the Parking and Development Layout SPD, which is NICE guidance on physical activity and the built environment. http://www.nice.org.uk/nicemedia/live/11917/38983/38983.pdf specifically recommendations 1 and 2 which relate to strategies, policies and plans. They state: Strategies, policies and plans Recommendation 1 Who should take action? Those responsible for all strategies, policies and plans involving changes to the physical environment. This includes the development, modification and maintenance of towns, urban extensions, major regeneration projects and the transport infrastructure. It also includes the siting or closure of local services in both urban and rural areas. What action should they take? Involve all local communities and experts at all stages of the development to ensure the potential for physical activity is maximised. Ensure planning applications for new developments always prioritise the need for people (including those whose mobility is impaired) to be physically active as a routine part of their daily life. Ensure local facilities and services are easily accessible on foot, by bicycle and by other modes of transport involving physical activity. Ensure children can participate in physically active play. Assess in advance what impact (both intended and unintended) the proposals are likely to have on physical activity levels. (For example, will local services be accessible on foot, by bicycle or by people whose mobility Transport Recommendation 2 Who should take action? Those responsible for all strategies, policies and plans involving changes to the physical environment, including local transport authorities, transport planners and local authorities. What action should they take? Ensure pedestrians, cyclists and users of other modes of transport that involve physical activity are given the highest priority when developing or maintaining streets and roads. (This includes people whose mobility is impaired.) Use one or more of the following methods: re-allocate road space to support physically active modes of transport (as an example, this could be achieved by widening pavements and introducing cycle lanes) restrict motor vehicle access (for example, by closing or narrowing roads to reduce capacity) introduce road-user charging schemes introduce traffic-calming schemes to restrict vehicle speeds (using signage and changes to highway design) create safe routes to schools (for example, by using traffic-calming measures near schools and by creating or improving walking and cycle routes to schools). Recommendation 1 Who should take action? Those responsible for all strategies, policies and plans involving changes to the physical</p>	<p>Noted. It is not possible to quote every guidance publication for parking but picks out key documents to provide clear design guidance. Whilst the SPD is a material consideration, it will be used in conjunction with other DPDs which provide the policies and criteria against which development will be assessed at the formal planning application stage.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended to clearly set out in Part 1: Summary the Borough of Poole's approach to parking and highway layout.</p> <p>LTP3 (adopted April 2011) provides the overall Transport Strategy for Bournemouth Dorset & Poole for the period to 2026. Some of the issues raised have been addressed in LTP3 Short, medium and long term measures for improving sustainable travel options. These have been incorporated in the Site Specific Allocations & Development Management Policies DPD at section 7: Accessibility and the Prime Transport Corridors.</p> <p>The emerging "Delivering Poole's Infrastructure DPD" provides the planning policy framework to deliver infrastructure to support the growth of communities in Poole. One of the key priorities is investment in transport networks including pedestrian facilities, roads, public transport routes and cycleways.</p>
-----------------------	----------------------------	---	--

				<p>environment. This includes the development, modification and maintenance of towns, urban extensions, major regeneration projects and the transport infrastructure. It also includes the siting or closure of local services in both urban and rural areas. What action should they take? Involve all local communities and experts at all stages of the development to ensure the potential for physical activity is maximised. Ensure planning applications for new developments always prioritise the need for people (including those whose mobility is impaired) to be physically active as a routine part of their daily life. Ensure local facilities and services are easily accessible on foot, by bicycle and by other modes of transport involving physical activity. Ensure children can participate in physically active play. Assess in advance what impact (both intended and unintended) the proposals are likely to have on physical activity levels. (For example, will local services be accessible on foot, by bicycle or by people whose mobility</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Question 2	Mrs Joan Jarvis		Paragraph 2.8	In this paragraph reference is made to mitigating any likely damage to the environment and taking measures to adapt to climate change. It is hoped that the relevant emerging Development Plan Documents will take account of likely increase in lorry movements and overnight lorry park facilities resulting from climate change. Due to the extreme weather conditions much heavier falls of snow, severe freezing and serious flooding etc more land for B8 use will probably be needed. Therefore, more overnight lorry parking space would be required than has been called for hitherto. Future need for additional warehouses ought to be investigated and considered during the present stages of the LDF in order that adverse effects from lorry movements can be avoided or minimised.	Noted. This comment relates primarily to matters outside the scope of the Parking & Highway Layout in Development SPD. As the DPD's take their lead from strategic objectives in the Poole Core Strategy including addressing climate change.
Question 2	Mr Christopher Allenby	Poole Old Town Conservation Group	2.1 - 2.8	The policy context is noted.	Noted.
Question 2	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	Questions 2-6	Paragraph 2.5. The only way to create a high quality public realm and streets that are pedestrian/cycle friendly is to remove cars. Paragraph 4-9. Unallocated car parking may be the most efficient but people want their own space. Unallocated spaces can cause friction between neighbours. Paragraph 4.12 The Planning Authority should be trying to avoid excessive control by means of Legal Agreements. Not only is it unreasonable, in terms of the guidance in Circular 05/2005, it requires more enforcement and compliance checks, increasing the costs of the Local Authority and increasing the perception of another police force. Paragraph 4.13 I agree there needs to be some surface parking, even where basement parking is proposed because visitors are unlikely to go into basements. Paragraph 4.14 I do not believe that adding 1 metre to the length of a garage is likely to encourage residents to use their garages for parking anymore than at the present. People who want to use their garage for storing spare sofas, freezers and hobby equipment will continue to do so. Perhaps, instead of trying to increase the size of garages, the Local Planning Authority ought to consider whether there is sufficient storage space within the proposed dwellings and if not, provide storage facilities outside of them. I think it is wholly unreasonable to say that a garage is not a parking space simply because it is not 6 metres long. Next, you will be arguing a parking space has to be 10 metres long to accommodate trailers and caravans. Paragraph 4.15 I do not accept that on-street parking can ever enhance streetscenes. Neither does it serve to make efficient use of land. Paragraph 4.17 This sentence is putting a positive spin	Noted. The Parking & Highway Layout in Development SPD seeks to provide guidance for agents, developers and applicants when planning for parking provision. The SPD has been amended to set out clearly its key objectives in Part 3. This includes clarifying the Council's proposed approach to ensure that car parking is integrated within a high quality public realm and seeks to promote pedestrian and cycle friendly streets. The SPD refers to national design guidance (Table 1) which, inter alia, sets out how Highway Layout in new development can be designed to enhance the streetscene.

on on-street car parking but cars of different shapes, sizes and colours just add to the clutter and cannot positively contribute to the streetscene, whether well designed or not. Paragraph 4.19 I do not think that the example photo shown is well designed. It looks like an awful desert leading into a canyon between tall blocks of flats. Paragraph 4.20 It is unreasonable to assume that the developer will manage parking into the future such that disabled spaces can be reallocated to an occupier where there is a need for such a space. Most private housing developers do not retain a management role into the future. Paragraph 4.22 Is a disabled driver to be limited to the one in ten houses built to accommodate him? Paragraph 4.24 Unless the SPD makes provision to curb car ownership, the provision of bike spaces is unnecessary. Paragraph 4.25 If the provision of cycle spaces is not on-site, it cannot be relevant to the developer therefore, inappropriate to seek contributions. Paragraph 4.26/4.27 I assume that the SPD is not encouraging the use of motor-cycling as an alternative to the private car! Page 12- Table 1 is confusing and unclear. I read the first line as applying to dwellings with up to three bedrooms. It would be clearer to either express this Table in terms of habitable rooms or as bedrooms and not to mix it up in this way. Why is the table related to car parking space for rented occupation relegated to the Appendix? Paragraph 4.29 Once again, I feel the Council want to introduce too many conditions which are going to be difficult to police unless they have an army of compliance officers. Paragraph 4.30 It is not appropriate to accept payments in lieu of car parking spaces unless secure spaces can be provided within sight of the dwellings proposed. Two decks over the ASDA car park are not going to be of any use to residents 400 metres away. Question 5 I consider the reference to car clubs in a Document of this type to be unnecessary. The benefit, in transport terms, is greatly exaggerated. If in 2009 car club vehicles in over 40 locations, that represents an average of 50 vehicles per location. Car usage on some local roads in this area is over 25,000 vehicles per day, so car club vehicles would be a drop in the ocean! Paragraph 5.15 Contributions towards supporting existing car clubs is unacceptable as they would not be related to the proposed development. Question 6 Paragraph 6.1 In my opinion, the priority in the road user hierarchy should change according to the function of a road and its location. If the Borough wants to encourage economic health it is ridiculous to have business users and car borne shoppers and visitors so low down the priority. On a normal Saturday you see cars queuing to come into the town centre, to get into the car parks. Personally, I would not join one

				<p>of those queues, I would go somewhere else. If the town wants to encourage economic development then it is essential that adequate car parking is available to shoppers and visitors and that the road hierarchy permits access to those car parks efficiently. Paragraph 6.4 If maximum speed limits are to be reduced to 20 mph those streets need to be limited in length, otherwise drivers will lose patience and will attempt to driver faster, with the resultant danger to themselves and other road users and properties and you will have to have more police officers. Paragraph 6.7 Tight kerb radii can be dangerous. I know of one such junction with on a free-flowing road where turning left is a nightmare. Brake too hard and too late and someone is likely to run into the back of the other car. The temptation is frequently to move over the centre of the road and to take the corner faster, to avoid the possibility of another vehicle running into the back. Paragraph 6.12 It will not always be possible to provide a turn on site. A turn on site frequently takes up much of the space which has to be hard surfaced and this has an impact on visual amenity. Generally, this looks like a highways driven document, if you will excuse the pun, that gives in to the desire of people to own cars but unfortunately, in Section 6 fails to give sufficient priority to the economic needs of the town.</p>	
Question 2	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	Paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5	These run counter to the sustainable development strategy.	Comments noted. The paragraphs are quotes from government policy in PPS3: Housing.

Question 2	Mr Dave Nash	Urban DNA	Policy Context.	<p>PPG13 was amended by the Coalition Government in January this year. The changes reflected earlier alterations to PPS3 Housing (i.e. removing the previously developed land priority, national indicative density target and reference to minimum parking standards). Importantly paragraphs 49-50 of PPG13 remain unaltered: hence policies on parking should complement planning policies on the location of development' (paragraph 49) and 'in developing and implementing policies on parking, local authorities should (inter alia): 1. ensure that, as part of a package of planning and transport measures, levels of parking provided in association with development will promote sustainable transport choices, and 2. not require developers to provide more spaces than they themselves wish, other than in exceptional circumstances which might include for example where there are significant implications for road safety' (paragraph 50)... Paragraphs 51-53 of PPG13 still define parking provision in maximum terms. We are unclear why the draft SPD uses the term optimum and whether that approach is justified from the evidence base and local circumstances. At the very least, there needs to be a definition of the term optimum' as that implies the amount of parking sought will be the most favourable but is that in terms of number of spaces (clearly contrary to PPG13 and MfS), location, type of development, best design outcome, encouraging modal shift, encouraging development delivery, carbon reduction etc?</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking & Highway Layout in Development SPD was published for consultation in December 2010, before the revised PPG13 was issued in January 2011. The effect of the changes are detailed in paragraph 4.6.</p> <p>The "optimum" parking provision for residential and commercial development set out in Tables 3 and 4 is based upon the findings of the evidence base detailed in Part 5 of the SPD. It is important to note that the SPD does not contain policies. These are provided within The Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD which provide the policies and criteria against which development will be assessed at the formal planning application stage. Sustainability Appraisal tool has helped to ensure that policies seek to promote sustainable transport choices.</p> <p>The SPD links with Core Strategy key outcomes, as detailed in Table 2: page 15</p>
Question 2	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways Agency	Para 2.1	<p>The policy context encompasses the majority of guidance available, and (subject to the requirement to update references to PPG13) is a robust approach for developing a parking and development layout strategy. The Agency notes that the DfTs Delivering Travel Plans through the Planning Process is not references. It is noted that the Council intends to publish a separate Supplementary Planning Document to provide travel plan guidelines within the district. The Agency considers it would be beneficial to reference the DfTs guidance until this additional travel plan guidance is published by the Council.</p>	<p>Noted. The Travel Plans guidance is programmed for update and consultation in 2012. Comments received and issues raised will be taken into account when finalising the forthcoming Travel Plans SPD.</p>

Question 2	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways Agency	Para 2.7	The Agency supports identification of the role that a well planned parking strategy can have in encouraging journeys by sustainable forms of transport.	Noted.
Question 3	Mr Lindley Owen			<p>There is an additional source of important evidence, which relates to the health impact of transport policies. This compendium of evidence is compiled by Dr Adrian Davis, on behalf of GOSW Public Health. It can be located at http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/content/Transport-Streets/Walking-Cycling/cycling-in-bristol/essential-evidence/essential-evidence.en Within this compendium, the most relevant pieces of evidence relate to: Impact of highway traffic reduction http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/content/Transport-Streets/Walking-Cycling/cycling-in-bristol/essential-evidence/essential-evidence-no-5---impact-of-highway-traffic-capacity-reductions.en Weight gain and car use: http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/content/Transport-Streets/Walking-Cycling/cycling-in-bristol/essential-evidence/essential-evidence-no-7---weight-gain-and-car-use.en Walkable communities: http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/content/Transport-Streets/Walking-Cycling/cycling-in-bristol/essential-evidence/essential-evidence-no-11---walkable-communities.en The role of habit in travel behaviour: http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/content/Transport-Streets/Walking-Cycling/cycling-in-bristol/essential-evidence/essential-evidence-no-18-the-role-of-habit-in-travel-behaviour.en Unintended health impact of transport policies & interventions: http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/content/Transport-Streets/Walking-Cycling/cycling-in-bristol/essential-evidence/essential-evidence-no-19---unintended-health-impacts-of-road-transport-policies-and-interventions.en Urban environment: http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/content/Transport-Streets/Walking-Cycling/cycling-in-bristol/essential-evidence/essential-evidence-no-35---urban-environment.en Children's independent mobility: http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/content/Transport-Streets/Walking-Cycling/cycling-in-bristol/essential-evidence/essential-evidence-no-36---childrens-independent-mobility.en Peak Oil: http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/content/Transport-Streets/Walking-Cycling/cycling-in-bristol/essential-evidence/essential-evidence-no-50-peak-oil.en Car Use, Weight Gain, and Carbon: http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/content/Transport-Streets/Walking-Cycling/cycling-in-bristol/essential-evidence/essential-evidence-no-58-car-use-weight-gain-and-carbon.en</p>	Noted. It is not possible to quote every national guidance publication available, since the scope of this SPD is limited to Parking & Highway Layout in Development in Poole. Influences shaping the SPD are shown in Fig 1. Page 10. The evidence base is extensive, up-to-date and relevant to Poole - as set out in Part 5, on page 16 in accordance with current government advice in national planning policy. PPG13: Transport - revision (2011) and PPS3: Housing - revision (June 2010).

Question 3	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	3 Evidence Base	All the documents referred to in section 3 of the report relate to a historic situation and projection without management of ownership. This evidence base will not achieve any shift in the way people travel.	The SPD forms part of a larger suite of documents in the Local Development Framework. The SPD is part of a package to encourage well designed parking provision, meeting local need in accordance with the evidence base. Paragraph 5.1 clarifies that the evidence base is up to date and is the research underpinning the SPD.
Question 3	Mr Christopher Allenby	Poole Old Town Conservation Group	3. Evidence Base	The evidence base is noted.	Noted.
Question 3	Ms Lindsay Thompson	Terence O'Rourke (representing Neptune Consulting Limited)	GENERAL COMMENTS	On behalf of our client, Neptune Consultants, we wish to make the following comments in regard to the draft Parking and Development Layout SPD dated December 2010. We note that PPG13 was updated on the 3 January 2011, following the publication of the draft SPD, and therefore there are several areas where the draft SPD does not reflect the most recent guidance. Our clients are promoting the site at West Quay road for mixed use regeneration, for which we submitted a planning application in July 2010. We note that the draft SPD provides new guidance in regard to the level of parking to be provided for different size dwellings. For the West Quay site the guidance in table 1 increases the level of parking spaces from 1:1 to 1:1.3 and for the larger bedroom properties 1: 1.6. Whilst we understand the evidence supports this general increase across the Borough of Poole, we believe that in central locations and where a mixed use development is proposed the guidelines should be relaxed to allow flexibility and ensure the delivery of these schemes. It would be useful therefore to recognise this in the text. We feel like the regeneration sites are unique in the challenges they face and the long established guidance on parking to which schemes have been designed to meet. This is supported by PPG13 that notes that developers should not be discouraged from developing central locations.	The parking zones and optimum level of parking required in Table 1 take account of the needs and requirements of the community and expected levels of car ownership of those living and working in Poole. The New Builds Evaluation Report (2008) found that lack of car parking provision results in tension amongst residents. Car parking provision in new development will be balanced with other material considerations and any requirement for relaxation of parking provision would need to be supported by an appropriate Transport Assessment comprising Travel Plan.

Question 4	Reed		4.8 4.10 4.14 4.18/4.19	<p>4.8 Does the use of "Optimal" in 4.8 mean that failure to achieve the specified provision will be grounds for refusal of an application for lack of parking? Too many aspects of the policy are qualitative and open to argument. Parking provision is readily quantifiable and as such provide a "gate" for all applications 4.10 Appendix C does not show car parking layouts, only those for cycles. 4.14 Does this mean that the enclosure / blocking in of carports to form garages could no longer be permitted since they may result in the loss of a parking space? 4.18/4.19 The emphasis on not normally allowing on street parking as part of a schemes provision is welcomed. However it is evident from the use of "normally" that this is not necessarily going to be used in relation to infill development. Any assessment of the viability for on street parking should take into account the cumulative effect of multiple developments in a road rather than each case being considered on an individual basis. As such previously approved and ongoing applications must be considered when assessing if on street parking is to be allowed as part of a new development.</p>	<p>The Optimal parking level referred to has been derived from the evidence base which takes account of the needs and requirements of the community and expected levels of car ownership of those living and working in Poole, in line with government guidance in the recently revised PPG13: Transport (2011) and latterly PPS3: Housing (2010) – this is clarified in Part 4: Policy Context pp12-13). The content of the Parking & Highway Layout in Development DPD is a material consideration in the determination of a planning application – this has been stated at paragraph 1.4 on page 6.</p>
Question 4	Mr Ray Harris-Hawkins			<p>4.14) Garages: Provisions for garages to have a minimum internal dimension of 6m + 3m will not encourage residents to use their garages for parking, they will just be able to store even more in them in my view.</p> <p>4.20) 4.21) 4.22) Residential Disabled Parking & Lifetime Homes Standards: Although very often a considerable amount of parking spaces are provided for Disabled Drivers , very little provision is given to Mother & Child spaces. Anyone who has ever tried to either place a child, or remove a child from a car seat in a narrow parking space will realise how awkward this can be. 4.) Development Parking Poole I note that there is no proposals for Mother & Child parking spaces, this is an important area you may wish to look into.</p>	<p>This requirement reflects the provisions of Lifetime Homes Standards which encourages car parking to be capable of enlargement to attain 3.3m width.”</p> <p>Commercial decisions to provide mother and child spaces are taken by local businesses where there is an identified need.</p>
Question 4	Mrs Joan Jarvis		Paragraphs 4.1 - 4.4	<p>Appendix D parking zones map in conjunction with 4.1 - 4.4 does not clearly indicate the approximate extent of PZ2 zones, particularly 4.3 (d) Branksome Local Centre, Poole Road.</p>	<p>The Parking Zone has been extended to include the whole of Ashley Road and Poole Road. This fits with the methodology of local amenities and public transport links being key to this Zone (e.g. Tesco, Poole Road, Branksome train station and shops, high frequency bus routes).</p>

Question 4	Mr G Eves	PFA Consulting (representing Talbot Village Trust)	Development Parking (Section 4)	<p>Para 4.10 The Trust notes the slightly increased size of a standard parking space. This new standard may be entirely appropriate for some layouts however, paragraph 4.10 refers to examples of car parking space layouts within Appendix C, but this Appendix only identifies cycle parking arrangements. It is not therefore possible to comment fully on whether the increased parking space size is appropriate for all layouts (end spaces or locations where there are adjacent verges may allow a reduced width space). Para 4.19 The draft guidance confirms that well designed on street parking can reduce traffic speeds and may be acceptable in most circumstances. In residential areas however, on-street parking should primarily be for visitors. Specific "parking bays" may therefore not be appropriate but it is accepted that within any areas where parking may potentially take place, sufficient length will need to be available to enable vehicles to manoeuvre safely. Para 4.24 Insofar as the cycle parking arrangements are concerned, it is noted that Appendix C indicates that frontage cycle anchorage points are "not supported". Such arrangements however can be extremely efficient in terms of not occupying space when not in use and may still provide an acceptable form of cycle parking particularly for short term parking (i.e. at a local shop) where frontage anchorage points may permit easier loading of baskets or panniers when compared with the use of a Sheffield standard arrangement. Para 4.20 This makes reference to dimensions in Appendix C but again, these details are missing from Appendix C. Table 1: The Trust is primarily concerned with parking standards within PZ3 but, in particular those parts of PX3 around SPZ2. The SPD does not make it clear what parking standards will be applied within these SPZs but there already exists on street parking restrictions in the vicinity of SPZ2 which therefore limits the ability of residents within these adjoining areas to utilize residential streets outside of their properties for "overflow" and visitor parking. It is therefore particularly important that those parts of PZ3 which are immediately adjacent to SPZ2 have sufficient "off street" residential parking. Para 4.8 of the document identifies that Table 1 indicate "optimum" parking provision. It is not clear therefore whether the Council will tend to treat these standards as minima or maxima (or indeed exact!). The Trust is particularly concerned that the optimum levels for small (1 and 2 bed) units is less than the average identified in the present adopted SPG and, in terms of the larger units is significantly less than the parking standards identified in the adopted Local Plan.</p>	<p>The SPD has been amended to include examples of acceptable car parking layout in Appendix C. Dimensions between cycle parking stands have been increased by 200mm to accommodate bike furniture.</p> <p>The title of the SPD has been amended and refers to "Highway Layout in Development". A table of Recommended Design Guidance has been added to the SPD at para 1.1. This signposts the Council's expected approach to designing parking schemes. Applicants and agents would be expected to have regard to the suggested guidance in any scheme involving new highway layout in development.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended at Part 6, Appendix D, Tables 3 & 5 to clarify the extent of Parking Zones 1, 2 & 3 and Special Parking Zones 1 & 2. It has also been amended to state that the submission of a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment will be required to determine parking provision within these zones.</p> <p>The government have dropped the minimum and maximum requirements in recent revisions of government policy in favour of a locally set level of parking in line with a local up-to-date evidence base. The optimum parking provision is defined as the "ideal" and is set out in Tables 3 & 4, in line with the findings of the Bournemouth, Poole & Dorset Residential Car Parking Study.</p>
---------------	-----------	--	---------------------------------------	---	--

Question 4	Mr Lesley Burden		General Comment	To reduce traffic jams and improve air quality, where kerbside parking is allowed - ONLY in the DIRECTION OF TRAVEL i.e. prohibit crossing to the "wrong" side of the carriage way. PS. Ashley Road would benefit from this.	Comment noted. This is outside the scope of the Parking & Highway Layout in Development SPD.
Question 4	Mr Lesley Burden		4.18	Where there is space, is "toast rack" parking ever considered?	Comment noted.

Question 4	Mr Lindley Owen			<p>What is missing in all these detailed figures is any recognition that the borough must over the next few decades provide for a very different world. Virtually every car, bus and truck on our roads depends on a rapidly diminishing resource, which as it is used, adds to a concentration of atmospheric CO2 which will render human life on earth very difficult in the medium term. There is no scalable, renewable, non-polluting alternative to the portable power of fossil fuel which has led to this over-dependence. Poole in 20 years time must function with fewer, shorter journeys, and much less power. The infrastructure changes to support this must involve re-allocation of space currently wasted on excess travel, to growing daily needs locally. Your parking policies must reflect this, and explicitly signal a removal of space for this purpose over time. (See also comments in car club section).</p>	<p>Comments noted. These comments fall outside the scope of this SPD. The implementation of Poole Core Strategy Policies PCS15, PCS16, PCS17 and PCS19, PCS22 all contribute to enabling reduced reliance on fossil fuels and reducing carbon emissions. All Poole's DPDs and SPD's take their lead from the Core Strategy. Emerging Site Specific Allocations and Development Management DPD sets out policies to help promote healthier lifestyle choices through encouraging walking and cycling. The Local Transport Plan for Dorset (LTP3) is a strategy that seeks to manage the projected growth in traffic as a result of planned development. LTP3 and SSA&DM DPD sets out the short, medium and long term measures to enable sustainable growth in Poole and the wider area.</p>
Question 4	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways Agency	Paras 4.6 - 4.7	<p>The SPD explains that optimum parking levels within residential development have been derived from relevant evidence included expected car ownership levels. It is noted that car ownership in areas located close to public transport links and good amenities are generally lower than within other areas of the borough; it is qualified however that even with the most sustainable locations, residents are likely to own cars. The Agency supports flexible parking provision that reflects the accessibility of the location. In accessible areas such as town and city centres, the Agency would expect high density development and a reduced level of car parking spaces as a result of the provision of alternative modes of sustainable transport services. Alternatively in areas further from the Town Centre, a greater number of spaces would be allowed, however the provision would need to be within the council's thresholds and in line with the revised guidance contained in PPG13.</p>	<p>Where reduced car parking spaces are proposed for new development, this would be expected to be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. The council recognises that car clubs can reduce car ownership. The SPD clarifies at Part 7, how lessons learned from car clubs in the past have shaped the council's existing approach. Whilst car clubs are part of the package of measures contained in a Travel Plan to promote sustainable transport choices, a recognition of the elements which make them successful are dealt with in this section.</p> <p>The SPD has taken account of the national planning policy changes of PPG13 in January 2011 and the SPD has been amended accordingly.</p>

Question 4	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways Agency	Paragraph 4.24	The Agency supports the Council's approach towards the provision of secure cycle parking in residential developments. This is particularly important in areas where car parking levels have been reduced, such as in town or city centre locations, or in high density residential developments.	Comments noted.
Question 4	Mr Malcolm Brown	Sibbett Gregory	Paragraph 4.7	The attitude which comes across in Paragraph 4.7 suggests to me no attempt by the Authority to change patterns of car ownership	Noted. This paragraph relates to the evidence base. The SPD forms part of the LDF which contains the Core Strategy and other emerging Development Plan Documents which seek to encourage sustainable travel options for new development proposals.
Question 4	Mr Christopher Allenby	Poole Old Town Conservation Group	4. Development Parking Poole	Parking Zones The Parking Zone Hierarchy as long as the broad spectrum follows and is delivered in accordance with the Poole Core Strategy policies PCS1 and PCS5 then the policies would continue to receive our support. Residential Parking Guidelines Table 1 page 12 We agree with the revised parking space of 2.5m x 4.8m in Poole and a garage size of minimum internal dimension of 6m x 3m. Table 1 shows that the car parking space for a development varying between 1.4 and 2.3 spaces per dwelling depending on type and size of dwelling, in the zoned areas 1 to 3 inclusive. This would also receive our support. Para re: On street parking - agreed. Para re: Residential Disabled parking and lifetime homes standards - agreed. Para re: Residential Cycle Parking - agreed. Para re: Residential Motorcycle Parking - agreed. Para re: Payments in Lieu of Parking Spaces - agreed. Para re: Disabled Parking in Non-residential Development - agreed.	Comments noted.
Question 4		McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd.	Q4	Reference to enlarged car parking bays, namely 2.5m wide, is significantly larger than those given in national guidance. In the case of sheltered housing they would result in a less efficient use of land contrary to other national guidance, such as PPS3. A recent survey of the residents of sheltered housing, for example, showed that the most popular vehicle owned was a Nissan Micra, a small vehicle. The survey showed that 95% of residents' cars were 4.47metres long, or less and 1.73 metres wide (or less). The application of this suggested standard in a sheltered housing development would be unnecessarily restrictive and wasteful of expensive urban brown field land. The enlargement of parking spaces in the case of sheltered housing is not justified.	Comments noted.

Question 4	Mr Dave Nash	Urban DNA	<p>4. Development Parking Poole</p> <p>The rationale for the different Parking Zones and their boundaries is not clear at Section 4. There are some parts of Parkstone, for instance, within 400 m walk of the Ashley Road shops / public transport corridor yet they are included in PZ3 along with the rest of suburban Poole. So there are areas being treated as lowest accessibility but, based on the Core Strategy are able to accommodate change. On the other hand there are parts of Poole that are susceptible to pressure for change (ref characterization study) - how are the overlaps to be dealt with? Residential Parking It is unclear how the Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Residential Car Parking Study 2010 (reference at paragraph 4.6) has informed and shaped the draft SPD parking zones. It would also be more 'user friendly' for the lower parking standard for permanently rented accommodation' to be shown in Table 1, rather than a separate Appendix, as that would be helpful for designers of larger developments where mixed housing is provided. The SPD proposes (paragraph 4.10) a new standard parking bay size of 2.5 x 4.8m stating that new models have increased in width but 'very few are longer than 4.4m'. Figures published by DrivenData in 2010 indicate that the width of the contemporary British car now holds at an average of 1,798.2mm, up from 1,780.9mm in 2006 as wider vehicles are developed to accommodate additional safety features and improved levels of comfort. The question is does that justify an extra 10cm on the width of an average car parking space as there remains 60cm 'spare' in the current 2.4m wide space for door opening etc? If the additional dimension was applied to the 10,000 homes to be built in the Borough over the Core Strategy timeframe that would result in additional cost to the development industry of about £1.2M (15,000 spaces x £80 additional cost per space) and the loss, on average, of 0.72Ha across the Borough to parking when it could be garden or green space that would benefit amenity and biodiversity. The proposed 3m x 6m garage (for it to count as parking - paragraph 4.14) would be 30% larger than the current 2.7 x 5.1m guideline size and would result in the loss of comparatively more land than a parking space and would also increase the cost of an average garage by about £2500-3000. Arguably that additional cost is in practice going to effect householders more than the development industry. These costs and impacts are not justified and ill-timed given the current economic down turn. It is ironic that the right hand image of the montage at paragraph 4.17 has been highlighted as a negative 'consequence of lack of parking' when in fact this parking is known to us. It represents vehicles owned by 2 generations parked as close as</p>	<p>The Parking Zones description and explanation has been re-written to be clearer (paragraphs 6.1-6.4 of the final SPD). Parking Zone 2 has been extended/alterd to include additional areas along the A35 corridor (Page 56, Appendix D map).</p> <p>To avoid an overly complicated parking table for residential development and considering that the majority of residential development in Poole is private accommodation it was considered appropriate for the "Special Residential Parking Guidelines" Table (Table 5 of the adopted SPD) to remain separate. Reference to this additional residential parking table is contained within the main document (page 24).</p> <p><i>Parking Space Dimensions</i> – The issue of the impact of requiring wider parking spaces (2.5m) than the previous Council Parking Guidelines SPG guidance (2.4m), including impact on development densities and urban environment, was discussed during Working Party meetings. It was determined that the widening of the parking spaces was considered appropriate given that research indicated that cars have generally increased in width in recent years. The figures quoted within the consultation response of 10,000 homes requiring 15,000 spaces may be inaccurate. This calculation is based on each home requiring 1.5 parking spaces per unit. It is anticipated that a considerable number of new units within Poole will be within Parking Zones 1 and 2 of the Guidelines where lower level ratios of parking will be anticipated. For</p>
------------	--------------	-----------	---	--

they can to optimise on-street parking outside their house to be considerate of neighbours. These traditional streets are located in some of the more accessible parts of the Borough where growth is anticipated. Applying the 6m parking bay length (suggested at paragraph 4.19) for new development could be counterproductive as it would reduce the existing optimum capacity of such streets to the detriment of existing residents (who would rather have awkward parking than less parking). The risk of having standards is that they are not interpreted flexibly to reflect local conditions and circumstances! The SPD lacks guidance about when development need and design / character considerations and issues such as conservation, low carbon design, placemaking, SUDs, greening etc. will be judged to be more important than maximising parking. That is 'optimal' parking and the type of DM decision making that we are all involved in and where 'development opportunity' will be stifled completely if parking provision is now the policy priority. There is also a real risk, due to the current lack of clarity in the SPD, that this will be used as a crude 'blue print' by highways and that DM officers will not apply the more subtle, sophisticated approach to design advocated by Building for Life and MFS1-2 (the former is not even referenced in the SPD). Non-residential Development Parking This is covered at paragraphs 4.31-4.36 and Table 2. There is no explanation of the table and how the 'optimum' figures for parking will be interpreted in practice, there is no apparent flexibility for reduced parking to apply in the more accessible parts of the Borough and the explanatory notes are missing from the draft Table 2. Paragraph 4.31 indicates that in 'most cases' the car parking figures in Table 2 correspond to the 'low car' figure of the current Parking Guidelines SPG, 2004. That is not the case. The proposed new optimum parking levels generally correspond to the current 'guideline' figures (i.e. the figure for development under the PPG13 thresholds) these are higher than the old 'low' figures which applied to the most accessible locations like the town centre. Only the optimum car parking figure for the D1: Non-Residential Institutions and Sui-Generis classes reflect the previous 'low' parking maxima. Generally this section is very unclear and appears to be promoting a higher level of parking than is reasonable, justified or sustainable in the more accessible locations (i.e. exactly the locations where most of the office and retail type uses are to be found and where modal shift through travel planning can actually have a positive impact on car use). Table 2 also indicates 18 lorry spaces to be provided per 1000 m² of B2 General Industrial floorspace whereas in 2004 the figure was 1-2 spaces depending on

example the adopted SPD allows parking ratios down to 0.7 within Parking Zone 1.

6m on-street parking bay length – this length assists drivers to manoeuvre vehicles efficiently out of parking spaces. This dimension is used when considering how many car parking spaces a street will provide for in practise when considering parking capacity for an existing street or proposed street. Providing clear guidance on what is accepted as a realistic on-street parking space will assist developers when they are assessing on-street and off-street parking provision calculations in their development proposals.

The SPD has been amended at Part 1 to include a section on design guidance and explain how high quality design includes parking provision, the SPD now signposts recommended design guidance for parking and highway layout in development at Table 1 including Criteria 12 Building for Life.. Existing Core Strategy Policies PCS5 and PCS23 set out how parking should positively contribute to attributes of a particular street. Emerging Development Management policies and SPD Design Guidance will compliment the suite of policies in the LDF that encourage good design.

Explanatory notes have been added to the base of the Non-Residential Parking Table (Table 4 within the adopted SPD). The explanatory notes and paragraph 6.31 of the adopted SPD give advice

				<p>accessibility. It is hoped this is a typing error as that level of provision would be unduly onerous! In the group's experience, parking levels for B1 Business and B2 General Industrial developments are quite different with the latter generating less parking demand than the former. Rather than have the same optimum parking guideline for both it is suggested that Table 2 be amended to indicate a lower optimum figure for B2 type development (i.e. 25 spaces per 1000m² GFA).</p>	<p>that a reduction of parking provision below the optimum figure will be considered within the more accessible areas of the Borough, Parking Zones 1 and 2. The stipulated lorry parking requirement for B2 uses has been amended from 18 spaces as this was an error within the draft consultation document.</p>
Question 4	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways Agency	Para 4.31 - 4.33	<p>The SPD explains that the TRICS trip rate database provides the key evidence base for non residential parking and that the proposed optimum parking provision given in the SPD is comparable to the previous (2004) parking guidelines. The Agency would support the calculation of car parking standards for non residential development being based upon the overall accessibility of the site, having regard to sustainable means of travel including public transport. We support the standards being adjusted on the basis of how well located the development site is in accessibility terms. TRICS includes information on accessibility to development sites by all means including non car modes, and we trust therefore that this data will be utilised in full in the derivation of optimum standards. Notwithstanding these comments, the Agency reserves the right to respond to individual applications. References to PPG13 contained in this section will clearly need to be updated in light of the revised guidelines. However it appears that the use of the term optimum parking provision in the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

				SPD in place of maxima and minima, and the emphasis on the need for greater flexibility, is consistent with the revised approach encompassed by PPG13.	
Question 4		Gallagher Estates	4. Development Parking in Poole	The proposed parking zone hierarchy was first established for the Borough Council's 2004 Parking Guidelines and this seems to be a sound basis for the calculation of these two zones, with PZ1 being mainly the Town Centre and the Regeneration Area, PZ2 covering all other areas within the Borough.	Comments noted.
Question 4		Gallagher Estates	Para 4.10	Relates to the size of parking bays from new developments. The new standard within Poole is proposed to increase the standard parking bay from its current 2.4 metres by 4.8 metres to 2.5 metres by 4.8 metres. In general terms, whilst this may seem reasonable, there clearly must be a level of flexibility on constrained sites within the Borough where 2.4 metre wide spaces are permitted in certain circumstances. This is particularly important for the regeneration area where it is essential that the Council is understanding of the constraints of each site and the cumulative implication of increasing the width of parking bays.	Comments noted.

Question 4		Gallagher Estates	4.11 - 4.13, 4-18 and 4.19. Table 1.	<p>Reference is made to Table 1 of the document which sets out the parking guidelines for residential car parking. There is a distinction between allocated and unallocated residential parking. The document is not explicit with regards to the level of allocated or unallocated parking within a residential site. Following discussions with Chris Francombe, it is clear that it is the developer's discretion as to what proportion of the car parking is allocated or not. This should be reflected in the document to ensure flexibility and in recognition that the developer is best placed to consider the level of allocated/unallocated car parking. The discussions with Chris Francombe also confirmed that, although para 4.13 states that some surface parking can provide accessible parking for visitors; this does not preclude some visitor parking being provided at basement level. This should also be added to the document for clarity. Para 4.18 deals with on street car parking. The document states that on-street parking will only be accepted as part of developments where new streets are proposed which allow the satisfactory design of parking provision within the new street layout. this is noted but clearly this does not mean that on normal sections of highway with a 5.5 metre wide carriageway without dedicated on street parking that traffic regulation orders would be required to restrict car parking. This needs to be included in the section for clarity. Para 4.19 Goes on to state that the proposed length of on-street parking bays should be 6 metres. It however does not state what the width of these spaces should be. In our experience this should be stated as 2 metres. This paragraph also does not explicitly state that some of the on street car parking can form part of the allocated parking provision within a residential development site. This point needs clarifying in the document. Table 1 of the document sets out the various guidance on parking allocation. As an overall guide these allocations seem reasonable although clearly each site needs to be considered on its own merits and that caveat should be specified within the document, given the varying degrees of non-car accessibility throughout the town, and the specific circumstances of each development site. Section 5 considers the use of Travel Plans and Car Clubs to reduce the reliance on the private car.</p>	<p>The SPD has been amended at para 6.8 to clarify the Council's approach to the issue of allocated/unallocated parking that for 5 or less units, all parking will be considered as allocated. Low unit numbers are unlikely to provide a mix of car ownership levels to allow efficient unallocated parking.</p> <p>Minor changes have been made to Visitor Parking text and clarifies that where unallocated parking is provided, no further car parking spaces will be required for visitors.</p>
---------------	--	----------------------	--	--	--

Question 4	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways Agency	Paras 4.1 - 4.5	The Agency supports innovative approaches to encouraging smarter travel choices which includes the proposed parking zone hierarchy. Circumstances vary for car parking needs by districts and areas, and executed correctly, a strategy that recognises this can be beneficial to all parties. In respect of the proposed Special Parking Zones (SPZ) for the Port of Poole, and Bournemouth University and Arts University College, the SPD recognises that the use of travel plans is key in encouraging smarter travel choices. This approach is support by the Agency.	Comments noted.
Question 4	Ms Lindsay Thompson	Terence O'Rourke (representing Neptune Consulting Limited)	Section 4	We note that paragraph 4.30 and the appendix makes reference to payments in lieu of parking spaces. However, this is likely to be increasingly difficult for the Council to reconcile with National Guidance as the recently updated PPG13 states: "given that there should be no minimum parking requirements for development it is inappropriate for a local authority to seek commuted payments based purely around the lack of parking on the site" (paragraph 85). Given this and that the figures presented are not minimums but guidance; we believe that the Council should provide greater justification for paragraph 4.30 and appendix E payments in Lieu of Parking spaces.	Commuted payments will be sought where there is likely harm from lack of parking, rather than purely from lack of parking. This comment is selective of para 85 as it goes on to state that it would be appropriate to negotiate contributions towards a park and ride scheme or towards the cost of on street parking controls. Appendix E reflects this at page 57 3(i)-(iii).
Question 4	Mr Mark Eagland	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	GENERAL COMMENTS	We are instructed by our client, Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc (Morrison's) to make comments on the above.	Comment noted.
Question 4	Mr Mark Eagland	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Section 4.	We note that the proposed parking standard for food retail development in Zone 3 is 60 spaces/1,000 sq m of floorspace, which equates to a ratio of 1 space/16.6sqm This implies a lesser level of parking than the 1 space/14 sqm ratio set out in Annex D of PPG13. We also note that Para 4.33 of the Draft SPD comments that in Zones 1 and 2 car parks of more than 50 spaces f or single use class non residential developments will not generally be permitted. Our client is concerned that the above measures could result in a significant shortage of parking for new foodstores in Poole, thus causing operational problems, and putting such developments at a competitive disadvantage to existing food shopping facilities in, and outside the Borough. Accordingly, we propose the following changes to the draft SPD: 1. The parking ratio for food retail development should be amended to 1 space/14sqm consistent with PPG13. 2. There needs to be additional flexibility to allow for circumstances when more than 50 parking spaces are proposed for single use class non residential developments, where Applicants can demonstrate that a higher level of parking is appropriate through a Transport Assessment.	Comments noted.

Question 4	David Willey	Bournemouth University	Section 4	<p>Further clarification is sought on the following: Table 2 Non Residential development parking on page 46 refers to "note A" for higher and further education uses but note A does not appear below the table or anywhere else in the consultation document. A representative of the council's forward planning team has confirmed that this is an omission in the draft SPD and that note A should refer to the requirement for a transport assessment (TA) to determine parking provision requirements. Is this confirmed, and if so, is this a single TA for the site or a number of TAs proposed for individual proposals? We would wish to avoid a position that is onerous or inflexible given a variety of potential scenarios for the site in the future. It may be best that the SPD avoids over prescription here. Not all the development proposals at the campus that are likely to come forward during the Core Strategy period will give rise to an increase in staff and student numbers. Some proposals (as has been the case before) will be required to support existing academic functions and will be necessary to accommodate displaced students/staff whilst existing buildings undergo refurbishment. These proposals will not increase the numbers of staff and/or students on the campus and consequently there will be no need for additional vehicle parking. Producing a TA for each planning application could therefore become an unnecessarily onerous requirement for the university. It is also noted that, although Bournemouth University and the AUCB are neighbours at Talbot Campus, they are two separate educational institutions with separate estate strategies and growth aspirations. It would be impractical to produce a TA which accurately assesses the traffic and parking impacts of both institutions.</p>	<p>The SPD has been amended on page 29 to include "Note A" stating that applications by schools or higher/further education establishments for residential and non-residential schemes will require a Transport Assessment to determine parking provision. It is implicit that applications would be on an individual basis to determine the impact of the development on the road network.</p> <p>The Bournemouth University (BU) Site is identified as one of the Special Parking Zones. The Site Specific Allocations & Development Management Policies DPD Submission Document states that a Masterplan approach for BU and the Arts University Campus Bournemouth (AUCB) at Fern Barrow is encouraged. It is expected that this Masterplan will contain an overarching Transport Assessment from which any new applications would be expected to take the lead, thereby reducing the need to produce an onerous list.</p>
---------------	-----------------	---------------------------	-----------	---	--

Question 4	Mr Paul Barlow	Sainsbury's Supermarket	Section 4	<p>Poole Parking and Layout SPD Paragraph 4.33 of the draft SPD states that in Parking Zones 1 and 2, car parks of more than 50 spaces for single use non residential development will generally not be permitted. This document promotes the shared public use of public or shared use with other developments. The SPD does not appear to allow for any flexibility in the non residential development parking standards. National Planning Policy Policies relating to parking in the Borough of Poole should have regard to the recently updated Planning Policy Guidance 13 - Transport (PPG13) and Planning Policy 4 - Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth (PPS4). PPS4 and PPG13 allow for some flexibility with regard to parking provision for retail and leisure developments in town centres. Both policy documents provide guidance on those circumstances under which additional parking (over and above agreed maximum parking standards) could be acceptable to local planning authorities. Policy EC18 of PPS4 states that the application of parking standards should apply unless a new development can demonstrate that a higher level of parking provision is needed. According to Policy EC18 and Paragraph no. 55 of PPG13 additional parking should be considered for retail and leisure developments in town centre or edge of centre locations, if the applicant can satisfy the local planning authority that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposals are consistent with any town centre parking strategy and that the facilities will genuinely serve the town centre as a whole. 2. The scale of parking is proportionate to the size of the centre. <p>We would like to clarify that the Poole Parking and Development Layout SPD should be in accordance with PPG13 (including recent changes) and PPS4 with regard to the above matters. In particular, the SPD should recognise the need for flexibility when applying parking standards to retail development, which will support the vitality and viability of town centres. Â</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SPD is guidance and the use of the word “generally” in this context has been used to ensure flexibility. It is consistent with national planning policy PPG13 and PPS4.</p>
---------------	-------------------	----------------------------	-----------	---	--

<p>Question 4</p>		<p>Talbot Village Residents Association</p>	<p>Section 4</p>	<p>The Talbot Village Residents Association wishes to make the following comments. We strongly oppose the creation of a special parking zone to cover Bournemouth University/AUCB. Whilst we recognise the importance of Travel Plans in promoting sustainability, we see no reasons to give these establishments special treatment. Experience has shown that whilst travel plans may mitigate the effect of development, none the less, the continued expansion of both these establishments has given rise to parking problems which have only been resolved by Waiting Restrictions. We do not accept the proposition that such restrictions are the appropriate way to deal with this since they penalise residents through no fault of their own. It is our view that both these establishments should be required to meet the appropriate standards which should be defined in Table 2. Houses in Multiple Occupation Whilst standards may be appropriate for new developments they are not relevant for one off applications in existing areas. We have consistently over a number of years made the point to your officers that where residential houses in the Village become HMOs the car ownership exceeds that of a family home, particularly where garages are converted and there are 5/6 bedrooms. We have asked your officers to conduct surveys with a view to developing appropriate standards. We are disappointed that this is not covered by the BPDRCPs. For example, the standard in para 4.28 that HMOs have a lower car ownership does not hold in these cases. It is our view that Talbot Village should be covered by an Article 4 Direction requiring Planning permission for conversion to HMOs. On that basis, we support the view that HMOs should be a separate category. But we object to the proposed standards in Table 3 Appendix F. We object to the level of car parking provision for HMOs in as far as they relate to Talbot Village since they do not allow for sufficient parking. Furthermore, it is unclear how "Student only accommodation" is defined. For large halls of residence where tenancy agreements can be used to control car ownership these standards may be appropriate. For student only houses it would not. This definition needs to be clarified. As there is no guarantee that the Council will implement an Article 4 Direction, we would also object to the Standards for 4+ bedroomed houses. We do not consider 2 spaces adequate. We believe that where an application is made to convert a garage into living space and it results in a dwelling with 5+ houses it should be a requirement to provide four spaces.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SPD has been amended to clarify how development proposed in the Special Parking Zones will be treated, in terms of parking provision. This is consistent with the recent revisions in PPG13 (2011 which promotes parking standards as part of a package of measures to promote sustainable travel. The Bournemouth University Travel Plan has been successful in reducing the number of cars coming to the site, year on year by taking an approach suitable for the site and its location. Any Transport Assessment would be expected to have regard to the BU Travel Plan, Dorset LTP3 short, medium and long term measures, as well as the suite of documents in the LDF, which would be used to determine the outcome of the planning application.</p> <p>In terms of the Article 4 Direction, this would only remove permitted development rights and it would still be open to any applicant to make a planning application. However, there is a commitment from the council to move forward on this issue, as a direct result of public opinion. Emerging Site Allocation SSA16 contained in the SSA&DM policies DPD provides an assessment criteria, upon which a planning application will be determined.</p>
-----------------------	--	---	------------------	---	---

Question 5	Mr Lesley Burden		Para 5.17 and general comment.	Car sharing is difficult due to flexi-hours. Ban right hand turns where appropriate e.g. York Road on to the Broadway - reduce air pollution and improve traffic movement and improve bus times. Filter left against RED, cautiously, help keep traffic moving, improve road space and air quality! e.g. Waterloo Road left into Sopers Lane.	Comments noted. This is outside the scope of the Parking & Highway Layout in Development SPD.
Question 5	Mr Lindley Owen			The borough must be much more pro-active in encouraging car clubs into the transport 'mix'. Private motor vehicles spend over 95% of their time idle. They are wasting assets, cluttering the streets, at just the right height to conceal children and teenagers- those most likely to be killed or injured in road collisions. Car clubs are growing in popularity, especially in London and other large cities which have, as does Poole a significant proportion of thinking residents who can see the advantages of personal mobility separate from the perceived social status embodied in vehicle ownership. Local authorities are ideally placed, through parking strategies and other inducements, to encourage car club operators to set up, and residents to take advantage. As highly inefficient vehicles (only 2% of the energy used by a car is to transport the occupants), cars are on the way out, starting in urban areas. The Borough of Poole can accelerate this process, to everyone's advantage. Car clubs can be retro-fitted into established residential areas, especially if done with local involvement, eg as part of a "Quality Street" (http://www.quality-streets.org.uk/index.php?id=2).	Comments noted.
Question 5	Mr Christopher Allenby	Poole Old Town Conservation Group	Travel Plans and Car Clubs	Agreed.	
Question 5	Mr Dave Nash	Urban DNA	5. Travel Plans and Car Clubs	There needs to be some cross referencing between this section and the definition of optimum levels of parking provision. The intention behind travel planning is to encourage reduced car use, modal shift and carbon reduction. A lower than optimum figure would be justified, and hence should be allowed and encouraged by the SPD, in the case of development, in the more accessible parts of the Borough, where effective travel plans are proposed (corporate or personal). Similarly the Council's support for car clubs in parking Zone 1 (paragraph 5.13) ought to be reflected in Table 1 via a lower than optimum figure (i.e. 0.8 space per single dwelling).	Comments noted. The SPD seeks to promote high quality, sustainable, well designed parking. The SPD has been amended to clearly set out its role, objectives and structure of the document at Part 3 of the document. It contains guidance to help implement Core Strategy policies and this is shown at page 2 of the SPD. It also links to Policy DM8: Demand Management in the emerging Site Specific Allocations & Development Management Policies DPD. This has been set out on page 2

					of the document.
Question 5	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways Agency	Paras 5.1 - 5.6	<p>The Agency strongly supports the Council's approach towards travel plans, and notes the emerging Residential Travel Plans SPD. The Agency looks forward to being consulted on this document once available. As stated above, the Agency considers it would be beneficial to reference the DfTs travel plan guidance within the interim period. In some cases, it will be appropriate for a car parking management plan to be included alongside the travel plan for developments, which may be secured as a condition of planning permission or included within a Section 106 clause.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Borough of Poole has existing Travel Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance, linking to existing Local Plan Policy T14. The Local Plan is replaced by Site Specific Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. Policy DM8: Demand Management will replace Local Plan Policy T14. This will trigger a refresh of the existing Travel Plan guidance and be put out to public consultation as SPD, as part of the suite of LDF documents.</p>

Question 5		Gallagher Estates	Para 5.9 and conclusion	<p>Suggests that sites will allow Car Clubs to be effective will have parking ratios of less than 0.8 spaces per dwelling. Discussions with Borough of Poole Council suggest that this need not necessarily be the case in particular if there is allocated parking within the site. Each site should be judged on its own merits and the management of a Car Club is clearly key to its ongoing success. Conclusion In summary, there are a number of points of clarification which we consider are required to be included within the Parking and Development Layout SPD which we look forward to seeing included in the adopted document. Furthermore, we would be happy to discuss our comments further should you find this helpful in finalising the draft SPD. The key aspects within our comments relate to the fact that this SDPD will have the status of being guidance, not a mandatory or rigidly applied standard. An acknowledgement is therefore appropriate by the Council that parking arrangements will need to be discussed, negotiated and agreed for each specific site. This negotiation should take account of design, layout, house types, public transport, accessibility to town centre and local facilities and all other relevant matters. Flexibility in response to these factors will therefore be appropriate in applying the guidance to specific planning applications. Scheme viability is of course absolutely critical, in addition to the other factors listed above. This consideration needs to be applied to all issues, including parking provision. As work continues on the preparation of this guidance and the proposals at the former Poole Power Station site, we will continue to provide further input and comment to the Council's policies - including in respect of this guidance.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SPD has been amended at 7.10 to remove this reference.</p> <p>The status of the SPD is clearly defined. The role, objectives and structure of the document has been added to the SPD.</p>
Question 6	Mr G Eves	PFA Consulting (representing Talbot Village trust)	Development Layout in (section 6)	<p>The Trust notes the requirement to include tight corner radii but is concerned about the reference to "overrun strips". In some instances, overrun strips may be necessary but generally within residential developments, it is considered that it will be acceptable for the relatively limited number of large vehicles to utilize the entire carriageway rather than introducing overrun strips which may potentially be more hazardous for pedestrians.</p>	Comments noted.

Question 6		McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd.	Paragraph 7.6	<p>In the case of sheltered housing, a parking level requirement of 1 space per 2 units has been cited. What has this figure been based upon? Regard must be had to what is operationally and commercially required as part of the development which will vary from site to site. The background evidence base in the form of the Bournemouth Poole and Dorset Residential Car Parking Study is notably weak on assessing parking need at sheltered housing developments and for the need of mobility scooter storage points. It is suggested that the policy and guidance be amended to allow it to be flexibly applied, based on the nature of the sheltered/older persons accommodation and any evidence that is submitted on the parking needs to be specific to a particular development. It is respectfully requested that these comments are given due consideration in the formulation of the Car Parking and Layout SPD and amended accordingly.</p>	<p>The SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications received by the Council. Where reduced parking provision is proposed, evidence should be submitted which justifies this lower provision. The document makes reference at para 3.2 that it is essential that developers and agents have regard to this SPD at an early stage of developing the proposal and recommends pre-app discussion for all developments involving parking provision.</p>
Question 6	Mr Ian Roberts		Section 6 - Paragraph numbers on pages 27, 28 & 29	<p>There are no paragraph numbers in the document, and I am therefore unable to refer to those.</p>	<p>The SPD has been amended and all paragraphs are numbered.</p>
Question 6	Mr Ian Roberts		Pages 27 and 28 in Section 6 Development Layout	<p>Whilst we have just received this and will need to peruse the document fully, we note that in respect of the table on visibility that is derived from Manual for Streets 1, the y-distance is wrongly quoted. The table for the y-distance should be the SSD in metres and the 3m element should not be added to the y-distance. Please refer to paragraph 7.7.10 of Manual for Streets 1. What is quoted in your table is the forwarded stopped sight distance which is the SSD plus 3m to allow for the bonnet. This is not the y-distance. Furthermore, with regard to the paragraphs relating to the x-dimension, the information obtained therein is contrary to the advice of Manual for Streets 2, which was published in September 2010.</p>	<p>The SPD has been amended accordingly, See Visibility at all accesses (all developments) paragraphs 8.23 – 8.39.</p>

Question 6	Mr Lindley Owen			<p>(6.1) The road user hierarchy is strongly supported. However, it also features in existing transport policy, but appears to have been honoured mainly in the breach. For example, at most pedestrian crossings in the borough of Poole, there is a delay, often of a long period, after a pedestrian pushes the button, before the lights change. This increases the chance of injury, as walkers are tempted to dash across in a gap in traffic, instead of waiting. Why should the slowest traveller, who causes least environmental damage, have to slow down even more? (6.4) 20mph is a critical limit. Below it, the survival rate of pedestrians hit by road vehicles is around 95%. Above 20mph, the survival rate drops geometrically, so at 40mph, only 5% survive. Residential roads should be designed (width, surface, vertical and horizontal displacement) so that drivers 'sense' that 20mph is a natural upper limit. See Grundy et al., "Effect of 20mph traffic speed zones on road injuries " BMJ 2009;339:b4469 (6.6) lowered kerbs. It is important that these are completely flush. If a small drop remains, it presents an unnecessary obstacle to wheelchair users. In addition, a kerb height of under 3cms is easily overlooked by novice cyclists, yet is sufficient to unseat them. (The same applies to longitudinal ridges denoting cycle path junctions). (6.7) tight corner radii are strongly supported as a re-inforcement of 20mph speed limits. (6.22) The proposal to permit any parking for school students (disabled excepted) is a 'nudge' in the wrong direction, so is opposed. Walking and cycling are healthy habits we should encourage in all pupils who are able to do so. Any switch to personal motor transport should be delayed, or avoided altogether, for health reasons. Visibility (no para number) This section appears to ignore evidence that vehicle drivers who think they can see clearly take junctions at higher speeds. Elsewhere, transport authorities recognise this and are installing barriers to cut visibility at (eg) roundabouts. This cuts speed and thus reduces the frequency of collision, and closing speeds where collisions still occur.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Parking & Highway Layout SPD clarifies at part 8: Development Layout that the needs of pedestrians and cyclists are prioritised over car borne commuters. However, the purpose of the SPD is to provide guidance to applicants in designing parking schemes and optimum level of parking for all use classes in accordance with the findings of the local evidence base. Objectives have been defined in Part 3 Role, Objectives and Structure of the document. Promoting high quality, sustainable, well designed parking provision is a key objective as stated at 3.3. The SPD set out the council's preferred approach to help implement Core Strategy Policies and Policy DM8: Demand Management in the emerging Site Specific Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended and numbering applied to all paragraphs.</p>
Question 6	Mr Christopher Allenby	Poole Old Town Conservation Group	Development Layout	The Road User Hierarchy is noted.	Comment noted.

Question 6	Mr Dave Nash	Urban DNA	6. Development Layout	<p>Para 5.2 of PPS12 makes clear that DPD documents should not repeat or conflict with national policy. This section of the guidance does both. Manual for Streets has more and better structured guidance on parking and street design (chapters 7 and 8 respectively). MfS is a better placeshaping design tool and, in the absence of any context specific justification for a Poole approach there is no reason to repeat this. This section of the draft SPD does not cross reference the Borough Characterisation study or highlight best design practice and therefore is neither justified nor effective.</p>	<p>Section 6 has been amended and covers relevant issues relating to Development Parking in Poole.</p> <p>Development Layout section is now at Part 8 and sets out the hierarchical approach in relation to road users. This aligns with the approach taken in LTP3 (adopted April 2011) that pedestrians and cyclists should be considered before the needs of car borne commuters.</p> <p>Manual for Streets 1 and 2 are recognised as significant influences shaping the SPD (page 10, figure 1). The Borough of Poole Characterisation Study will relating to sets out the approach for the road user hierarchy out that the road user hierarchy</p>
Question 6	Mr Dave Nash	Urban DNA	Conclusion	<p>It is normal practice to recommend what changes should be made to make policy documents sound. In this case the whole document is unsatisfactory: it is poorly defined, lacking in objectives, trying to cover too much ground and will not add to the quality of spatial planning or Development Management decisions in Poole. We would recommend that the spatial content (the parking zones) and parking guidelines be revised and re-issued with better justification and that the layout/design component be cancelled until such time as an integrated design SPD is prepared (i.e. a replacement for the now out-dated Design Code SPG).</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD has been structured and sets out the councils approach to parking and highway layout in new development. It has been amended to promote and recommend key Design Guidance (on page 5, Table 1) for incorporating parking provision in new development. The SPD sets out the council's expectations in the introduction. Part 3 has been incorporated into the SPD to clearly set out the role, objectives and structure of the document. Part 6 Development Parking sets out the Parking Zones hierarchy. in accordance with our current and up to date evidence base. This approach is supported by PPG13: Transport (January 2011) and PPS3: Housing (June 2010).</p>

Question 6	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways Agency	Paras 6.1 - 6.3	<p>The Agency strongly supports the Council's road user hierarchy, which proposed that consideration will be given to the needs of user groups in priority order, with pedestrians as highest priority and car borne commuters as lowest priority. We agree that this should form the basis for assessing proposals in transportation terms. The proposed road hierarchy is focussed on designation of (i) distributor roads designed to meet the needs of the moving vehicle and (ii) access roads designated to discourage non access traffic. The Agency supports this approach and agrees that it can assist in meeting the objectives of the road user hierarchy. The Agency supports the Council's approach towards industrial access. For clarification, the Agency would like to see additional reference to the Strategic Road Network alongside "Primary and Distributor Roads" within the upper tier.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Para 8.2 states that the council adopts a three tier hierarchy for accesses to industrial developments. The upper tier referred to may include any strategic road network (SRN) e.g. Holes Bay Road, Dorset Way and Gravel Hill Road. New planning proposals which affect a SRN will be referred to the Highways Authority (BoP) as part of the public consultation process. The SPD has been amended at para 3.2 to recommend that developers and agents have regard to its contents at an early stage of developing their proposal.</p>
Question 6	Ms Lindsay Thompson	Terence O'Rourke (representing Neptune Consulting Limited)	Section 6	<p>This section seems in some areas to be repetitive of the Streetscapes. It would be useful if this section of the document refers to the Streetscapes Manual adopted by the Borough of Poole and the link between the two, particularly in regard to materials an the adoption of new roads.</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD is one of a suite of documents within the LDF and therefore reference to other adopted DPDs and SPDs is minimised to avoid repetition. This section has been amended to set out the detail to the Parking Zones. The guidance it provides for residential and non-residential parking does not repeat Streetscapes but seeks to update the previous Parking Guidelines SPG where necessary, in line with government policy changes since 2004.</p>
Question 6	Ms Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust	Section 6	<p>We have no particular comment to make on the document but support a bullet point on page 37 of a sub-objective (LTP3) to ensure all members of the community have access to cultural and community facilities. Parking facilities, for those who prefer to use their cars, at the Lighthouse should remain available at nearby car parks as theatres and evening entertainment arts venues are unlike other forms of the night time economy. They attract families, young people, disabled patrons and older people who can be discouraged to attend a performance if the costs of travelling and parking make the price tag of the evening out too high. Where restrictive regimes do occur we would urge the planning authority to allow for special conditions that can provide free parking to theatre patrons.</p>	<p>Noted. The operational and management of commercial car parks are outside the remit of this SPD.</p>

	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways Agency	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	<p>The Agency is supportive in principle of supplementary guidance for developers and landowners in relation to the parking and layout requirements of new development. Specifically we support the emerging Parking and Development Layout SPD for Poole, subject to the key requirement that it is revised to take account of the revised PPG13 released in early 2011. We look forward to our further involvement in the production of the Poole Borough LDF. If in the meantime you wish to discuss any of the above, please do not hesitate to contact me on 01392 312502</p>	<p>The SPD has been amended in accordance with recent government policy revisions in PPG13:(2011) which encourages local authorities to set the appropriate level of car parking to meet the pattern of car ownership in their own area. Part 5 comprises the evidence base which includes the Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Residential Car Parking Study (2010).</p>
--	------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	--	--