

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

<b>Summary of consultation responses</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Reference in revised policy</b>
Create a crisper document that focuses on what users really need to know and to ensure the key requirements are not overlooked	WODC	Agreed, the policy document has been amended in this respect	Throughout
Background supporting information could be retained and held separately	WODC	Partial agreement but some information is still needed to introduce the topic. Background and supporting information has been cut down	Sections on Background and Research have been amended
Section 1 could be omitted. The contents page makes clear what the document contains	WODC	Agreed Old Section 1 removed	
Paragraph 1.5 If retained, this could be more succinctly worded as follows: <i>Finally, some advice is offered on ways of minimising the use of land for car parking.</i>	WODC	Agreed Old Section 1 removed	
Section 3 could be made more succinct, referring only to research findings. There is also duplication of paragraphs 3.2 and 3.6 in particular. These two paragraphs could be combined to report quite simply the finding that, even where overall parking provision was adequate, some households had access to too few spaces and others had too many. The implications for greater use of unallocated spaces could then go in Section 4.	WODC	Agreed	Section on Research has been amended
Paragraph 3.2 Notwithstanding the comment above, the last two sentences if retained or moved to Section 4 could perhaps be better worded as: <i>The inclusion of some unallocated car parking spaces, which could also be used by visitors, is therefore a more flexible and efficient solution.</i>	WODC		Section on Research has been amended
Paragraph 3.4 This adds nothing and merely casts doubt on the validity of the standards in relation to flats.	WODC		Section on Research has

## CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments

### ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS

Summary of consultation responses	From	Officer comments	Reference in revised policy
It should be omitted.			been amended
Paragraph 3.5 Are the lower car ownership rates shown below, but do they need to be anyway?	WODC		Section on Research has been amended
Paragraph 3.7 This is not a research finding and the principle, if it needs to be said, could go in para 2.2.	WODC	Agreed, move para 3.7 to para 2.2	Paragraph moved to section on Research
Paragraph 3.9 The research finding is an increase in the number of large cars. The policy on bay sizes is out of place here.	WODC		Section on Research has been amended
Section 4 generally would be better structured and easier to follow with paragraphs on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The principles of including an element of unallocated parking to maximise flexibility and economy of land use</li> <li>• Allocated spaces and where they can be located</li> <li>• Unallocated spaces and where they can be located.</li> </ul>	WODC	Agreed, change section 4 as suggested, leave para 4.5 in	Paras 3.6-3.10
Paragraph 4.3 This effectively duplicates the first sentence of 4.1 and should be omitted.	WODC	see above	
Paragraph 4.5 Does this really need to be included?	WODC	see above	
Paragraph 5.1 The grammar might be improved by rewording the final sentence: <i>....unallocated spaces with no further provision for visitor parking.</i>	WODC	Agreed, it is proposed to merge old paras 5.1 and 6.1	Para 3.1
Paragraph 9.3 Stronger wording is needed with regard to off-plot tandem parking. This could be reworded as follows: <i>Tandem (in line) parking is inconvenient and should generally be avoided as both spaces are rarely used. It</i>	WODC	Agreed	Para 3.32

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

<b>Summary of consultation responses</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Reference in revised policy</b>
<i>should not be used off-site but may be acceptable on-plot if overspill of one vehicle onto the highway would not have unacceptable consequences.</i>			
Paragraph 9.8 could perhaps be better worded as follows: <i>Sufficient space must be provided to allow for safe and convenient access by vehicles to parking spaces and garages. A width of at least 6.0m is needed to swing into a parking space and 7.3m to get into a garage.</i>	WODC	Agreed	Para 3.36
Paragraph 13 This section could incorporate paragraph 9.7 which would be better located here. Together they could be reworded as follows <i>Unplanned Parking</i> <i>13.1 Unplanned parking on roads and footways which causes obstruction to the passage of vehicles (including service vehicles) and pedestrians tends to take place where planned parking provision is inadequate or less convenient. Adherence to the policies in this document should prevent this, but where less convenient forms of parking (tandem on-plot and rear parking courts) are proposed, developers will need to show that unacceptable, unplanned parking will not occur. Careful consideration will need to be given to road widths and designs that deter inappropriate parking.</i> <i>13.2 Bollards, planters and street furniture can assist in the definition of parking areas, but good planning should avoid the need for an unsightly clutter of structures to be installed at a later date to prevent unacceptable unplanned parking.</i> <i>13.3 Delete</i>	WODC	Agreed	Paras 3.58 and 3.59
Appendix C Table C1 Note 2 Line 2. Should this read	WODC	Correction needed	Table C1 revised

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

<b>Summary of consultation responses</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Reference in revised policy</b>
'allocated' rather than 'unallocated'?			
<p>Appendix D The first example should explain that the flats will have '<i>unallocated parking</i>' (not '<i>one unallocated parking space per flat</i>' - the overall unallocated provision is 13 not 11!).</p> <p>The total for the first column is 38 not 37.</p> <p>A further column in the table with total/overall parking provision would be useful.</p> <p>The alternative approach, with one allocated space per house (also usefully applied to the 3 bed units), could be Example 2 with its own table (which would clarify the arithmetic for calculating the unallocated provision: I didn't see how you arrived at 18 unallocated spaces for the 2 bed units - is it not <math>22 \times 0.6 = 13</math>?). A comparison of the additional column figures in the two tables would then demonstrate very clearly the benefits in terms of land use of a greater proportion of unallocated spaces. If this does not form Example 2, then <i>Example 1</i> as a heading should be removed.</p>	WODC	<p>This observation is confusing, calculation does say 13</p> <p>Needs correcting</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Re-write to add example 2</p>	<p>Table D1 amended</p> <p>Example amended</p>
1.4 'parking for the disabled or mobility impaired' should be changed to 'parking for mobility impaired people' or 'disabled people' throughout the whole document.	Deborah Whelan	Change all references	Throughout
1.5 No longer mentions a (government and planning) desire to reduce car ownership and use.	Deborah Whelan	Noted but para now deleted	
2.2 Could mention exclusions for Blue Badge Holders (BBH)	Deborah Whelan	Do not think this is needed but the subject is well covered in its own section	

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

<b>Summary of consultation responses</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Reference in revised policy</b>
2.1 Would be better if it included a reference to DFT's Inclusive Mobility (IM) standards.	Deborah Whelan	Noted, added	Throughout
3.9 please cross refer these standards with IM	Deborah Whelan	Para deleted	Throughout
4.3 Would be improved if some mention of BBH where made.	Deborah Whelan	Not needed as these paras talk only about allocated and unallocated spaces, BBH dealt with elsewhere	
7.1 & 8. People with mobility difficulties or a person with a mobility difficulty	Deborah Whelan		Paras 3.25-28
8.1 mobility range - entrance to be within 50m (max range for BBH)	Deborah Whelan		Paras 3.25-28
8.2 offer flat, firm, free draining level access.	Deborah Whelan	Inc specifications used	
8.4 mobility impaired people.	Deborah Whelan	Agreed	Throughout
A9 Except BBH's?	Deborah Whelan	Agreed	Para 3.17
A11. Car free may not be possible for some people- e.g. BBH's so some mention should be made in this or A12	Deborah Whelan	Noted, see above	
A22. Should add something like' accommodating the need for safe pedestrian travel routes, drop curbs' etc.	Deborah Whelan	agreed, covered in urban design section	Paras 3.19-22
B2 Note 2. We are encouraging on street parking with 'infill' development which causes difficulties for residents/ streets do we really want this? (Practice in Didcot has shown that this creates big neighbourly problems)	Deborah Whelan	We are only encouraging on street parking when there is capacity and it does not impede other users	
Note 3. To enable inclusion in a car free development a shopmobility scheme (wheelchair loan) facility will be necessary	Deborah Whelan	This should be dealt with by other policies with respect of shopmobility	
Not sure that the long winded preamble to you questionnaire is going to encourage people to	Iain Brown	this policy has to reflect reality and to make best use of the land space available	

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

<b>Summary of consultation responses</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Reference in revised policy</b>
<p>participate in this consultation.                      Basically, there are too few parking places allocated for new developments.                      Go back to what was expected in the days when planners had some common sense and the greedy speculators were kept on a tight rein!                      One Bedroom = 1 parking space + 1 parking space for guests/visitors.                      Nothing complicated or any need for me to give you my inside leg measurement or where my parents were born or what star sign I was born under.....KEEP IT SIMPLE!</p>			
<p>'Herringbone' parking, where vehicles park onstreet at an angle, are much easier to access and exit from than conventional inline parking spaces.</p>	Jean Fooks	Noted, but can only be approached from one direction and takes up more land space	
<p>Some places- e.g. in small towns outside Munich, have a policy of insisting on cars being parked underneath the houses – with a half-storey excavation, so that the cars are not on the road and the front gardens are planted rather than car parking spaces. Maybe this is more expensive – but it is hugely preferable to the acres of car parking we are getting in new developments, especially blocks of flats but also very much in single or semi-detached houses.</p>	Jean Fooks	noted	
<p>I'd be happy to see more cars parked on street than losing so much of plots to parking and hard surfaces, even if 'permeable'.</p>	Jean Fooks	noted	
<p>too much on-street parking, want 2 car spaces off street for each dwelling, and sheltered accommodation needs more disabled spaces</p>	Witney Town Council	This is not realistic, we have to make best use of the land space available	
<p>I believe that all new developments should provide</p>	John	This is exactly what this policy aims to	

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

<b>Summary of consultation responses</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Reference in revised policy</b>
sufficient off-street parking for a reasonable number of prospective new residents. The concept of restricting off-street parking spaces to discourage car ownership is demonstrably not working and has never worked. What is happening is that our streets have become an unpleasant and often dangerous car park.	Sanders	achieve  The aim of the policy is to partially address this whilst still making best use of land space available.	
The allocated spaces for three bedroom houses should be increased to 3	John Sanders	This is not realistic. The research did not provide evidence to the contrary. We have to make best use of the land space available	
Response to question 2: I do not believe that small developments should be exempted. Some developers will be encouraged to create small developments in order to avoid the obligation to provide adequate off-street parking. The rule should be <insufficient car spaces = refusal>. This should include HMO conversions where (often) residents live 4 to 6 to an HMO, each with a car.	John Sanders	Making exemptions might have to be the case especially in Oxford. However some permitted development rights may well lead to this behaviour occurring anyway and thus out of the Council's control	
Response to question 3: Absolutely not. I do not believe that development policy is an effective way of controlling car use. Oxford's streets are stuffed with parked cars due to this policy.	John Sanders	This parking policy is not meant to control car use however this policy in conjunction with on street controls will attempt to reduce the congestion and problems caused by indiscriminate on-street parking	
Response to question 9: I disagree entirely with the concept that providing alternative transport means that fewer people will choose to own cars. Residents in new developments entirely ignore this concept. I can provide officers with many examples of the misuse of the "fewer spaces" principle, resulting in obstructed pavements and cluttered streets. Alternative transport should encourage people to leave their cars at home, in	John Sanders	This parking policy is not meant to control car ownership however it does try to put the correct amount of spaces in where they are needed and it is also recognised that where public transport is available it does get used.	

## CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments

### ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS

Summary of consultation responses	From	Officer comments	Reference in revised policy
appropriate parking spaces, not to sell them.			
Response to question 3: people will buy cars and those without may also end up buying cars as more are seen on the development	Unknown 1	Evidence does not support this view, car ownership is steady	
Response to question 9: not enough spaces given especially considering for weekends when more people park (visitors)	Unknown 1	This is not realistic, have to make best use of the land space available	
Response to question 10: more spaces should be given	Unknown 1	ditto	
Response to question 6: As long as a garage can contain the average car, why make it larger? It will just take up more land.	West Hendred PC	Evidence shows that part of the garage is used for storage and some domestic appliances so to get a car in it needs to be bigger, as well as there being bigger cars available now	
Response to question 3: Human nature, selfishness, whilst morally supporting would not be satisfied if it was directly affecting them	Unknown 2	noted	
Response to question 4: Car sizes are always increasing but never carry many people. By restraint for a parking space size will encourage smaller vehicles	Unknown 2	noted	
Response to question 6: Same as point 4. some garages have become sheds!	Unknown 2	ditto	
Response to question 3: There should be space for visitors who might not be able to use public transport, and tradespeople who similarly don't come by bus to mend your washing machine for example.	Lynda Pasquire	These are included but there will never be a development which has totally off street allocated spaces	
Response to question 5: Some people have huge people carriers and others might have a smart car; a range of spaces might be available but the average family saloon should be the norm.	Lynda Pasquire	It is not realistic to provide different size spaces except for those with impaired mobility	
Response to question 9: Car ownership is a fact of life and tampering with the housing market in an attempt to	Lynda Pasquire	this policy should not be addressing the influences of the housing market but to be	



**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

Summary of consultation responses	From	Officer comments	Reference in revised policy
<p>encourage people not to own a car does not encourage mobility in the housing market. A four bedroomed house could mean 4 cars as each resident of a bedroom could own a car in order to go about their daily business. There should be a minimum number of spaces according to the number of occupants, and if the land on which the house is built on has to accommodate the car parking facilities there will be less congestion on the streets. Where houses have been built with limited car parking it can clearly be seen that residents are parking inappropriately. The Developers might get less houses on a plot of land but the quality of people's live in the streets where they live must be improved if the street is able to be traversed and not cluttered with parked cars on pavements and on both sides of the street, causing traffic jams.</p>		<p>realistic about providing sufficient parking spaces without causing problems to all users of the highway</p>	
<p>Response to question 10: In a new development people are buying off plan and should have the opportunity to purchase allocated parking space(s). This way the Developer can amend the number of parking spaces, allocated and non allocated as the plots are sold. Market forces will apply, so if someone in a one bed flat wants two parking spaces they should be able to pay the extra cost to get the space they need. One bed might be occupied by two people who own a car each,</p>	<p>Lynda Pasquire</p>	<p>This is not realistic as the numbers and layout is consented as part of the planning consent. It is a good idea but what happens when the property changes ownership and the requirement changes?</p>	
<p>Response to question 2: All properties should have a minimum of 2 parking space</p>	<p>Fulbrook PC</p>	<p>This is not realistic, have to make best use of the land space available</p>	
<p>Response to question 3: People are not going to give up car ownership. Many people have a car/van provided by their employer essential to their type of work.</p>	<p>Fulbrook PC</p>	<p>Ditto</p>	

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

Summary of consultation responses	From	Officer comments	Reference in revised policy
Developments should be limited to provide 2 parking spaces per property.			
Response to question 9: People are not going to give up car ownership. Many people have a car/van provided by their employer essential to their type of work. Developments should be limited to provide 2 parking spaces per property.	Fulbrook PC	ditto	
Response to question 10: Developments should be limited to provide 2 parking spaces per property.	Fulbrook PC	The policy is reacting to the result of the research and providing a more realistic car parking policy to that used now	
Stonesfield Parish Council has strong views on the inadequacy of parking provision for developments in rural areas. It is accepted that constraining the parking at the journey destination in towns and cities is likely to reduce car usage. However, it has always been obvious to the Parish Council that constraining the parking at the journey origin would never reduce car ownership or use. This is particularly true where public transport is inadequate which is the case in most villages. Cars are essential to work, to shop and to access leisure facilities. Stonesfield has many traditional cottages with no off street parking but they are still purchased by car owners who park on street. Counting garages as parking spaces is completely misleading because most garages are not used for this purpose. This is an intellectual ploy to reduce the provision of off street residential parking provision. It is not easy to grasp the concept of decimals points of parking spaces. Cars are not built that way. This is further complicated by rounding up or down when the	Stonesfield PC	Evidence shows that car ownership is not affected by parking availability unless it is very strictly controlled. Strict control is not realistic at all locations.  Garage use is addressed: they will be counted if they are bigger and if there is a risk that they are only being used as storage then planning consent conditions might be used as a control mechanism	

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

Summary of consultation responses	From	Officer comments	Reference in revised policy
<p>calculated requirement results in a decimal point. This is clearly shown in appendix C when the requirement for 1 bedroom units adds up to 1.6 parking spaces but the note says two allocated spaces will not be provided for 1 bedroomed dwellings. Hey presto you have suddenly lost .6 of a car.</p> <p>The Parish Council appreciates that given the price of land it is essential that it is used effectively but current parking provision leads to neighbour disputes and unacceptable living conditions in many developments. In rural areas where public transport is not adequate cars are essential and they have to be parked somewhere. There is a strong argument for having different parking provision standards relating to the town centres and villages. The provision of a mix of allocated and unallocated parking spaces would be acceptable if it helps to solve the problems.</p>		<p>Table does reflect evidence and in some way needs to be like this to reflect the variations and to optimise parking across the board.</p> <p>To get finesse within the calculation decimal figures are needed. Rounding the numbers up and down does deliver the correct result.</p> <p>Disputes such as this are acknowledged but officers at this council work with the planning authorities and the developers to deliver layouts which mitigate against such disputes.</p>	
<p>The Parish Council asked me to write to you to express its support for a relaxation of the present quota on parking spaces, which it finds unnecessarily restrictive and counter-productive.</p>	<p>Drayton PC</p>	<p>noted</p>	
<p>Response to question 9: It is not clear why dwellings should be considered in relation to both rooms and bedrooms. To avoid confusion better to just consider bedrooms.</p> <p>Rooms are also not defined – are they just habitable? Meaning of asterisk in Table A1 not defined.</p> <p>The proposed number of unallocated spaces seems to be of the correct order.</p> <p>Paragraph A6 refers to “good accessibility” – but this is not defined.</p>	<p>PFA Consulting</p>	<p>Some dwellings, especially the bigger ones do have rooms which can be used as bedrooms. This policy gives the flexibility where the rooms with that potential are added in</p> <p>Notes have been added and tables amended</p>	<p>Tables A1, B1 and C1</p>

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

Summary of consultation responses	From	Officer comments	Reference in revised policy
<p>Faringdon Town Council Planning &amp; Highways Committee has considered the proposed new standards and I have been asked to advise you that it approves the proposed policy</p>	<p>Faringdon Town Council</p>	<p>noted</p>	
<p>Response to question 9:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To ensure the provision of sufficient unallocated parking spaces, new residential areas will need to be designed to accommodate safe on-street parking. This will require wide streets (as well as parking courts). The policy, therefore, needs to highlight the urban design implications of the new parking standards.</li> <li>2. In existing urban areas, it will often be difficult to provide the required number of unallocated parking spaces for new smaller scale residential developments given the existing road layout. The policy, therefore, needs to be more flexible for new developments of less than, say, ten dwellings within existing urban areas.</li> </ol> <p>It is not practical to restrict the number of allocated parking spaces to a maximum of two for larger dwellings which have double garages with a driveway in front. This will lead to unnecessary disputes with developers/applicants.</p>	<p>VOWH DC</p>	<p>agreed, document amended</p> <p>Acknowledged, where there is no on street provision then off street will need to be provided. In constrained areas then on street control will do just that for dwellings with less or no parking</p> <p>Noted, but the need to maximise land use space may well lead to this effect being reduced The standards are maximum</p>	<p>Section 3</p>
<p>Response to question 10: Tables A1, B1 and C1 are complicated and not easy to use. The tables need to make the following clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the first row below the heading relates to the number of allocated spaces per dwelling (i.e. none, one</li> </ul>	<p>VOWH DC</p>	<p>accepted</p>	<p>Tables A1, B1 and C1</p>

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

<b>Summary of consultation responses</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Reference in revised policy</b>
<p>or two)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• two allocated spaces per dwelling is a maximum</li> <li>• the numbers in the other rows relate to unallocated spaces per dwelling</li> </ul>			
<p>Response to question 9: Very often 1 bedroom apartments have two people living in them and they each have their own cars. Even if the public transport provision is good, where are vehicles in excess of one to be parked?</p>	Cumnor PC	Noted but evidence and policy takes a balanced view of this phenomena	
<p>Response to question 1: We have some concern over a potential over-proliferation of parking which could be to the detriment of overall residential quality. Standards should allow for a lower provision of unallocated spaces where lower density schemes provide for a good level of allocated parking within plots. Larger houses on larger plots tend to provide allocated spaces in addition to double garages and consequently require less unallocated/visitor spaces</p>	Pegasus	accepted	throughout
<p>Response to question 3: A car free approach should be included as an option rather than a strict policy. The market may still require some allocated parking and without provision for occupiers parking will be displaced to other peripheral locations. However, unallocated spaces could appropriately be restricted in such locations due to accessibility</p>	Pegasus	Noted, car free developments will only be considered when on street controls are provided and other transport measures provided	Throughout
<p>Response to question 4: Parking spaces of 4.8 x 2.4 m have generally been adequate and additional width for disabled applied.</p>	Pegasus	Evidence does not support this Mobility access is increased by additional 1m strip	
<p>Response to question 5: There needs to be some flexibility to allow for innovative design approaches which respond to a particular site's context, constraints</p>	Pegasus	noted	

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

Summary of consultation responses	From	Officer comments	Reference in revised policy
and opportunities			
Response to question 9: Whilst a flexible approach to a mix of allocated and unallocated provision is supported, the unallocated provision for schemes providing 2 allocated spaces is considered excessive and could have counter-productive design consequences eg in terms of reducing street landscaping. A reduction of unallocated provision where more than 2 spaces can be provided as allocated spaces on plot with larger houses should be considered	Pegasus	Developers can choose not to have two allocated spaces Street design is evolving to deliver innovative solutions which will provide well designed self enforcing parking layouts	
Response to question 10: The example should have explained explicitly it is based on Table C1 only and set out the entire calculation of the alternative scenario in a box in same way as the first example. And it does not explain why for the 2 bedroom houses the figure of 0.8 was used for unallocated rather than 0.6 - as the example does not state how many rooms they have ( as opposed to bedrooms) see C1. Moreover the statement “choice which would be more efficient” refers to being able to cram more dwellings on the site only one assumes and not the overall functioning of the development. As you say quite reasonably elsewhere it is a delicate balance and this does not reflect that.	CPRE	accepted	Table C1
1. We welcome the proposed changes in policy in recognition of the need to provide adequately for off street parking based on research and experience.  2. Rural settlements - CPRE is primarily concerned with the rural settlements of the County. Given the real social and economic problems currently faced in rural communities, parking policies need to be pragmatic,	CPRE	Noted  Noted	

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

<b>Summary of consultation responses</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Reference in revised policy</b>
<p>realistic and based on an understanding of those issues. We therefore welcome the proposed hierarchy of residential parking provision across the County which seems a sensible approach to the issue.</p> <p>3. Personal mobility and cars - Lack of personal mobility is particularly damaging to the social balance and economic wellbeing of rural communities. We have to be realistic in recognising that both the young and low paid need personal transport as public transport is not able to and probably never will be able to meet their needs. Adequate parking provision is therefore essential.</p> <p>4. Parking on-street - The environment in many rural settlements is seriously compromised by nose-to-tail kerbside parking along the village streets, parking on footways and on verges, all exacerbated by previous policies which tended to follow the orthodoxy of restrictive parking provision, particularly for smaller or low cost houses.</p> <p>5. Public transport - Throughout rural Oxfordshire the slight improvements achieved in subsidised public transport provision whilst providing a valuable social service, have fallen way below that needed to provide a reasonable alternative to the car or motorcycle for families and workers living in these areas. The drift from the villages and 'gentrification' continues. Policies have to recognise this reality.</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

Summary of consultation responses	From	Officer comments	Reference in revised policy
<p>6. On-street parking regulation - There is reference in the consultation document to restriction of on-street parking by regulation. Whilst this is possible in town centres and possibly in many residential areas in Oxford and Banbury, it is inappropriate in rural settlements. In our experience, enforcement of 'yellow line' restrictions is totally impractical in these locations.</p> <p>7. Conversion of garages - Finally, the consultation is silent on the vexed issue of conversion of garage parking to residential rooms displacing parking onto the streets and the equally problematical use of garages for storage rather than for their intended purpose. The proposed increase in garage dimensions is to be welcomed. However current planning legislation would appear to be inadequate to control the conversion of garages and the knock-on effects.</p>		<p>Noted, good street design needs to be provided to prevent problems of indiscriminate parking</p> <p>This policy cannot address conversion of garages which is a matter for the district councils</p> <p>There is a need to retain a minimum parking in some circumstances which is dealt with in the policy</p>	
<p>Sparsholt Parish Council feels the Policy does not reflect the largely rural nature of Oxfordshire and small villages do not have the same public transport availability. Also the users of, often narrow, village roads include wide farm vehicles. The Council would like planners to consider the needs of rural villages as distinct from urban areas.</p>	Sparsholt PC	<p>Where public transport is poorer then more parking generally will be provided Appendix C does provide for more parking than B and C but still a maximum is applied</p>	
<p>Response to question 3: Continuation of car clubs and good public transport cannot be relied upon, so these 'special cases' should be included</p>	Cholsey PC	<p>Noted, but they are increasing in popularity and do provide an important alternative access to a car</p>	
<p>Response to question 9: The unallocated number in the tables maybe acceptable if the developers decision on allocated spaces are adequate</p>	Cholsey PC	<p>noted</p>	
<p>Response to question 10: Table in appendix D does not</p>	Cholsey PC	<p>The appendices are different to reflect the</p>	



**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

<b>Summary of consultation responses</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Reference in revised policy</b>
seem to be consistent with table in appendix C: 3 bed house is 1.8 and 0.4 in app C but 0.4 in app D?		evidence	
Response to question 3: This should be included as an option rather than a strict policy. The market may require some allocated parking and without provision for occupiers parking will be displaced to other peripheral locations. However, unallocated spaces could appropriately be restricted in such locations due to accessibility	Dorchester Group	noted	
Response to question 4: Parking spaces of 4.8 x 2.4 m have generally been adequate and additional width for disabled applied	Dorchester Group	Evidence does not support this Mobility access is increased by additional 1m strip	
Response to question 5: A standard garage of 6 m x 3 m would be acceptable.	Dorchester Group	noted	
Response to question 7: NB. Specifications on entrances to parking courts (para 12.3) should be more appropriately dealt with as a design issue and through Building Regs.	Dorchester Group	Noted but it is a critical part of parking provision and it is given for general guidance	
Response to question 9: The flexible approach to a mix of allocated and unallocated provision is generally supported. However, the unallocated provision for schemes providing 2 allocated spaces is considered excessive compared to previous standards. Also there needs to be a reduction of unallocated provision where more than 2 spaces can be provided as allocated spaces on plot with 3 and 4 bed houses.	Dorchester Group	Noted, policy reflects evidence and government guidance but also does address the flexibility which is illustrated in the revised worked example	Appendix D
Government advice for the past few years since the issue of PPG13 has been to issue maximum car parking standards to seek to reduce the reliance on cars and to maximise the use of public transport. It sought to effectively ration the number of spaces to make parking	Watlington PC	Evidence shows that restricting domestic parking does not affect car ownership. Government have acknowledged that control is best placed in other ways eg workplace restrictions and better public	

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

Summary of consultation responses	From	Officer comments	Reference in revised policy
<p>uncomfortable The content of this consultation appears to fly in the face of that in that it seeks to increase the amount of parking in residential development. It is going to have an impact on the amount of development that sites can take, reducing the number of houses and increasing parking. The amount of residential non greenfield land is at a premium in rural areas and underdeveloped sites with a swathe of parking in front is not the answer.</p> <p>The proposed standards are made in the light of evidence of existing usage which may not have been influenced by the need to restrain motor cars and given that it includes an increase in spaces will not discourage parking for the future. The provision of more spaces in residential development, making parking easier and more available has ramifications on the future of public transport especially in rural areas such as Watlington. We have already seen the decline of the public bus services recently and this will make car usage more convenient.</p>		<p>transport</p> <p>Public transport provision is dealt with by other policies</p> <p>Restricting parking in new developments will not automatically mean that bus services will either be used more or be improved</p>	
<p>Although the concept of the calculation based the way the tables are set out is difficult to understand</p>	<p>Unknown 3</p>	<p>Noted, some improvements made</p>	<p>Tables A1, B1 and C1</p>
<p>comment on whether we need a standard on HMOs. As discussed, a maximum standard is included in both the existing Local Plan (Appendix 3) and also we are carrying this forward into the Sites and Housing DPD. Your document could cross-refer to this (perhaps don't include explicitly though in case the standard changes as the Sites and Housing document evolves.) See also Sites and Housing background paper</p>	<p>Oxford City Council</p>	<p>agreed</p>	<p>Section 2</p>

**CABINET – 19 JULY 2011 - Parking Standards for New Residential Developments**

**ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND COMMENTS**

<b>Summary of consultation responses</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Reference in revised policy</b>
Para 6.6: Note that this would not apply in Oxford where maxima apply (hence, the maximum provision would always be rounded down not up)	Oxford City Council	Noted, but rounding down does not work by providing too few spaces in some circumstances. Prefer to round up/down and give officers leeway in document	throughout
Para 9.10: drawing could be clearer	Oxford City Council	Drawing amended	Section 3
A9: Add to end of paragraph "No more than 1 space per dwelling will be permitted within the Transport Central Area. Within the West End, flats will be car-free with disabled parking only." (To make consistent with adopted policy - which is unlikely to change.), and, Add "...taking into account the need to provide for the needs of disabled people." (In response to comment from Deborah Wheelan - also this is consistent with West End.)	Oxford City Council	agreed	Appendix A
A10: This paragraph is in the wrong place as it relates to residential parking throughout the city.	Oxford City Council	Agreed	