



PARTIAL REVIEW OF REGIONAL  
SPATIAL STRATEGY (RSS) –

Consultation on the Draft Options: Car Parking  
June – July 2008

(Responses by Organisation)

## **North West Regional Assembly**

### **PARTIAL REVIEW OF REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY (RSS) – Consultation on the Draft Options: Renewable Energy**

A consultation report from

#### **CAG Consultants**

in association with **Concept 4 Creative and Community Consultants**

April 2008

CAG CONSULTANTS  
Gordon House  
6 Lissenden Gardens  
London NW5 1LX  
Tel/fax 020 7482 8882  
hq@cagconsult.co.uk  
www.cagconsultants.co.uk

for direct enquiries about this report please contact:

Emma Cranidge  
Ewood House, Ewood Lane, Todmorden, OL14 7DF  
tel 01706 817347 or mob 07879 017617  
[ec@cagconsult.co.uk](mailto:ec@cagconsult.co.uk)

## Macclesfield Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	No	Fails to meet the commitment in RPG13 to review parking standards every five years.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	In part	Option 2 sets out a more comprehensive and appropriate range of parking standards for developments and is therefore preferable to option 1. Both options set out maximum parking standards, but there are certain arguments for the introduction of minimum parking standards, particularly for residential developments. Macclesfield has high levels of car ownership, and it is also important to recognise the difference between car ownership and car usage. Car parking requirements for residential developments are a reflection of car ownership, and not necessarily of car usage. In fact,		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			reducing car usage is likely to result in an increase in the requirement for residential parking if car ownership remains the same. Whilst it is acknowledged that the introduction of specific minimum standards would be contrary to national policy in PPG13: Transport, some acknowledgement in the revised RSS that Local Planning Authorities could require a certain minimum level of parking provision for residential schemes where appropriate and necessary would be welcomed.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Individuals

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Individuals	No	-		

<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Individuals	-

<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Individuals	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
	<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
	<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
	<b>D) Environment? -</b>
	<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Individuals	Yes	<p>Option 2 is the better option because of its flexibility Points 1. Note that A3 and A4 have the same allocations which no doubt reflects the fact that the line between restaurants and public houses is blurred given that many provide both a bar and a restaurant. There appears to be no mention of A5, takeaway use, as a separate category. My view is that the category should still exist so that a change of use, requiring planning permission, is needed for such premises. I welcome the comment that on street parking controls should be considered, stronger wording would be better given the problems that take-aways can cause communities. 2. In practice parking provision is often far less than the maximum because of the policy of shared parking. This is a policy that works well up to a point but beyond that can drive customers out of village and town centres to provision further afield that has large free car parks. The law of unintended consequences means that there are more and longer journeys being made because the alternatives are being clamped, risking prosecution through parking illegally, or driving round in circles for some time. This is of course a Development Control issue but nevertheless how policies work in practice should be considered.</p>		

<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Individuals	-

<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Individuals	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
	<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
	<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
	<b>D) Environment? -</b>
	<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Northwest Regional Development Agency

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	No			We do not consider the retention of existing parking standards from RPG13/Draft RSS to be a realistic option, given the commitment in RPG13 that these are reviewed at least every 5 years and the detailed work undertaken on this issue by consultants Mouchel.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	No			Option 2 proposes that the revised parking standards developed by Mouchel are 'adopted'. We presume this means that they would be subject to further consultation when the Partial Review is submitted for examination. A further option, which has not been considered, is to ask whether RSS should continue to set out regional parking standards or whether these might more usefully be agreed at city region or sub regional level.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Countryside Properties

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	Yes	On the basis that the RSS, should concentrate on overarching strategic issues Option 1 should be preferred.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
	Properties	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Government Office North West

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Sara Lewis	GONW	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Sara Lewis	GONW	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Sara Lewis	GONW	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Sara Lewis	GONW	Yes	It is considered that the new standards in option 2 are more consistent with PPG13. Given that the standards are based on the different categorisations of areas is it clear how these fit with the locations as set out in RDF1. Will it be clear which type of standard applies where given that the categorisation used in the policy does not clearly apply to the way settlements are categorised in the plan		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Sara Lewis	GONW	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Sara Lewis	GONW	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Preston City Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Molyneux	Preston City Council	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Molyneux	Preston City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Molyneux	Preston City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Molyneux	Preston City Council	Yes	Preston City Council would support Option 2 on car parking but has no particularly strong view.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Molyneux	Preston City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Molyneux	Preston City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Halton Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	No	The existing standards are now five years old and there is professional agreement that the standards need to be reviewed and updated in line with current transport policy and planning needs and approaches. Demand management is now the fundamental approach to be pursued, particularly within the urban context, and parking management is core component of an effective demand management policy.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	Yes	The accessibility tool and standards table should help to ensure a common approach across the region to the development of parking policy. It would help with resources to have a regional parking standard that could be		

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			adopted as an SPD as it stands (including having been put through a sustainability appraisal). Doing this would improve consistency between neighbours.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	It is crucial that the broad locations for development, particularly housing and commercial, are sustainable in transport terms. The effectiveness of the proposed parking policies will be undermined if the broad locations are not able to support and deliver sustainable transport options and travel choices.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Ensuring that all authorities understand the policy direction and the application of the tool through planning decision-making.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> The policy should contribute to elevating the quality of new developments, from an urban design and sustainability perspective. The site and the development will be able to contribute to a more sustainable built environment that makes a positive infrastructure intervention.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> The support for sustainable transport modes and travel choices will enable social transport barriers to accessing opportunities, essential services and facilities to be removed. The ability to access new developments by a range of modes is crucial for linking areas of need and opportunity, and ensuring that all in the community have the opportunity to be fully involved in society and benefit from the full range of opportunities available.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> A more carbon efficient transport system that contributes to climate change mitigation and adaptation. Air and noise quality improvements. Urban design and townscape improvements. Landscape enhancement through the alternative uses of land for vehicular parking provision.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> More energy and space efficient developments that are able to maximise economic growth through the full utilisation of the developments footprint for intended economic purposes. Increased ability to attract and retain the required workforce for economic growth and prosperity.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		Increase the number of people contributing to the economy through their ability to access employment. Enhanced demand management will result in less congestion and associated economic gains through travel time savings, predictability and improved efficiencies of the transport network.

## National Trust

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Hubbard, Alan	National Trust	No		Need to regularly review standards in response to changing circumstances.	

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Hubbard, Alan	National Trust	No specific comments.

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Hubbard, Alan	National Trust	<b>A) Delivery:</b> No specific comments.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> No specific comments.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> No specific comments.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> No specific comments.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> No specific comments.

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Hubbard, Alan	National Trust	Yes		It is appropriate to up-date the standards to reflect the new research that	

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			has been undertaken.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Hubbard, Alan	National Trust	None specifically noted.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Hubbard, Alan	National Trust	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Ensure followed up in LDF work and that the approach is consistently applied, in accordance with the Table, across the Region – the importance of joint working between LPAs to ensure a consistent approach is also essential.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> o specific comments.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> o specific comments.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Consideration will need to be given to the impact upon sensitive locations and in particular those that are important for tourism. It is considered that this matter is appropriately addressed at section 9.4 of the Mouchel Report; however, it is noted that no specific recommendation for “historic and environmentally sensitive locations” is set out and this is a matter that should be addressed in the draft revisions to RSS.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> o specific comments.

## Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	Don't know	The initial view is that the revised standards could be supported. However, in the short time available since the publication of the document it has not been possible to fully consult Technical Services colleagues, and their views		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			need to be taken into account before the response is submitted.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
--------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## South Lakeland District Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	Yes	OPTION 2: ADOPT THE REVISED STANDARDS SET OUT IN THE CONSULTANTS REPORT We support the adoption of revised car parking standards; on the basis they are underpinned by a robust evidence base study.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Cheshire West and Chester

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	No	We agree that this option would however fail to meet the commitment outlined in RPG13 to review parking standards every five years.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal</i> )	Yes	The proposed car parking standards outlined by the consultants present a positive way forward in enabling a regional overview of parking provision to be created while allowing Local Authorities to tailor the precise standards to		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
	<i>officer views)</i>		meet their local needs. The linking of parking provision to accessibility as opposed simply to the land use is a positive approach. However, the increased number of land use definitions, while helpful, is likely to generate a greater number of options which will result in greater complexity in interpretation.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester <i>(comments represent informal officer views)</i>	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester <i>(comments represent informal officer views)</i>	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Lancashire County Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Kirby	Lancashire County Council	No	Option 2 is preferred		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Kirby	Lancashire County Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Kirby	Lancashire County Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Kirby	Lancashire County Council	Yes	The revised parking standards are supported for the reasons set out in section 2 of the consultation paper		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Kirby	Lancashire County Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Kirby	Lancashire County Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Merseyside Policy Unit

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	No			The existing standards are now five years old and there is professional agreement that the standards need to be reviewed and updated in line with current transport policy and planning needs and approaches. Demand management is now the fundamental approach to be pursued, particularly within the urban context, and parking management is core component of an effective demand management policy.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	Yes	The accessibility tool and standards table are transparent and should help to ensure a common approach across the region to the development of parking policy.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	It is crucial that the broad locations for development, particularly housing and commercial, are sustainable in transport terms. The effectiveness of the proposed parking policies will be undermined if the broad locations are not able to support and deliver sustainable transport options and travel choices.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Ensuring that all authorities understand the policy direction and the application of the tool through planning decision making.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> The policy should contribute to elevating the quality of new developments, from an urban design and sustainability perspective. The site and the development will be able to contribute to a more sustainable built environment that makes a positive infrastructure intervention.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> The support for sustainable transport modes and travel choices will enable social transport barriers to accessing opportunity and essential services and facilities to be removed. The ability to access new developments by a range of modes is crucial for linking areas of need and opportunity, and ensuring that all in the community have the opportunity to be fully involved in society and benefit from the full range of opportunities available.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> A more carbon efficient transport system that contributes to climate change mitigation and adaptation. Air and noise quality improvements. Urban design and townscape improvements. Landscape enhancement through the alternative uses of land for vehicular parking provision.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> More energy and space efficient developments that are able to maximise economic growth through the full utilisation of the developments footprint for intended economic purposes. Increased ability to attract and retain the required workforce for economic growth and prosperity.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		Increase the number of people contributing to the economy through their ability to access employment. Enhanced demand management will result in less congestion and associated economic gains through travel time savings, predictability and improved efficiencies of the transport network.

## Allerdale Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Richard Evans	Allerdale Borough Council	No	Whilst we have little concern about the actual standards in RPG13, they are not sufficiently sensitive to real accessibility criteria relying as they do on arbitrary definitions of "Regional" and "Urban Conurbation". Also, they do not include standards for bicycles, motorbikes etc.		

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Richard Evans	Allerdale Borough Council	Not appropriate with this option.

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Richard Evans	Allerdale Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Keeping the old standards is easy to deliver!
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> NA
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> NA
		<b>D) Environment?</b> The old standards do not sufficiently reflect real accessibility issues and therefore sometimes will not follow a truly sustainable line.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> A big issue for any local economy must be the consistent and fair application of car-parking standards, so that one settlement does not gain an advantage over another by pursuing more generous standards. Where, for instance, competing town centres are close together it is important to ensure one does not seek to gain an economic advantage by seeking

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		more car-parking than its rival.

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Richard Evans	Allerdale Borough Council	In part	<p>The proposed standards are broadly supportable. However, we are concerned about how they will be applied. It is proposed to apply an accessibility questionnaire to most development proposals no matter of what scale, with few exceptions. With the ever increasing burdens for information required to assess applications there is a case for applying a scale threshold to the use of the questionnaire. We also object to the Area Accessibility Categories as defined in the consultation literature. This suggests that the categories are simply linked to the settlement hierarchy in the Regional Spatial Framework, if so, why is an accessibility questionnaire proposed? We consider that the area categories should be solely linked to accessibility criteria and not to the hierarchy. There may be a case in areas where there are a number of towns close together (or when considering small scale development), for the standards applied to be informed by the hierarchy, but in rural and remote areas the sole determinant should be accessibility. Accessibility should be the starting point in all proposals. Because of its importance, the contents of the accessibility questionnaire should be subject to consultation.</p>		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Richard Evans	Allerdale Borough Council	This option needs to be amended to be more sensitive locally, and in terms of the scale of proposals. There may also be a case for allowing flexibility in an area where the local economy is fragile (RPAs?) or in a town with particular economic problems which might not be reflected in the town's accessibility score.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Richard Evans	Allerdale Borough	<b>A) Delivery:</b> The process of delivering the standards needs more clarity. In particular, the respective roles of the settlement hierarchy and the area accessibility questionnaires in applying

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
	Council	the standards need to be spelled out. There needs to be some flexibility/local discretion in applying the standards in areas which are remote or in towns experiencing economic difficulties.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> NA
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> NA
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Tying the standards to accessibility should ensure a broadly sustainable policy but there may be local justification for flexibility.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Fragile or poor economic performance may be a justification for local flexibility.

## Haslington Parish Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
R Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	No	Understand the need to review, but accept that existing definition could be acceptable.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
R Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
R Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
R Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	In part	Satisfies the requirement to review requirements. Can work with a minimum standard of provision but do not agree with the proposal for maximum values. Maximum values should be constrained by economic factors e.g. land values and developers requirements. Limiting houses to only 2 or 3 car parking places WILL lead to parking on estate roads or outside neighbouring/older properties – leading to bad neighbour and security issues – accept the need for minimum but not maximum provision. Rural areas are increasingly isolated from shopping, educational and medical facilities the need for independent transportation is increasing – notwithstanding the increased cost of fuel. The renewed/recent trend to amalgamation of schools and PFI medical centres increasingly puts the rural community at a disadvantage. Residential development in rural areas need minimum but no maximum values for car parking provision.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
R Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	Residential development in rural areas need minimum but no maximum values for car parking provision. Standards should not be driven by a city view of the region – need to avoid the increasing domination of Manchester and Liverpool on the regions policies – they do not represent the views and needs of the rural community. Encourage provision of parking for shops, pubs, restaurants as FREE shared/public parking space to allow multiple use through the day by different types of user. Encourage use of school parking provision by other users outside school hours at NO CHARGE.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
R Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Standards should not be driven by a city view of the region – need to avoid the increasing domination of Manchester and Liverpool on the regions policies – they do not represent the views and needs of the rural community.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Residential development in rural areas need minimum but no maximum values for car parking provision. Standards should not be driven by a city view of the region – need to avoid the increasing domination of Manchester and Liverpool on the regions policies – they do not represent the views and needs of the rural community.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		<p><b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Residential development in rural areas need minimum but no maximum values for car parking provision. Standards should not be driven by a city view of the region – need to avoid the increasing domination of Manchester and Liverpool on the regions policies – they do not represent the views and needs of the rural community.</p> <p><b>D) Environment?</b> Ensure that car parking provision is designed to absorb rain water to avoid flooding issues.</p> <p><b>E) Economy?</b> Maximum parking provision should be limited only by customer/developer financial constraints not direct regional policy.</p>

## Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	-	-		

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	-

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	In part	Stockport Council supports the submission made by AGMA and has a number of additional comments.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	<p>Parking standards would be strongly dependent on travel plans, accessibility improvements and demand management. There are resourcing issues in applying or checking complex calculations / questionnaires for parking provision for each application. Most developments do not require Transport Assessments or Transport Statements to be prepared by consultants who could do the calculations. Applying a formula would be an additional burden for most of the developers that local authorities deal with. All standards should relate to gross floor area or numbers of dwellings, as this information is included in all applications. The standards divide B2 and B8 into different categories even though most applications for units are generally 'B2/B8' as for spec built units the developer doesn't know what tenant they are he is going to get. Similarly division of A1 from A2 will be difficult, if not impossible to manage as they are generally interchangeable uses. Applying maximum parking standards to a car showroom would be unworkable. Some of the differences between zones do not seem as if they will make a great deal of difference to reducing car usage but do add further complication to the process. There is considerable potential for parking standards to present perverse incentives for developers to consider first those sites where the parking allocation could be maximised, rather than those sites with maximum existing accessibility. The advantages of providing additional parking facilities close to railways should be highlighted. In respect of cycling standards a distinction is needed between long and short – term parking; employees require more secure cycle parking than someone who is 'popping in' to a shop for 10 minutes. The biggest failing of many developments currently is the siting of cycle facilities. A first consideration should be its inclusion into the main fabric of the development. If cycle parking is to be physically separate from this, the early identification of its location should be a priority, and precede that of non – disabled car parking spaces. On no account should the location of cycle parking be decided once the general parking layout has been decided. Making this clear at the Regional level will enhance the ability of councils to achieve better cycle parking</p>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
		provision.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> The resourcing of this is potentially problematic for local authorities. As this stands a key concern is that the standards are complicated for both developers and the public to understand, to the extent that dealing with this would put an additional strain on resources.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Carlisle City Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	No			In particular RSS does not consider residential car parking requirements which is now a void as PPS3 has replaced the previous guidance

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		D) Environment? -
		E) Economy? -

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	In part	The accessibility areas suggested in the RSS consultation paper are an improvement on those in the consultant's report but there are concerns if there were to be any further changes through the RSS review process		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	-

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Accessibility areas would have to be clearly defined at the local level to deliver differing standards for city centre, district and local centres and a consistent approach may be useful. Removal of the suburban reference to category C rather than B is more appropriate for regional towns and cities with a large rural hinterland. Due to business and social interactions and lack of appropriate rural transport car ownership is still required which impacts on design and layout of development. Reducing parking spaces does not reduce ownership and impacts on design of a scheme and inappropriate parking affecting safety of other road users and emergency/service vehicles
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Lambert Smith Hampton

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Jennie Hann	Lambert Smith Hampton	No	Do not agree that existing parking standards as detailed in PRG13 and draft RSS should be retained. Many of the use classes are omitted from table 1 including C3. The maximum car parking guidance for residential dwellings has been removed from national guidance, and as such a general guide should be set out in RSS, in order to ensure consistency across the region.		

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Jennie Hann	Lambert Smith Hampton	None

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Jennie Hann	Lambert Smith Hampton	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Car parking standards will remain inconsistent throughout the region and between different local authorities.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Inappropriate car parking provision will be provided across the borough, leading to congestion in the urban area.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> On street car parking provision may be enhanced if insufficient car parking is provided according to the location of the site.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Limited impact on the environment.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Investment will not be encouraged into the region if the car parking standards are inappropriate for the area.

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
-------	---------------	----------------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Jennie Hann	Lambert Smith Hampton	Yes	In general the revised standards set out in the consultants report are welcomed. It will ensure consistency throughout the region. However, for clarity a definition should be provided as to what Area A, B and C incorporate. It should also be noted that the regional parking standards do not attempt (and should not attempt) to categorise every individual location in the region. It is the role of each local authority to divide all areas within their boundaries into the three area accessibility categories, for the avoidance of doubt.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Jennie Hann	Lambert Smith Hampton	Policy RT2 should be amended to incorporate the parking standards as recommended by Mouchel. The policy should identify the broad locations for the specific car parking standards, but acknowledge the role of each authority to divide all areas within their boundaries into the three accessibility categories.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Jennie Hann	Lambert Smith Hampton	<b>A) Delivery:</b> If the RSS adopts the revised car parking standards then the local authorities will have to be in general conformity with it. As such, the relevant car parking standards should be delivered.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> The car parking infrastructure should be provided that conforms with the car parking standards.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Less potential for on-street parking within new developments.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Investment should be encouraged throughout the region with this option as the car parking standards are more realistic.

## AGMA (the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities)

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	No	See response to Option 2		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	Yes	AGMA's preference would be for Option 2, subject to clarification of a number of issues. The revised standards were prepared in line with Draft RSS; in advance of the Panel Report (following the Examination in Public) and the Government's Proposed Changes. In the light of these changes the links between key RSS policies and the new parking standards need to be reviewed, in particular how they will operate as part of the regional spatial framework given the removal from the policies of a settlement hierarchy. AGMA would wish to have the opportunity to comment in much greater detail on the proposed revised standards, since this consultation on broad		

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			options does not appear to permit this.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	Government guidance stresses the importance of decisions about housing growth being underpinned by evidence that the growth can be delivered through adequate infrastructure provision. The revised car parking standards are the only aspect of transport policy in Draft RSS to be covered in the Partial Review. It is a matter of considerable concern that the impacts on transport infrastructure requirements of the options for major housing growth are not being considered.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Government guidance stresses the importance of decisions about housing growth being underpinned by evidence that the growth can be delivered through adequate infrastructure provision. The revised car parking standards are the only aspect of transport policy in Draft RSS to be covered in the Partial Review. It is a matter of considerable concern that the impacts on transport infrastructure requirements of the options for major housing growth are not being considered.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> See a) above
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> See a) above
		<b>D) Environment?</b> See a) above
		<b>E) Economy?</b> See a) above

## GVA Grimley

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Ella Wood	GVA Grimley ( <i>on behalf of Goodman</i> )	No	There needs to be some change to allow for growth and sustainability. The proposed replacement parking guidelines consider much more detail than the existing ones.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Ella Wood	GVA Grimley ( <i>on behalf of Goodman</i> )	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Ella Wood	GVA Grimley ( <i>on behalf of Goodman</i> )	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Ella Wood	GVA Grimley ( <i>on behalf of Goodman</i> )	In part	Parking numbers should be reviewed every 5 years in line with the commitment outlined in RPG13. However, the Area Accessibility Categories which have been used to identify different levels of parking provision need to be revisited as these do not fairly reflect accessibility levels. Categories B and C should cover more of the region than they currently do with Category A only applying to city centres.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Ella Wood	GVA Grimley ( <i>on behalf of Goodman</i> )	It needs to be recognised that parking ratios which are suitable for city centres and their immediate surroundings are not always suitable for areas on the edge of large metropolitan areas. Ratios which are appropriate for city centres should only be applied in areas with significant public transport facilities, otherwise development opportunities may be restricted.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Ella Wood	GVA Grimley ( <i>on behalf of Goodman</i> )	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Emerson Group

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
D.W. Short	Emerson Group	In part	The existing standards have gained general acceptance and are relatively simple to understand and operate. It would however be better to have added to these the missing elements such as A2 and dwellings		

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
D.W. Short	Emerson Group	None, this represents a simple review exercise that can be achieved by minor changes and formal addition of bicycle and motorcycle parking standards.

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
-------	---------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
D.W. Short	Emerson Group	<b>A) Delivery:</b> No real change to existing. Additional requirements on space may, however reduce other elements of a development e.g. landscaping
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> None in particular.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Will assist in providing reasonable provision for visitors to uses such as clinics, nursing homes etc.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Minimal change.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Supports existing users and viability of commercial and retail outlets.

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
D.W. Short	Emerson Group	In part	<p>The use of the accessibility assessments and the multiple sub division of locations is an unnecessary and complex proposal that is time consuming, confusing and an exercise in time wasting for all concerned. The proposals are similar to the existing in many respects, taking aside the over complications mentioned above. As a result the need for change is minimal. The standards for retail warehouses are far too low and should be closer to non food retail. The standard for A2 seems about right. Those for C2 uses seem to be the wrong way round as less accessible locations by other means than the car have fewer spaces! The standard for housing appears reasonable as do those for D1 and sui generis uses. Disagree strongly with charging for retail developments as this will depress trade and is an admission that insufficient parking is provided for town and district centre locations. Pedantic adherence to the proposed parking management and design suggestions will be anti competitive and fail to take account of individual circumstances. Travel plans will not be viable or logical in some instances. Agree they should be provided on larger developments, possibly using the PPG 13 thresholds but not smaller A2, B1, C1, C2 and D1 users.</p>		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
D.W. Short	Emerson Group	Should be no need for any significant changes

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
D.W. Short	Emerson Group	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Chorley Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	No			Option 1 would fail to meet the commitment outlined in RPG13 to review parking standards every 5 years

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	Yes	Support Option 2 in principle but await the Consultant's report before an ultimate commitment		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	No	The standards need review and the new proposed standards are more comprehensive and are likely to be more sensitive to local circumstances		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	Yes	The proposed approach is more comprehensive and is likely to be more sensitive to local circumstances. The work better reflects the type of approach already being followed under the auspices of the Merseyside LTP. The sustainability appraisal shows that it will perform better than the existing standards.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	Consistency across sub-regions should be promoted

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Delivery is likely to be better supported where the new standards can be shown to fully reflect the actual accessibility of individual sites.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## University of Cumbria

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Phil Howard	University of Cumbria	No			Categorizing parking standards on the basis of Key Service Centres and Regional Centres is too rigid and doesn't take into account the local variations in accessibility across an economically and geographically diverse region. Even within these categories there is no differentiation between centres so the parking standard for a new HE centre in Barrow for example would attract the same parking standards as one in Manchester which would clearly disadvantage students at the former site with less good access to public transport. Also, the standards are more restrictive than those set out in PPG13 which is unrealistic for a county such as Cumbria which comprises dispersed communities over a large area with a relatively poor public transport infrastructure.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Phil Howard	University of Cumbria	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Phil Howard	University of Cumbria	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> A tightening of restrictions placed on the parking standard in comparison to that laid out in PPG13 will disadvantage Higher and Further Education students in areas where public transport infrastructure is limited. Apart from the difficulties that this will cause such students in terms of physical access to their places of study, it will also lead to overspill parking where students (and staff) take up street parking spaces that would normally be used by residents. This has a negative impact on community relations for Higher and Further Education establishments.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Phil Howard	University of Cumbria	Yes	Use of Area Accessibility Categories, and differentiation in their parking standards, will allow for more equitable standards to be applied across the region in accordance with local variations in accessibility. This solution is more appropriate for Cumbria which, being a large county with a less dense and more dispersed population, doesn't have the public transport infrastructure of the city regions.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Phil Howard	University of Cumbria	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Phil Howard	University of Cumbria	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> This approach will enable students who live in areas poorly served by public transport appropriate physical access to their places of study and help minimise on-street parking.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Congleton.gov.uk

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
--------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton.gov.uk	No	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton.gov.uk	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton.gov.uk	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton.gov.uk	Yes	It is considered that option 2 sets out a more comprehensive and appropriate range of parking standards for development.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton.gov.uk	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton.gov.uk	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## NW Transport Roundtable

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Lillian Burns	NW Transport Roundtable	No		The new standards offer a better tool.	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Lillian Burns	NW Transport Roundtable	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Lillian Burns	NW Transport Roundtable	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Lillian Burns	NW Transport Roundtable	In part	The car parking review failed to consider parking at railway stations and park & ride sites and these issues should have been part of the overall 'mix'.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Lillian Burns	NW Transport Roundtable	Reductions in car use will not be achieved through car parking standards. The need is to revise the entire RSS & RTS (inc. the RFA recommendations) to deliver better public transport, more smart choices and less road building.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Lillian Burns	NW Transport Roundtable	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Highways Agency

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jonathan Reade	Highways Agency	No	There is a need to update standards to reflect revisions to land use classes. There is a need to align parking standards with RT2 policy aim to manage travel demand, especially car use. Retaining existing standards could result in an unworkable set of standards. It could miss the opportunity to strengthen the importance of parking standards as an integral part of a successful travel demand management strategy / policy.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jonathan Reade	Highways Agency	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Jonathan Reade	Highways Agency	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jonathan Reade	Highways Agency	Yes	In order to better align with current land use classification and strengthen / support application of travel demand management in a consistent manner across the region. This allows for / provides for an easy initial assessment of parking requirements to support formulation of development plans and review of planning applications. It could avoid the need for protracted debate at an inquiry in the absence of relevant advice on the matter of parking. It supports the efficient review of planning applications and reduces the potential for conflict / misunderstanding about parking standards at any public inquiry.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jonathan Reade	Highways Agency	Policy RDF1 should recognise that LDFs need to define those towns and cities anticipated in Area Type A, B and C. Maybe a need to mention parking standards in Policy L4 Housing

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
--------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Jonathan Reade	Highways Agency	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Standards need to be embedded in LDFs and applied by local planning authorities. The application of standards needs to be assessed as part of a review of LDFs & monitored (perhaps as part of the RSS monitoring plan)
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> There maybe a greater priority given to / investment in public transport improvements / demand management technology measures.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Stricter off-highway parking standards at development may lead to greater amount of on-street parking : particularly migration from centres to adjacent residential areas. Need to consider the potential impact of land-use decisions as part of the formulation of LDFs and develop / adopt appropriate on-street parking strategy where necessary eg Residential Car Parking Zones.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Maybe possible to calculate / assess CO2 emissions saved as part of evidence base for EA of taking forward parking standards under Option 2 compared with Option 1.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Option 2 needs to form part of a broad, aligned transport / spatial strategy to address / respond to concerns about potential detrimental impact of congestion on regeneration / economic growth aspirations.

## Cheshire East Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	No	-		

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	These are my general comments on the difficulty in using this database, which is cumbersome and constantly crashing. The Limehouse system used for the S of S's proposed changes consultation was far superior.

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
-------	---------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	Yes	As above		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Chester City Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	No	The proposed car parking standards outlined by the consultants present a positive way forward in enabling a regional overview of parking provision to be created while allowing Local Authorities to tailor the precise standards to meet their local needs. The linking of parking provision to accessibility as opposed simply to the land use is a positive approach, which reflects that taken by the Council in its adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance, 'Parking Provision within Developments in Chester' (2003). However, the increased number of land use definitions, while helpful, is likely to generate a greater number of options which will result in greater complexity in interpretation.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
--------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	Yes	See previous comments		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## CPRE North West

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	No	see answers to question 2		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
--------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	Yes	This is a much more sophisticated and nuanced tool that is more fit for purpose and more likely to achieve the aims for which maximum parking standards are intended. It is a much better complement to the spatial principles, spatial framework and policies RT2 & RT9 and better implements the aims of RSS. However, it should have been further improved by addressing parking at railway stations and park and ride sites. The standards for cycling spaces could also be more ambitious in order to better reflect the context of RSS policies.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	No other policy changes are required to deliver this option.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	<b>A) Delivery:</b> This option will improve the delivery of RSS aims to reduce the level of traffic growth, manage travel demand and reduce reliance on the private car, with all the concomitant social ,economic and environmental benefits that achieving those aims will bring.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> By reducing reliance on the private car, this option should reduce pressure for the development of extra highway capacity. It may increase pressure for the improvement of public transport services and walking and cycling infrastructure, and such improvements are called for by other RSS policies.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		<p><b>C) Community and social issues?</b> If this option reduces reliance on the private car and therefore contributes to reducing traffic, etc, affected communities will benefit from relatively improved air quality, noise levels, local environmental quality, safer roads, reduced congestion, etc.</p>
		<p><b>D) Environment?</b> If this option reduces reliance on the private car and therefore contributes to reducing traffic, etc, there will be reductions in air pollution and carbon emissions.</p>
		<p><b>E) Economy?</b> If this option reduces reliance on the private car and therefore contributes to reducing traffic, etc, reduced levels of congestion will deliver economic benefits.</p>

**English Heritage** The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Judith Nelson	English Heritage	No	-		

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Judith Nelson	English Heritage	-

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Judith Nelson	English Heritage	<p><b>A) Delivery:</b> -</p>
		<p><b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -</p>
		<p><b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -</p>
		<p><b>D) Environment?</b> -</p>
		<p><b>E) Economy?</b> -</p>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Judith Nelson	English Heritage	In part	see comment under 2.3D		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Judith Nelson	English Heritage	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Judith Nelson	English Heritage	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> It is essential that in implementing car parking provision this is undertaken in sensitive manner appropriate to the context. For example, the provision of semi-basement car parking in city centres has the potential to impact on archaeology and create inactive frontages unattractive to pedestrians and the street scene. The provision of surface car parks in historic centres has the potential to harm the character and appearance of the area. The inability or the inappropriateness of providing car parking should not be seen as a reason to resist the adaptive re-use of historic buildings. These issues should be referred to in the interpretation of the car parking standards.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Dalton Hall Business Centre

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
F A Mason-Hornby	Dalton Hall Business Centre	Yes	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
F A Mason-Hornby	Dalton Hall Business Centre	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
F A Mason-Hornby	Dalton Hall Business Centre	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
F A Mason-Hornby	Dalton Hall Business Centre	No			Poor public transport in rural areas means people depend on their cars and need car parking spaces

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
F A Mason-Hornby	Dalton Hall Business Centre	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
F A Mason-Hornby	Dalton Hall Business Centre	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Graham Hale	Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership	No			<p>Cumbria County Council had been opposed to the car parking standards in the draft RSS Table 10.1 at the time of the Examination-in-Public in 2006/07, as it was concerned that that the Regional Parking Standards, as referred to in Policy RT6 – ‘Parking Policy and Provision’, appeared to indicate a more restrictive standard for Regional Towns and Cities such as Carlisle and Barrow-in-Furness, which were significantly lower than the standards set in the adopted Cumbria and Lake District JSP Policy T32 – ‘Car Parking Standards’. This point relates to the County Council’s view that Cumbria does not have a high quality network of transport links (or adequate car parking provision) to support the envisaged economic growth. As a result of the extremely rural character of the County and dispersed nature of the communities in Cumbria, car travel is likely to remain very important. Therefore car parking standards should be more flexible in Cumbria to recognise the fact that local communities are more likely to be reliant upon the use of the car compared to more urban locations elsewhere in the NW.</p> <p>In line with the EIP Panel report, the GONW accepted less stringent car parking requirements in rural areas in Table 8.1 of the Proposed Changes to RSS (North West Parking Standards), including in Key Service Centres in Cumbria, except for Carlisle, Barrow-in-Furness, Workington and Whitehaven, which would have the higher standards applicable to urban areas across the North West. In our responses to the Proposed Changes to the RSS, the less stringent standard has been supported for the rural parts of the District, but Cumbria County Council opposed the more stringent standard being applied to Carlisle, Barrow-in-Furness, Workington and Whitehaven.</p> <p>Cumbria County Council remains of the view that rural communities still</p>

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			<p>need to gain access to employment, shopping and other services in these Key Service Centres, and the higher car parking standard applied to them would hinder accessibility to such services for the rural populace in the County. The higher car parking standard would be more appropriate to the metropolitan areas of the North West than Cumbria. An extremely sparse population and widely dispersed settlement patterns make public transport uneconomic and consequently car dependency is high by national standards.</p> <p>In line with the EIP Panel's report, GONW accepted changes to Policy RT3 – 'Public Transport Framework', which requires Local authorities to introduce measures to enhance the accessibility of the regional towns and cities, such as Carlisle, Barrow-in-Furness, Workington and Whitehaven. Cumbria County Council welcomed and supported this approach. However it was considered that this Policy should be applicable to all Key Service Centres in Cumbria, as defined in the adopted Cumbria and Lake District Joint Structure Plan.</p> <p>For the above reason, Cumbria County Council would not support keeping the standards as detailed in the Proposed Changes to RSS.</p>		

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Graham Hale	Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership	None, aside from amending the Proposed Changes to RSS in accordance with Cumbria County Council's submissions.

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Graham Hale	Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership	<p><b>A) Delivery:</b> It would otherwise lead to increased inflexible use of relatively higher car parking standards for Carlisle, Barrow-in-Furness, Workington and Whitehaven that would not adequately reflect local circumstances in Cumbria, and the higher dependency upon the use of the car due to the sparse nature of the county.</p>
		<p><b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> It may reduce the need to improve infrastructure provision for alternative means of transport. It would also lessen the amount of car parking provision in these Key Service Centres, which may then add to current levels of congestion.</p>

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		<p><b>C) Community and social issues?</b> The higher car parking standard would be likely to have an adverse effect upon local communities, especially in remoter rural locations, and their ability to have adequate access to social and community facilities within Carlisle, Barrow-in-Furness, Workington and Whitehaven.</p> <p><b>D) Environment?</b> The lack of sufficient car parking spaces could potentially increase congestion within the Key Service Centres of Carlisle, Barrow, Whitehaven, and Workington and thereby harm local urban pollution levels.</p> <p><b>E) Economy?</b> The higher car parking standards would undermine the attempts to regenerate the economies within Carlisle, Barrow-in-Furness, Workington and Whitehaven, as it would make them less attractive places in which to invest, and affect the ability to attract enhanced employment skills from within Cumbria.</p>

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Graham Hale	Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership	Yes	<p>The revised standards and methodology enables both location and accessibility to be taken into account and therefore provides a more flexible and appropriate parking provision to be achieved than applying a uniform standard.</p> <p>It is noted that the car parking standards applicable to Area Type C in Table 2 are virtually the same as those contained in Policy T32 – ‘Car Parking Standards’ in the adopted Cumbria and Lake District Joint Structure Plan 2001-2016. It is considered that the higher standards in Area Type A and B are also appropriate in highly accessible locations.</p> <p>Section 6 of the consultants - Mouchel - report (2007) sets out how the different Area Type car parking standard could be applied in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• metropolitan areas,</li> <li>• non-metropolitan areas, and</li> <li>• other rural areas.</li> </ul> <p>If this were applied too rigidly in terms of relating towns and cities within Cumbria to within those 3 specific definitions, it could lead to the same concerns expressed above about the car parking standards identified in Policy RT3 in the current Proposed Changes to RSS. However, Table 6.2 and</p>		

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			Figure 6.5 provide clarity with regards where the 3 area type standards should be applied and the impact of accessibility on the overall provision.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Graham Hale	Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership	None

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Graham Hale	Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership	<b>A) Delivery:</b> If applied too rigidly and inflexibly, the option may otherwise lead to increased inflexible use of relatively higher car parking standards for Carlisle, Barrow-in-Furness, Workington and Whitehaven and perhaps other higher order settlements such as Penrith and Kendal that would not adequately reflect local circumstances in Cumbria, and the generally higher dependency upon the use of the car due to the sparse nature of the county.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> None
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> The suggested higher car parking standard could have an adverse effect upon local communities, especially in remoter rural locations, and their ability to have adequate access to social and community facilities within Carlisle, Barrow-in-Furness, Workington and Whitehaven.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> None
		<b>E) Economy?</b> None

## Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
-------	---------------	----------------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	No			

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Car Parking Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	Yes	It is considered that option 2 sets out a more comprehensive and appropriate range of parking standards for development.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	-

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -