

## REPORT OF RESPONSES

<b>From</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action</b>
Erewash Borough Council	No comments	Noted.	No change.
Severn Trent	Recommend that where designing parking areas, opportunities to make the surfacing permeable are considered and where suitable taken forward.	Agree that it would be helpful to amend the text to include reference to permeable surfacing	Add new paragraph 4.15 to read: "All driveways and parking areas should be surfaced in a bound material, which is either permeable or includes appropriate drainage in the interests of highway safety and to minimise the risk of flooding."
Local resident	The draft SPD omits consideration of cycle parking standards, and other related issues such as the provision for e-bike charging, and a development management context for car club planning. The SPD should not be adopted without addressing this omission, which appears on the face of it to contradict both local and national policy contexts including those listed in the draft.	Paragraph 5.1 of the draft SPD cross refers to the Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide which sets out cycle parking and e-bike charging standards. Agree that the text should be amended to make this reference clearer.  The issue of car club planning is out of the scope of this SPD but could be addressed through the requirement for travel plans for larger developments.	Amend the first bullet of paragraph 5.1 to more clearly refer to the additional guidance included in the Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide, including specific reference to charging facilities.  No change.
Agent	At present 'private' roads have a restriction that suggests no more than five dwellings can be accessed. This is an anomaly because many private roads tend to have large detached houses with - ironically - few cars per large dwelling. Given there is a National need for more housing - it would seem eminently sensible to allow more homes to be built off private roads (not restricted to just five houses) - keeping to local planning standards parking requirements.	The comment does not directly relate to the content of the draft SPD. Unadopted private roads and access to dwellings is out of the scope of this SPD.	No change.
Environment Agency	No comments	Noted.	No change.
Papplewick Parish Council	The Parish Council would like to see 4 and 5 bedroom houses provided with 3 allocated spaces in rural areas as we believe it is more likely these homes will have young adults still at home with their own transport.  We are pleased to see the mention in 4.14 of 'at least 1 electric charging point being require for all houses'. There will be challenges to the electricity infrastructure though to enable this.	The standards are based on an updated methodology which sets standards based on anticipated future car ownership. However, we agree that it would be helpful to clarify the requirement for unallocated spaces where 3 allocated spaces are provided for 4+ bedroom houses.  Noted.	Amend Tables 1 and 2 to include reference to the requirement for 3 allocated spaces for 4+ bedroom houses.  No change.
Papplewick Parish Council	In addition to our previous comments (sent 8 <sup>th</sup> November 2021): The Parish Council advised there is no information relating to other forms of transport such as cycles, e-scooters, mobility scooters, motorcycles, especially in relation to the non-residential parking, and that for dwellings with shared access from the highway such as flats and maisonettes. New developments, and old lack anywhere to lock up and park your bike, or other modes of transport when we are supposed to be encouraging them.	Paragraph 5.1 of the draft SPD cross refers to the Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide which sets out standards for bicycles, motorcycles, mobility scooters and their charging facilities. Agree that the text should be amended to make this reference clearer.	Amend the first bullet of paragraph 5.1 to more clearly refer to the additional guidance included in the Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide, including specific reference to bicycles, motorcycles, mobility scooters and their charging facilities.

Natural England	No comments	Noted.	No change.
Ravenshead Parish Council	We are aware of the need for an increase in the number and size of parking spaces and are pleased that this is recognised within the proposal. Accordingly, Ravenshead Parish Council have supported the proposals set out therein.	Noted.	No change.
Developer	<p><u>Section 3 – Methodology, Summary and Evidence</u></p> <p>The evidence to support the residential parking standards is outdated (notably the 2011 Census data) and since this SPD will be adopted and in use for some years it would be prudent to hold out until the 2021 Census data is published in 2022.</p> <p>The summary states visitor parking has been combined with the unallocated parking requirement where relevant which Persimmon Homes welcomes in order to ensure that parking is used and schemes do not become car dominated spaces through a series of allocated/unallocated and visitor parking.</p> <p><u>Section 4 – Requirement for Residential Parking Provision</u></p> <p>The standards state that “an unallocated / visitor parking space should be available to all residents associated with the development to meet the residential parking demand of the development and includes on-street car parking”. Persimmon welcomes the inclusion of on-street parking as unallocated / visitor parking. Persimmon also welcomes the flexibility of how parking requirement is provided, as per appendix B.</p> <p>Tables 1, 2 and 3 are complicated to read and could be simplified. As it currently reads, 1 bedroom homes need anything between 1 and 2 spaces (a mix of both allocated and unallocated spaces), and could be a combination of 0 allocated and 0.8 unallocated, 1 allocated and 0.4 unallocated and 2 allocated and 0.2 unallocated. In the real world 0.2, 0.4 or 0.8 spaces won’t be provided and therefore the reader of the document will round up those figures (0.8 to 1 and 0.2 and 0.4 to 0 unallocated). This should be rectified so it is less confusing. Therefore within the category there should be no numbers with decimal place.</p> <p>If the fractions are rounded to a full parking space, this means that 1 bedroom homes could have either 1</p>	<p>The reservation concerning outdated supporting evidence has been noted. However, it should be taken into consideration that, 2011 Census data has been projected forward using National Trip End Model (NTEM) and brought to 2051. Therefore, the car ownership levels used in the SPD reflect the future need. The standards included in the revised SPD are not significantly different to those in the 2012 SPD but the opportunity has been taken to produce a clearer more user friendly document justified by the most up to date evidence available at this time.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Parking provision requirement has been calculated using 2011 Census data, Residential Car Parking Research for Nottinghamshire (2010) and National Trip End Model (2017), which provide precise information and figures expressed as a decimal. The presentation of the standards is not intended to be complex, but rather to provide developers with flexibility as to how the standards are met via a mix of allocated and unallocated spaces. The worked example provided at Appendix B to the SPD clearly explains how the standards should be used.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	<p>space or 2 spaces. Flexibility is welcomed but could also be problematic for understanding and being certain upon parking provision. The same comments have to be made about the provision detailed for 2, 3 and 4+ bedroom homes. I suggest a table that looks more like the following:</p> <p>Alternatively, if developers have flexibility to distribute spaces between allocated and unallocated as per section 3, the number of spaces does not need to be separated into allocated and unallocated.</p>		
The Coal Authority	No comments	Noted.	No change.
Councillor	<p>I am aware there is a need to increase both the number of parking places and also the size of the spaces. I am pleased that this has been recognised within the consultation document. Hopefully, once a parking space has been allocated, including those in garages, they will remain as such and will not be allowed to be removed if subsequent planning applications for the property are made.</p> <p>I believe it is important that garages are built large enough to accommodate a car and other household items, including bicycles. If the garage is not sufficiently large enough to accommodate both, it should not be included in the number of allocated parking spaces.</p>	<p>Noted. The change of use of a garage will be considered through the submission of a planning application. However if a garage meets the minimum space standards then any application to remove the condition would be unlikely to be granted planning permission unless there had been a material change in circumstances.</p> <p>The dimensions for garages in the SPD are consistent with the standards set out in the Nottinghamshire County Council's Highway Design Guide.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change</p>
Developer	<p>1. The proposed increase in parking bay sizes cannot be justified. Some cars may have increased in size but most of those changes occurred before adoption of the local plan which set the required bay sizes at 2.4m wide x 5 m deep. Who knows where we'll be post pandemic/post fuel price increases and post the banning of new petrol diesel cars?</p> <p>2. Most modern family cars do not exceed 5m in length. Very many are well below it. Some SUV's &amp; 4x4 vehicles are larger but it is inherently wrong to plan 100% of bays to suit larger cars – when most people don't drive them. It's also pertinent to note that the local plan acknowledges that smaller cars do exist and can be catered for in bay sizes at a reduced length of 4m.</p> <p>3. Increasing bay lengths to 5.5 m across the board is wasteful &amp; unnecessary. Even in a "perfect world scenario" of an ideally proportioned site, the adoption of 5.5m parking bays, results in a minimum additional land take of over 6% and almost 9% more land than required by the national standard length of 4.8m.</p> <p>4. That means less space for landscaping and/or buildings; but in reality when working with constrained sites, it may be impossible to provide parking to those dimensions. This could result in land being sterilised or at best only being developed at much</p>	<p>The draft SPD does not propose an increase in parking bay sizes. The current Parking SPD (2012) refers to Figure DG18a of the 6C's Design Guide concerning on-street parking spaces, which requires bay sizes at 6 m deep, whereas the draft SPD sets out 2.4m x 5.5m as minimum internal dimensions. However, LPD 2018 refers to Highway Requirements Part 4, which mentions 5 m as a rough approximation. These two documents mentioned above (the 6C's Design Guide and Highway Requirements Part 4) have been superseded by the Nottinghamshire County Council's Highway Design Guide which include detailed standards for various scenarios, i.e. 30°, 45°, 60° parking. The draft SPD is in accordance with the standards set out in this latest document.</p>	No change.

	<p>reduced densities resulting in inefficient use of land, which is a scarce commodity.</p> <p>5. One answer is to leave mandatory sizes as they are whilst permitting/encouraging where possible a mix of bay sizes. For example in larger car parks provision of both smaller &amp; larger vehicles. For example if an area of 4m length bays is arranged "back to back" with a bank of up to 6m bays this would fit within an existing car park grid and wouldn't require more land. In addition there may be "natural" opportunities due to accommodate larger bays. I'm also mindful that if a "venue" doesn't cater for its customers its trade will suffer.</p> <p>6. The "rural" versus "urban" parking provision is too "broad brush". There are settlements falling inside the areas defined as "rural" on the SPD plan which are more "urban" in nature &amp; well connected with public transport. An increased number of spaces but cannot be justified by any meaningful difference in car ownership or use.</p> <p>7. Finally as a matter of principle I'm not convinced that it is appropriate to automatically embrace any "revisions" to parking standards by reference to changes made in the County Council's/6C's Design Guide. Any such changes are not subject to the scrutiny of examination in the same way as Local Plan Policy is examined and should not result in additional car parking spaces being required.</p>	<p>Rural and urban classification is based on the boundaries at the geographical level middle layer super output areas (MSOA) as per the Census 2011.</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council is the highway authority responsible for the local highway network in Gedling Borough, and the Highway Design Guide should therefore be the starting point for setting out guidance on the design of parking provision in the Borough. In terms of the actual standards, a borough-specific approach has been taken based on evidence.</p>	No change.  No change
Resident	<p>I consider the draft Consultation SPD October 2021 to be inadequate and would recommend adoption of the Newark &amp; Sherwood proposals of August 2020 - Appendix A - see attached. The Newark proposal follows the Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide - see section 4.1 Residential Parking.</p> <p>My particular focus is with dwellings of 4+ Bedrooms, where I think they should have, as a minimum - 3 parking spaces plus 3 cycle parking spaces.</p> <p>Parking spaces should be a minimum of 3m x 5.5m with an additional 0.5m if bounded by a wall, fence, hedge, line of trees or similar obstruction and 1m if bounded on both sides.</p> <p>Garages should only count towards the parking provision if they have clear internal dimensions of at least 3.3m x 6m with a minimum door width of 2.4m for single garages and 6m x 6m with a minimum door width of 4.2m for double garages. If the dwelling has no provision for separate parking for cycles, lawn mowers or storage, it should affect whether the</p>	<p>Noted. The standards are based on an updated methodology which sets standards based on anticipated future car ownership. However, we agree that it would be helpful to clarify the requirement for unallocated spaces where 3 allocated spaces are provided for 4+ bedroom houses.</p> <p>The dimensions for garages in the SPD are consistent with the standards set out in the Nottinghamshire County Council's Highway Design Guide.</p> <p>The Nottinghamshire County Council's Highway Design Guide provides detailed information at part 4.2.9 regarding minimum dimensions for parallel parking. The proposed dimension in the document is 2m * 6m for parallel parking. The draft SPD requires 2.4m * 5.5m and to add 0.5m if bounded on one side by an</p>	<p>Amend Tables 1 and 2 to include reference to the requirement for 3 allocated spaces for 4+ bedroom houses.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	<p>garage should counted to the required provision.</p> <p>I also feel the new SPD should incorporate the following from the 6Cs Design Guide section 3.223 - Cars can park in front of the garage door and garage doors can be opened while a car is on the drive.</p> <p>Finally, any subsequent Planning Applications for new garages/garage conversions should obviously comply with these requirements to the letter...</p>	<p>obstruction such as a wall, fence, hedge or tree, or to add 1m if bounded on both sides. It seems to be in line with the Highway Design Guide.</p> <p>The parking of cars in front of the garage door is already covered by paragraph 4.9 of the revised SPD. However, in the interest of clarity it is intended to reword paragraph 4.9.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.9 to be reworded to read ' Tandem spaces are acceptable but no more than 3 spaces in a line will be acceptable, to include one garage space and no more than 2 driveway spaces and subject to minimum dimensions of both garages and driveways being met.</p> <p>No change</p>
Notts County Council	<p>The following information should be added to the Parking SPD:</p> <p><u>Garage door type &amp; Minimum distance from highway boundary:</u></p> <p>No garage: 5.5m Roller-shutter, sliding, or inward opening: 5.5m Up-and-over: 6.1m Hinged, outward opening: 6.5m</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.1 of the draft SPD cross refers to the Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide which sets out standards for driveway lengths, encompassing the information mentioned in the comment. Agree that the text should be amended to make this reference clearer.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 4.8 and the first bullet of paragraph 5.1 to more clearly refer to the additional guidance included in the Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide, including specific reference to driveway lengths.</p>