

SCHEDULE OF ACTIONS MATTER 18 (TRANSPORT)
(Action 18.1)

Policy TR4 – Transport – Parking Standards

18.1	TR4 Transport - Provide further evidence to justify having maximum parking standards e.g. explain the negative consequences which would arise if maximum standards were removed
-------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1. Please see the response below from Lancashire County Council Highways Strategic Highways Development Control Manager (Neil Stevens) regarding this issue.
2. In response to Mr. Stevens' views (which reflect our own) it is requested that we be given the opportunity to draft a specific policy relating to Parking Standards, which neither relies on maximum or minimum standards but takes an evidenced based approach as outlined below. Further to Mr Stevens' comments Rossendale Borough Council reiterates the Highway Authority's view that, *'The approach suggested is not an argument in favour of retaining maximum (or minimum) parking standards/parking provision but is pragmatic and is based on the facts when considering a proposal (but also having regard to the influence of wider documents).'*
3. If this is not considered appropriate, the Council will accept the approach as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework at para 106.

Response from the Highway Authority

4. The concept of maximum parking standards was introduced as an element of Planning Policy guidance 13 (PPG13) in an effort to avoid the over reliance on private vehicle travel and promote alternative sustainable travel options. The premise was by restricting and controlling parking provision within new development and in areas accessible by alternative modes of transport, it would have the effect of encouraging more sustainable travel behaviour and releasing land for more productive purposes. Unfortunately, the success of this strategy in supporting the greater use of alternative travel options was limited (the issue and solution is much more complicated than a one size fits all). The private car is perceived to be more convenient and reliable than the alternatives. To date, the incentives (delivered by Lancashire County Council (LCC), Local Planning Authorities (LPA's) or through Travel Planning (TP)) for individuals to switch mode have not fully been embraced by the general public (for all journeys). Consequently, private vehicle ownership and use remains significant. When parking demand exceeds availability within a site (irrespective of the land use) then the residual parking demand is displaced (beyond the site) and impacts on the surrounding local highway network.

5. In reality car-park usage is not straightforward and has many parameters. For example, a food retail car park can often be used by other neighbouring retailers in the area as a primary or secondary trip, thus increasing parking need, but also duration of stay as a consequence in the increase in the retail offer. Alternatively, it may be the case that a nearby service, e.g. a school, results in a car park also being utilised for drop off and pick up. In addition, a car park layout (car park bay size) / restrictions (time/cost) influences operation and use, as does surrounding roads such as ease of access/egress or network congestion.

6. In March 2015 the Department for Communities and Local Government stated that, *"Local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is a clear and compelling justification and that it is necessary to manage their local road network"*.

7. The above statement was not prescriptive in terms of referring to maximum standards so it is feasible to also consider the use of minimum parking standards. With the exception of network capacity issues, the main concern in dealing with planning applications **is whether or not the parking provision will be adequate to cater for the predicted demand**. In practical terms it has been the custom to generally insist that the maximum parking standards referenced in the Joint Lancashire Structure Plan (JLSP) and/or district parking standards are met. This is because inadequate provision will invariably lead to on street parking which would be detrimental to highway safety, the movement of traffic and residential amenity.

8. Clearly limitless and uncontrolled parking is not in everyone's interest and a balance needs to be struck between provision and demand (car parking accumulation is a technique often used in determining the appropriate size of a car park). From a practical point of view there is merit to consider minimum standards adopted for development which would ensure that the highway network is not unduly affected by overspill on street parking.

9. It is suggested, for all development that parking requirements should be evidence based (on that proposed) and ideally agreed at the highway pre-application advice stage. Non-core residential developments should have traditional fixed requirements as currently exists with each district and core to be considered on a case-by-case basis. However, those current residential maximums should now be considered as minimums as a base line position and adjusted accordingly through evidence. This is considered a flexible approach best managing highway safety, parking demand and network operation. The level of parking to have full regard on the location of the development, other parking provision locally, its proximity to local services and transport opportunities, mitigation measures aimed at addressing and promoting the availability of sustainable transport options as well as future opportunities as per the local plan or highway master plans. Equally, if the development end use is known to require a labour intensive workforce then suitable adjustments can be made on a case-by-case basis. The approach suggested is not an argument in favour of retaining maximum (or minimum) parking standards/parking provision but is pragmatic and is based on the facts when considering a proposal (but also having regard to the influence of wider documents).

10. The utopia of a cheap, frequent, accessible and reliable public transport network has not yet been delivered and I don't see it coming forward soon. With this there is merit in adopting an approach as described, which will provide consistency (county-wide) and also

follows the philosophy of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Manual for Streets (MfS). This reduces reliance on historic standards and promotes a more intelligent approach having regard to all factors and policies with a stronger link to sustainable credentials and Travel Plans.

11. I am happy to work with you on the above and supporting policy following a similar style to the NPPF.