



Newark & Sherwood Local Development Framework

**Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide
Supplementary Planning Document**

Statement of Consultation

June 2021

Contents

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| 1.0 | Introduction | 2 |
| | Purpose of the Consultation Statement | 2 |
| 2.0 | Early Engagement | 2 |
| 3.0 | Initial Consultation | 3 |
| 4.0 | Initial Consultation Responses | 4 |
| | Issues Raised | 4 |
| | How was the Document Changed? | 4 |
| 5.0 | Final Consultation | 5 |
| 6.0 | Final Consultation Responses | 5 |
| 7.0 | Appendices | 6 |
| Appendix 1 | List of Statutory Consultees | 7 |
| Appendix 2 | Text of Email sent to statutory consultees and consultees on the Local Plan database | 8 |
| Appendix 3 | Text of Letter sent to Consultees | 9 |
| Appendix 4 | Main Issues Raised by Public Consultation and LPA Response | 10 |

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Newark & Sherwood District Council has prepared a Supplementary Planning Document ('SPD') on cycle and car parking and its design to guide new residential development that comes forward in the District. The SPD provides additional guidance to the parent policies in the Development Plan, and once adopted will be used as a material consideration for planning applications determined within the District.

Purpose of the Consultation Statement

- 1.2 This Statement of Consultation sets out the consultation which was undertaken and the responses received in relation to the Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (Consultation Draft) in accordance with Regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires that before a local planning authority adopt a supplementary planning document it must:

- a) Prepare a statement setting out –
 - i. The persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document;
 - ii. A summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
 - iii. How those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document.

- 1.3 Regulation 12 (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires that LPAs should make the document available for a minimum of four weeks. In normal circumstances, Regulation 35(1) requires that the documents are made available by the LPA for inspection at their principal office and at such other places within their area as appropriate and published on the Council's website. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Council was unable to carry out consultation in exactly the way set out in the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. Therefore the consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the 2020 Annexe of the Statement of Community Involvement.

- 1.4 This report summarises the consultation process and sets out the feedback received. These comments helped to shape the amendments made to the final draft of the SPD.

2.0 Early Engagement

- 2.1 The first draft consultation document was informed by discussions with stakeholders including other departments in the Council and Dr Stefan Kruczkowski of Urban Design Doctor Limited.
- 2.2 The first draft document was discussed at the Council's LDF Task Group on 24th August 2020 and Economic Development Committee on 9th September 2020. A second (final draft) draft of the document was discussed at the Council's LDF Task Group on 16th December 2020 and Economic Development Committee on 13th January 2021.

2.3 Prior to consulting on the SPD, the Council screened the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and / or a full Habitats Regulations Assessment to be produced. It was concluded that an SEA was not required and the SPD would not need to be subject to a full Appropriate Assessment under the Habitat Regulations.

3.0 Initial Consultation

3.1 The initial consultation took place between the 17th September and the 11th November 2020, a period of 8 weeks. A total of 30 responses were received. After the initial consultation period closed, the Council contacted a number of consultees again to ensure they had not missed the opportunity to comment.

3.2 Under Regulation 12 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the District Council contacted various specific and general consultation bodies. An indicative list of groups is set out below and full details of the statutory consultees are included at Appendix 1.

| Specific Consultees | General / Other Consultation bodies |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Members of Parliament | Housing Associations |
| County Council | Developers incl. House Builders |
| Neighbouring Authorities | Planning Agents |
| Town & Parish Councils / Meetings | Members of the Public |
| Environmental Bodies | Council Members |
| Highways England | Council Officers |
| Network Rail | |

3.2 All consultees received an email or letter by post setting out the period of consultation, where the documents could be viewed and the deadline for submitting comments (Appendix 2 & 3).

3.3 The Council published its Draft SPD on its website but due to the current COVID-19 Pandemic, paper copies were not made available as usual at Castle House or libraries within the District. The web page included a copy of the document and supporting Topic Paper, the Screening Report, along with a copy of the representation form, which could be filled in electronically or printed and returned. However in line with the Council’s 2020 Annexe to the Statement of Community Involvement paper copies of documents could be made available on request. The Council also extended the usual consultation period of 6 weeks by a further 2 weeks.

- 3.4 Notices were placed in the Local Press (Newark Advertiser, Nottingham Post and the Mansfield Chad) inviting representations and information about the consultation was posted on the Council's social media platforms.
- 3.4 In response to the consultation the District Council received 30 representations and a summary of the main issues raised and how they were addressed are included at Appendix 4.

4.0 Initial Consultation Responses

4.1 In response to the consultation, the Council received 30 responses from individuals, groups or organisations in the first consultation which ran from 17^h September 2020 to 11th November 2020. This included responses from:

- Local residents;
- Parish Councils;
- Statutory consultees (incl. Historic England & Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board)
- Developers (incl. Urban & Civic, William Davis Homes and Persimmon Homes)
- Organisations (incl. Globe Consultants & SGA LLP)

4.2 A summary of the responses received and the Council's response are set out in Appendix 4. There have also been a number of other minor changes, typos, presentational amendments and factual amendments / updates.

Issues Raised

4.3 The keys issues raised in the representations included the following:

- Support for parking standards to be differentiated between more categories (i.e. not just Newark Urban Area and the rest of the District);
- Generally in agreement that garages (both integral and detached) should be counted as a parking space provided that they are of sufficient size to accommodate both a car and storage;
- Consultees support the need for 1 bedroom dwellings to have 1 parking space provided some visitor parking can be accommodated within close proximity to smaller dwellings;
- Support for visitor parking but generally in agreement this should not be quantified and be flexible.

How was the Document Changed?

4.4 A number of changes were made to the draft document to respond to the representations received. The Council's response to the consultation comments received can be viewed at Appendix 4.

4.5 One of the key changes to the document was the introduction of a zonal approach which better reflects local circumstances and strikes the right balance between

providing appropriate levels of car parking spaces while also promoting sustainable forms of transport in areas of good public transport accessibility.

4.6 The overarching principle of the zonal approach is that residential developments located within the most sustainable locations, close to good public transport networks, local facilities and public car parks will require less parking than equivalent development in areas with lower levels of public transport accessibility. The zones are proposed as follows:

- Newark Town Centre;
- Inner Newark
- Rest of Newark Urban Area
- Service Centres (Clipstone, Ollerton & Boughton and Rainworth)
- Rest of the District (including Southwell and Edwinstowe).

4.7 A detailed map of the zones in Newark Urban Area has been produced and is included within the SPD at Map 1 and 2 to enable users to clearly identify which zone an individual site is situated within.

5.0 Final Consultation

5.1 The final consultation took place between the 19th January and 10th March 2021, a period of 8 weeks. A total of 14 responses were received. The District Council contacted all consultees previously consulted and those who had responded to the initial consultation.

5.2 A summary of the responses received and the Council's response are set out in Appendix 5.

6.0 Final Consultation Responses

6.1 In response to the final consultation, the Council received 14 responses from individuals, groups or organisations in the final consultation which ran from 19th January 2021 to 10th March 2021. This included responses from:

- Local residents;
- Statutory consultees (incl. Historic England & Sport England)
- Developers (incl. Urban & Civic & Persimmon Homes)
- Parish Councils.

6.2 The same process as the initial consultation was undertaken in respect of notifying local residents and consultees and where the consultation documents were made available to view.

Issued Raised

6.3 A summary of the responses received and the LPA responses are set out in full in Appendix 5.

How had the Document Changed?

- 6.4 A number of minor changes were made to the SPD, mostly typos. However, an amendment was made to the wording of Figure 4 which brought the text in line with Key Principle 2 in order to reflect the SPD's position as guidance rather than a requirement.

7.0 Appendices

Appendix 1: List of Statutory Consultees

Appendix 2: Text of Email sent to statutory consultees and consultees on the Local Plan database

Appendix 3: Text of Letter sent to statutory consultees and consultees on the Local Plan database

Appendix 4: Initial Consultations Responses and LPA Response

Appendix 5: Final Consultation Responses and LPA Response

Appendix 1 List of Statutory Consultees

| Organisation | |
|--|--|
| All parish councils within the District | All Council Members |
| Age UK | Anglian Water |
| Ashfield District Council | Bassetlaw District Council |
| British Gas | BT |
| The Coal Authority | Central Lincolnshire Joint Planning Unit (Lincoln, North Kesteven & West Lindsey) |
| East Midlands Chamber | EE Customer Services |
| Environment Agency | Campaign to Protect Rural England |
| Gedling Borough Council | Historic England |
| Highways England | Homes England |
| Home Builders Federation | Lincolnshire County Council |
| Leicestershire County Council | Melton Borough Council |
| Mansfield District Council | Members of Parliament |
| National Trust | National Grid |
| Natural England | Newark & Sherwood Clinical Commissioning Group |
| Network Rail | Newark & Sherwood District Council Planning Development |
| Newark & Sherwood Community & Voluntary Service | Nottinghamshire County Council |
| Nottinghamshire Coalition for Disabled Persons | Nottinghamshire Police |
| Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue | Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust |
| O2 | Rushcliffe Borough Council |
| Severn Trent Water | South Kesteven District Council |
| Three Customer Services | Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board |
| Vodafone | Western Power Distribution |

Appendix 2 Text of Email sent to statutory consultees and consultees on the Local Plan database

Dear Consultee,

Public Consultation on the Draft Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document ('SPD') 2020

The Council has published the Draft Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide SPD for an eight week period of consultation commencing on 17th September 2020 until 11th November 2020. The SPD will set out the parking standards and design principles for parking in new residential developments in the District. This encapsulates both car and cycle parking and will apply when considering planning applications for new residential developments.

The Council is seeking views from local residents, landowners, developers, town and parish councils, registered housing providers and other interested stakeholders. The SPD can be accessed at <https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/spd/>

There are a number of ways you can comment on the Draft SPD:

1. Email: simply fill in the electronic Comments Form and return it to planningpolicy@nsdc.info: or
2. Post: fill in a copy of the Comments Form and return it to:

Planning Policy
Newark and Sherwood District Council
Castle House
Great North Road
Newark
Nottinghamshire
NG24 1BY

The closing date for comments is 5:15pm on 11th November 2020.

Regards,

Appendix 3 Text of Letter sent to Consultees

Dear Consultee,

CONSULTATION ON NEWARK & SHERWOOD LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – RESIDENTIAL CYCLE AND CAR PARKING STANDARDS & DESIGN GUIDE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT ('SPD')

I am writing to let you know that the official consultation period on the Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide SPD will take place between September 17th 2020 and November 11th 2020. The SPD will set out the parking standards and design principles for parking in new residential developments in the District. This encapsulates both car and cycle parking and will apply when considering planning applications for new residential developments.

The SPD and a response questionnaire can be viewed on the Council's website at <https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/planningpolicy/spd/>. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there will be no hard copy kept at the Council offices and as a result the period of consultation has been extended by a further two weeks.

If you have any questions in the meantime please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Appendix 4

Main Issues Raised by Initial Public Consultation and LPA Response

Each of the questions are set out below. Responses are summarised and the Council has responded to each comment directly in the table below. The consultation responses summary does not include the personal details of private individuals.

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposed role and scope of the Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide SPD? Please provide further comment if there is anything you would change in relation to the proposed role and scope of the SPD.

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|--|--|--|
| 001 / Resident of South Muskham | Agrees with proposed role and scope of the SPD. | The support for the proposed role and scope of the SPD is welcomed. |
| 006 / Collingham Parish Council | Agrees with proposed role and scope of the SPD. It is a good base document as the District moves forward and for future development. | The support for the proposed role and scope of the SPD is welcomed. |
| 007 / Resident of Sutton on Trent | Agrees in principle. The consultee points to the need of parking standards to take into account the location of new builds, the nature of new builds (such as infill) and the width of old roads and where public service buildings impact within an estate. | <p>The support for the proposed role and scope of the SPD is welcomed.</p> <p>The draft SPD does take into account the location of new residential development and different types of residential development (including redevelopment and reuse of existing buildings) but this will be made clearer within the document.</p> <p>The width of roads and impact on public service buildings is outside the scope of the SPD.</p> |
| 008 / Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board | Generally agrees with the proposed role and scope of the SPD. | The support for the proposed role and scope of the SPD is welcomed. |
| 012 / TOWN-PLANNING.CO.UK | Parking Standards is supported in principle but not in its current form. | The support for parking standards in principle is welcomed. |
| | The consultee does not agree with the desire to encourage electric vehicle charging points in new | The Council would like to reiterate this is Guidance, not policy. The encouragement of EVCP's is consistent with the requirements of National |

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| | development and believes it adds an unnecessary financial burden and introduces new policies outside of the Development Plan. | <p>Policy in Paragraph 105 and 110 of the NPPF. Changes to Building Regulations requiring electric charging points are anticipated early in 2021 and in light of this we think the Guidance is appropriate. NSDC have spoken with a number of providers of electric charging points to ascertain whether there is financial burden as a consequence of encouraging this. The findings are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EV Charging Solutions provide a domestic wall mounted charger (mode 3 at 7kW [fast charging]) for £400-£550. The cost of installation is additional. They have advised where a charging point is unviable, dummy units can be installed for c£50. This means the front can be removed and a charger fitted in its place by future occupants. • EON - £875 per charging point including installation. This excludes the Government scheme discount and is the cost for individual dwellings, not the price if bulk bought. • British Gas - £961 per charging point including installation. This excludes the Government scheme discount and is the cost for individual dwellings, not the price if bulk bought. • Scottish Power - £899 per charging point including installation. This excludes the Government scheme discount and is the cost for individual dwellings, not the price if bulk bought. <p>The Council believe that charging points should be encouraged for all new homes, but in the event that meeting the full requirement would render the development unviable, a requirement to install a dummy charger will be encouraged. This will not add a financial burden and the text in the SPD shall be updated to reflect this.</p> |
| | The issue of viability has not been addressed in respect of electric vehicle charging points and cycle parking. | The Council believes the cost of additional equipment (i.e. charging points and cycle storage) is modest. The implications from the design guidance represents recognised good urban design principles taken for the most part from Building for a Healthy Life, a recognised standard. We |

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| | | do not consider that their implementation should cause an issue in viability terms as it is incumbent on applicants to demonstrate high standards or design and layout in order to satisfy DM5, SP7 as well as Paragraphs 110 and 124 of the NPPF. It is advised that applicants factor in the need to meet these high standards from the outset. |
| | The consultee believes the provision of one electric vehicle charging point per dwelling in the event of unallocated parking spaces is excessive. | This guidance is in accordance with the Government's 2019 consultation on <i>"Electric vehicle chargepoints in residential and non-residential buildings"</i> which is understood to become implemented in spring 2021. The Government are seeking to phase out petrol and diesel fuelled vehicles by 2035 thus strengthening the need to provide facilities for alternatively fuelled vehicles will become a requirement as demand grows exponentially. |
| | The consultee believes the SPD fails to recognise that Western Power do not have capacity in the network to accommodate charging points in new development. | Western Power provides an online 'EV Capacity Map' which has assessed the available capacity at each site and have represented this as a generic level of EV Charging Capacity. It explains that for the lowest level ('some capacity available') management of charging may need to be considered but it is only expected to be a reactive solution in certain cases whilst Western Power create additional capacity. This map identifies that there are 459 sub stations in the District, and of these 388 have either 'capacity available' or 'extensive capacity available'. Only 15% have 'some capacity available'. Therefore it is considered that there is sufficient capacity in the network to accommodate charging points in new developments. https://www.westernpower.co.uk/smarter-networks/electric-vehicles/ev-capacity-map |
| | Parking Standards proposed are contrary to Paragraph 105 of the NPPF. | The Council consider the parking standards are compliant with Paragraph 105 of the NPPF, this is outlined in Appendix 2. |
| | The consultee believes the testing of case studies in respect of parking standards should not just be purely arithmetical. | Comments noted. The Council have assessed each case study based on its design and layout alongside its assessment the quantity of parking standards. |
| 013 / Fernwood Parish Council | Agrees with proposed role and scope of the SPD. | The support for the proposed role and scope of the SPD is welcomed. |

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| 015 / Historic England | Agrees with the proposed role and scope of the SPD. The content at present would provide opportunities for enhancing places, particularly Conservation Areas where parking and street clutter can affect one's appreciation of the character of an area. | The support for the proposed role and scope of the SPD is welcomed. |
| 016 / Persimmon Homes East Midlands | The consultee believes the SPD cannot be lawfully adopted as such and falls outside the scope of Regulation 5 (1) (a) (i), (ii) and (iv) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. | The Council believes the SPD fully meets the Regulations. See appended Table for full details. |
| | The SPD will introduce significant new burdens of new development which have significant impact on viability and should be examined as part of the local plan adoption process. | The Council believes the cost of additional equipment (i.e. charging points and cycle storage) is modest. The implications from the design guidance represents recognised good urban design principles taken for the most part from Building for a Healthy Life, a recognised standard. We do not consider that their implementation should cause an issue in viability terms as it is incumbent on applicants to demonstrate high standards or design and layout in order to satisfy DM5, SP7 as well as Paragraphs 110 and 124 of the NPPF. It is advised that applicants factor in the need to meet these high standards from the outset. |
| | The consultee believes the Topic Paper fails to consider all factors in paragraph 105 of the NPPF. | The Council consider the parking standards are compliant with Paragraph 105 of the NPPF. See appendix 2. |
| | The level of encouraged cycle parking provision is excessive. | The level of encouraged cycle parking is aimed at encouraging ownership and use of cycles. There should be opportunity for cycle storage for both those community on cycles and those who cycle recreationally. It is reasonable to assume that most households who cycle, particularly families, will own one bike per family member. The guidance allows some flexibility in the number of cycle parking spaces in certain situations (i.e. site specific constraints such as change of use proposals) |
| | The design principles in Key Principle 2 are too prescriptive and will result in indistinguishable and repetitive design. | Key Principle 2 is built on the principles of Building for a Healthy Life which is a recognised urban design standard, and one endorsed by the National Design Guide as a key reference, which seeks to create places |

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Key Principle 2 will reduce the number of dwellings that can be accommodated on site and is contrary to the NPPF as it does not result in an effective use of land.</p> | <p>that are better for people by making more attractive places with well-designed streets and well-integrated car parking.</p> <p>The overriding objective of the planning system is to deliver sustainable development and achieving high standards of design and layout is key to this objective. Housing developments should be both well designed and fit for purpose. Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 127 outlines that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area. It should also be noted that land provided for parking measures which aren't fit for purpose (such as driveways / garages too narrow and rear parking courts which aren't used) is an ineffective use of land. Therefore there should be a balance between effective use of land and developments which are fit for purpose and well-designed because the NPPF should be read as a whole document.</p> <p>The Council has allocated land with an estimated capacity (at generally either 40dph in Newark and 30dph elsewhere) which greatly exceeds its objectively assessed need. It is also noted the Council has a five year land supply so there is no existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs in respect of Paragraph 123 of the NPPF and the Council do not consider this to be relevant. In addition, there are three allocations which are included as case studies which delivered well in excess of this which demonstrates there is scope to improve the overall design of schemes but still meet the Council's objectively assessed need. Notwithstanding a number of case studies provided a higher number of parking spaces than the recommended standards require, these were just not the most effective parking solutions.</p> |

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | | Wellow Road, Ollerton | Ridgeway, Farnsfield | Nottingham Road, Southwell |
| | | No. of Dwellings Allocated | 125 | 35 | 30 |
| | | No. of Dwellings Built | 147 | 60 | 34 |
| | The consultee believes that electric vehicle charging points will be required through Building Regulations and inclusion in the SPD is surplus to requirements. | Only a consultation has yet occurred (closed October 2019), the outcome has yet to be announced. The Council considers it is important to encourage provision for EVCP's until a time where the Government makes them mandatory. | | | |
| 024 / Persimmon Homes Nottingham | Agrees with proposed role of the Parking Standards but the consultee believes the SPD cannot be lawfully adopted as such and falls outside the scope of Regulation 5 (1) (a) (i), (ii) and (iv) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. | Comments noted. The Council believes the SPD fully complies with the Regulations. See Appendix 4a for details. | | | |
| 025 / Southwell Town Council | Agrees with proposed role and scope of the SPD. | The support for the proposed role and scope of the SPD is welcomed. | | | |
| 028 / Globe Consultants | Is pleased that the SPD has been produced but is confused as to why it does not cover non-residential development. Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide is out of date and refers to old standards. | Comments noted. The Council only wish to pursue parking standards for residential development at the current time. The Highway's Authority is due to adopt a new Highway Design Guide in early 2021 which will address non-residential development. | | | |
| 029 / SGA LLP | Agrees in principle but has concerns that an over provision of spaces would result in over dominance. | Comments noted. The SPD has been amended to include more parking standards (Newark Town Centre, Inner Newark, Rest of NUA, Service Centres and Rest of District), when assessed against the case studies, in a number of cases the case studies provided a greater level of parking than that recommended. Therefore the Council do not believe this to be a concern. | | | |
| | Increasing size of parking spaces will have a negative impact. | Comments noted. This increase is in line with the recommendation from the Highways Authority. The reason being is that a standard parking | | | |

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>space in a car park is 2.4m. This is usually between other spaces. The average width of a car is c1.8m plus mirrors so on average you would have 0.6m between vehicles to open a door and enter or exit a car. On a driveway you would not be able to reasonably get out of an average car parking within a 2.4m wide space if between walls or you would likely need to step onto the garden if open plan. It would also be unlikely to provide sufficient passage to the side of a vehicle given that, in accordance with Regulation 5 of 'The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) (Amendment) (No. 4) Regulations 2005', mirrors may project up to 200mm beyond the overall width of a car, so another 0.4m as usually on both sides. At 3.0m you would have room to comfortably open a car door and walk down the side of the vehicle. Parking spaces need to be fit for purpose and convenient for the homeowner. The Topic Paper (Case Studies) highlights that where drives are narrow, on street parking becomes more frequent.</p> |
| | <p>Advice in Key Principle 2 could potentially result in the need to provide a distance of 8m between dwellings in a typical 3 bed semi-detached arrangement to accommodate the requirement vehicles.</p> | <p>The Council believes that there are a variety of parking solutions which can be used in line with best practice contained in Building for a Healthy Life. The parking standards have also been amended (standards (Newark Town Centre, Inner Newark, Rest of NUA, Service Centres and Rest of District) and in all cases except Rest of the District, only two spaces are required, this could be in the form of frontage parking.</p> |
| <p>030 / Barton Willmore c/o Urban & Civic</p> | <p>The consultee supports the role and scope of the Draft SPD and confirm that they do not challenge anything in principle. However they do suggest amendments to be considered (see additional comments below).</p> | <p>Comments are welcomed and noted.</p> |

Question 2: Does the SPD provide sufficiently clear guidance on what will be sought in relation to parking on new residential development? Please provide further comment if there is anything you would change in relation to the clarity of the document.

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|--|---|--|
| 001 / Resident in South Muskham | It goes a long way to supply clear guidance but each application should be based on its own merits. | Comments noted. There is sufficient flexibility in the SPD to allow for this where appropriate. |
| 006 / Collingham Parish Council | Agrees the SPD provides clear guidance but can't be certain until implementation begins. | Comments noted. |
| 007 / Resident in Sutton on Trent | The consultee believes estate roads are not wide enough for visitor parking which causes displaced parking frustrating road users. | Comments noted. The width of the carriageway is the responsibility of the Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) and falls outside the scope of this SPD. |
| 008 / Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board | Agrees that the SPD provides sufficiently clear guidance on what will be sought. | The comments are welcomed and noted. |
| 012 / TOWN-PLANNING.CO.UK | The consultee believes the SPD has a number of incompatible factors including discouraging tandem parking, large amounts of frontage parking and rear parking courts. | Key Principle 2 is built on the principles of Building for a Healthy Life which is a recognised urban design standard, and one endorsed by the National Design Guide as a key reference, which seeks to create places that are better for people by making more attractive places with well-designed streets and well-integrated car parking. There are a variety of parking solutions available to developers without encouraging on street parking and Building for a Healthy Life provides a number of examples of good parking solutions. However, further illustrations are to be provided in the document to demonstrate this in more detail. |
| | The consultee believes increasing the width of a parking space from 2.4m to 3m has a significant impact on schemes and viability has not been assessed. | Comments noted. This increase is in line with the recommendation from the Highways Authority. The reason being is that a standard parking space in a car park is 2.4m. This is usually between other spaces. The average width of a car is c1.8m plus mirrors so on average you would have 0.6m between vehicles to open a door and enter or exit a car. On a driveway you would not be able to reasonably get out of an average car parking within a 2.4m wide space if between walls or you would likely need to step onto the garden if open plan. It would also be unlikely to provide sufficient passage to the side of a vehicle given that, in accordance with Regulation 5 of 'The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) (Amendment) (No. 4) Regulations 2005', mirrors may project up to |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | 200m beyond the overall width of a car, so another 0.4m as usually on both sides. At 3.0m you would have room to comfortably open a car door and walk down the side of the vehicle. Parking spaces need to be fit for purpose and convenient for the homeowner. The Topic Paper (Case Studies) highlights that where drives are narrow, on street parking becomes more frequent. |
| | The Consultee disagrees with the Council's decision to discourage loose driveway materials within settlements. | Comments noted. The text already makes reference to recommending the surface finish of the driveway in the settlement boundary to be incorporated into a wider sustainable drainage scheme. However, the text will be amended to include the encouragement of 'smooth and hard porous materials'. Loose materials are discouraged in the settlement (although there may be some circumstances where appropriate such as barn conversions), particularly, large scale developments, because they encourage loose items to be deposited on the adoptable area of the highway (including the footway) which poses a safety risk. |
| 013 / Fernwood Parish Council | Agrees that the SPD provides sufficiently clear guidance on what will be sought. | The comments are welcomed and noted. |
| 015 / Historic England | Agrees that the SPD provides sufficiently clear guidance on what will be sought. The content at present would provide opportunities for enhancing places, particularly Conservation Areas where parking and street clutter can affect one's appreciation of the character of an area. | The comments are welcomed and noted. |
| 016 / Persimmon Homes East Midlands | The consultee believes Key Principle 1 in respect of cycle parking is vague and implementation needs to be clear what cycle parking is expected and where. | The text in Key Principle 1 has been amended to include reference to Table 1 and 2 (rather than just Table 1). |
| 024 / Persimmon Homes Nottingham | The consultee believes the document is generally clear but that the requirements are unlawful and excessive. It is believed the document lacks sufficient evidence to justify the recommendations in the SPD. | The Council has outlined in Appendix 4a why we believe the SPD is lawful. The parking standard recommendations in the SPD are based on the evidence in the Topic Paper and the recommendations for cycle parking and provision of electric vehicle charging points are a pragmatic response to the requirements of the NPPF. |
| | Fails to consider how the requirements of the SPD will affect viability. | The implications from the design guidance represents recognised good urban design principles taken for the most part from Building for a |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Healthy Life, a recognised standard. We do not consider that their implementation should cause an issue in viability terms as it is incumbent on applicants to demonstrate high standards or design and layout in order to satisfy DM5, SP7 as well as Paragraphs 110 and 124 of the NPPF. It is advised that applicants factor in the need to meet these high standards from the outset.</p> |
| | <p>Fails to consider the implications on land take. Recommends a blueprint should be commissioned to consider the impacts on land take and considered against Paragraph 123 of the Framework.</p> | <p>The overriding objective of the planning system is to deliver sustainable development and achieving high standards of design and layout is key to this objective. Housing developments should be both well designed and fit for purpose. Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 127 outlines that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area. It should also be noted that land provided for parking measures which aren't fit for purpose (such as driveways / garages too narrow and rear parking courts which aren't used) is an ineffective use of land. Therefore there should be a balance between effective use of land and developments which are fit for purpose and well-designed because the NPPF should be read as a whole document.</p> <p>The Council has allocated land with an estimated capacity (at generally either 40dph in Newark and 30dph elsewhere) which greatly exceeds its objectively assessed need. It is also noted the Council has a five year land supply so there is no existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs in respect of Paragraph 123 of the NPPF and the Council do not consider this to be relevant. In addition, there are three allocations which are included as case studies which delivered well in excess of this which demonstrates there is scope to improve the overall design of schemes but still meet the Council's objectively assessed need. Notwithstanding a number of case studies provided a higher number of parking spaces than the recommended standards require, these were just not the most effective parking solutions.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | | Wellow Road, Ollerton | Ridgeway, Farnsfield | Nottingham Road, Southwell |
| | | No. of Dwellings Allocated | 125 | 35 | 30 |
| | | No. of Dwellings Built | 147 | 60 | 34 |
| 025 / Southwell Town Council | The consultee suggests including more 'good' examples of design including Electric Vehicle Charging Points and cycle parking. | Comments noted. The Council will seek to include more examples of 'good design'. | | | |
| 028 / Globe Consultants | Welcomes the specific reference to parking provision at retirement / sheltered / extra care housing but believes there should be a minimum standard for both cycle parking and care parking to safeguard provision for disabled people, shift working staff and visitor provision. | Comments noted. Certain types of accommodation will require more parking provision than others and the Council believe it is most appropriate to determine this on a case by case basis depending on the type and nature of the accommodation proposed. | | | |
| 029 / SGA LLP | The consultee believes the SPD gives conflicting advice and the tandem diagrams are incomplete. | Comments noted. The tandem parking diagram is not exhaustive of all options but is provided to highlights examples of good and bad practice. | | | |
| | The SPD should provide examples of compliant schemes. The image showing frontage parking is misleading as it does not comply with the SPD. | Comments noted. Additional examples will be provided. The photographs are purely illustrative of what good design could look like. This particular photograph shows the rule of 4:1 which we seek to encourage. This is not illustrating the size of the spaces or the number of spaces which should be provided, but demonstrates how the 4:1 rule could be designed and implemented. | | | |
| 030 / Barton Willmore c/o Urban & Civic | Does not object to car parking requirements which are split between Newark Urban Area and Rest of the District or the standards set out in Table 1 but would suggest a plan showing these locations is set out to provide absolute clarity. | Comments welcomed and noted. A plan will be provided showing the extent of Newark Urban Area. | | | |

Question 3: Do you think integral garages should be counted as car parking space(s)? Do you think bicycles and mobility scooters should be stored in garages or elsewhere? Please provide an explanation.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 001 / Resident from South Muskham | Garages should be counted as a parking space and believes bikes and mobility scooters should be stored in garages or elsewhere to protect the property and keep amenity space open and clear. | Comments noted. The Guidance is considered to remain appropriate so it will count a parking space so long as it is of a sufficient size to accommodate a car and storage area for gardening equipment / bicycles and where appropriate, mobility scooters. |
| 006 / Collingham Parish Council | Garages should be counted as a parking space as long as it is of a sufficient size to accommodate a car and storage area for gardening equipment / bicycles and mobility scooters. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so it will count a parking space so long as it is of a sufficient size to accommodate a car and storage area for gardening equipment / bicycles and where appropriate, mobility scooters. |
| 007 / Resident from Sutton on Trent | The consultee has concerns about the size of garages and inability to accommodate the modern car and asks what NSDC propose for secure cycle storage. | The internal dimensions encouraged in the SPD are appropriate for the modern day car. Secure cycle storage should be lockable and undercover but the location of this will depend upon the developer. A sentence will be included in the SPD to encourage lockable and undercover storage. |
| 008 / Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board | The consultee believes garages should not be counted as a parking space as they are often not used for their intended purpose and it is difficult to compel people to only use for parking a car. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so it will count a parking space so long as it is of a sufficient size to accommodate a car and storage area for gardening equipment / bicycles and where appropriate, mobility scooters. It is always the occupiers chose as to how they use their garage, but one of sufficient size may encourage them to use it for their intended purpose. There is also a concern that parking will dominate the streetscene if garages are not counted as spaces. |
| | The consultee believes it is reasonable to store cycles and mobility scooters in a garage but this might not be practical and appropriate to do. A dedicated facility for either should not be required. | Comments noted. Mobility scooters storage should only be considered where bungalows are proposed. It will be down to the developer to determine if storage is appropriate within a garage and if not, where else. |
| 012 / TOWN-PLANNING.CO.UK | The consultee believes garages should be counted as parking spaces but considers the use of planning conditions to prevent garages from being used for other purposes should be adopted. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so it will count a parking space so long as it is of a sufficient size to accommodate a car and storage area for gardening equipment / bicycles and where appropriate, mobility scooters. |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | | The SPD seeks to put in place positive guidance over how the parking requirements of new development can be appropriately managed. Where implemented, this will provide residents with ample opportunity for their parking needs to be met without the need to resort to on street parking, without the need for the restrictive conditioning. From a practical perspective we would also have concerns over enforceability. |
| | Cycle parking should be within garages. Specialist cycle shelters are better suited to apartment blocks or HMOs. | Comments noted. |
| | The consultee believes the cycle parking standards for apartments in unrealistic and will impact on amenity space and landscaping. | Comments noted. The Council do not consider the cycle parking standards to be unrealistic. It is anticipated most apartment schemes will occur in or around Newark Town Centre and the service centres which are the most accessible and sustainable for cycling short trips and therefore should be encouraged. Secure cycle parking should not have a significant impact on amenity and could, for example, comprise of multiple stands in a lockable shelter that all residents have access to. |
| | Cycle parking should be differentiated between the largest settlements i.e. Newark, Ollerton/Boughton, Southwell, Edwinstowe and elsewhere. The opportunity to use cycles as a primary means of day to day transport is greatest in these largest settlements where services/facilities can be accessed in a 2 mile radius. | Comments noted. The cycle parking standards are not differentiated between settlements because households outside the largest settlements may wish to store bicycles for recreational cycling. |
| 013 / Fernwood Parish Council | The consultee agrees that garages should only be counted as parking spaces if they are large enough to fit a car and usual storage. | Comments noted. |
| 015 / Historic England | New development should ensure sufficient off street parking provided in addition to sufficient storage space for bicycles and mobility scooters so that development is futureproofed and has the best outcomes for the historic environment. On-street parking and street clutter can affect one's appreciation of the character of an area, particularly in | Comments noted. |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | Conservation Areas or within the setting of other heritage assets. | |
| 016 / Persimmon Homes East Midlands | The consultee believes that provided integral garages have sufficient internal space to park a car they should be counted as a parking space. | Comments noted. |
| | Bicycles / mobility scooters could be stored in a garage or cycle shed located close to the house. | Comments noted. |
| 024 / Persimmon Homes Nottingham | The consultee believes that garages should be counted as a parking space. | Comments noted. |
| | The consultee believes garages can accommodate bicycles and so designated storage is not necessary. | Comments noted. |
| | The need for mobility scooter parking is unjustified and lacks evidence for such a need. | The SPD recommends that only where bungalows are proposed should mobility scooter parking be given consideration. Users of mobility scooters will likely occupy single storey properties. |
| 025 / Southwell Town Council | The consultee believes garages should not be counted as parking spaces but they are rarely used for such purpose. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so it will count a parking space so long as it is of a sufficient size to accommodate a car and storage area for gardening equipment / bicycles and where appropriate, mobility scooters. |
| 028 / Globe Consultants | The consultee believes that garages should not be counted as car parking spaces as they are too small to accommodate modern cars. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so it will count a parking space so long as it is of a sufficient size to accommodate a car and storage area for gardening equipment / bicycles and where appropriate, mobility scooters. |
| 029 / SGA LLP | The consultee believes garages should be counted as parking spaces. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so it will count a parking space so long as it is of a sufficient size to accommodate a car and storage area for gardening equipment / bicycles and where appropriate, mobility scooters. |
| | Sufficient and appropriate, secure storage should be required for cycles and mobility scooters and these should be accessible; however there should be suitable planning consideration and guidance given as to how this can be achieved in all cases if large numbers of unsightly metal, timber and plastic | Comments noted. The SPD will allow bicycles and mobility scooters to be stored in garages provided they are of sufficient size to accommodate both those and a car. Where this is not the case, careful consideration will be given during the planning application process. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | lockups are not to become over prevalent pieces of street furniture. | |
| 030 / Barton Willmore c/o Urban & Civic | The consultee believes that garages should count towards the required parking space provision otherwise parking can dominate the street scene. | Commented noted. The SPD will remain as written so it will count a parking space so long as it is of a sufficient size to accommodate a car and storage area for gardening equipment, and where appropriate, mobility scooters. |

Question 4: Do you think the car parking standards should differentiate between Newark Urban Area and the rest of the district? Do you think there should be one standard applicable to the whole district? Please provide an explanation.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 001 / Resident from South Muskham | The consultee believes car parking standards should be circumstantial and dependent upon the application and location. | Commented noted. The Council believes there is sufficient flexibility in the SPD to enable this. |
| 006 / Collingham Parish Council | NUA and rest of the district are different in character, parking needs and car ownership so different standards are appropriate. | Comments noted. |
| 007 / Resident from Sutton on Trent | The consultee has concerns that the population will be not able to afford electric vehicles and the SPD should be encouraging more walking and cycling, as well as a need to improve public transport within the District and County. | Comments noted. The Council acknowledges the affordability of electric cars could become a serious problem, but cost of EV's is outside the scope of the SPD and consider the guidance over cycle requirements have been appropriately incorporated. |
| 008 / Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board | It would generally make sense to apply a different standard in an urban area to a more rural location. The availability of public transport and potentially better cycle links would mitigate the provision of less parking spaces in urban locations. Space can also be at a premium in urban areas and mitigation maybe required to support the viability of a development. More rural locations are likely to have less effective transport links but potentially more space available to provide enhanced onsite parking facilities. | Comments noted. |
| 012 / TOWN-PLANNING.CO.UK | The consultee believes car parking standards should differentiate between 'Central Newark', 'Outer Newark', 'Rest of NUA', Service Centres and Rest of District. | The Council have further reviewed the evidence available (both census data and the case studies) and will update the standards to reflect the following zones: Newark Town Centre, Inner Newark, NUA, Service Centres and Rest of the District (including Edwinstowe and Southwell).. |
| | The Council need to give consideration to conversions and the fact they don't have large curtilages to meet such requirements. | Commented noted. Text has been updated to explicitly refer to change of use proposals. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 016 / Persimmon Homes East Midlands | Agrees there should be some differentiation between areas but should not be limited to Newark Urban Area. | Comments noted. The Council have further reviewed the evidence available (both census data and the case studies) and will update the standards to reflect the following zones: Newark Town Centre, Inner Newark, NUA, Service Centres and Rest of the District (including Edwinstowe and Southwell). |
| 024 / Persimmon Homes Nottingham | Lack of justification and evidence for the need for different parking standards in Newark Urban Area is not provided and should not be limited to such. | Commented noted. The Council have further reviewed the evidence available (both census data and the case studies) and will update the standards to reflect the following zones: Newark Town Centre, Inner Newark, NUA, Service Centres and Rest of the District (including Edwinstowe and Southwell). The evidence is outlined in the Topic Paper. |
| | The SPD should be guidance and not strictly adhered to where it can be demonstrated that the development has good transport links close by | Comments noted. The standards will reflect public transport links / sustainable location but it is also important that realistic levels of car parking demand is anticipated to guard against displaced and anti-social behaviour. |
| 025 / Southwell Town Council | The evidence suggests differentiation may be appropriate although the Newark Growth Point being a long way out of the town centre might need to be the same as the rest of the District. | Comments noted. The Council have further reviewed the evidence available (both census data and the case studies) and will update the standards to reflect the following zones: Newark Town Centre, Inner Newark, NUA, Service Centres and Rest of the District (including Edwinstowe and Southwell). |
| 028 / Globe Consultants | Agrees that parking standards should differentiate between NUA and the rest of the district. | Comments noted. The Council have further reviewed the evidence available (both census data and the case studies) and will update the standards to reflect the following zones: Newark Town Centre, Inner Newark, NUA, Service Centres and Rest of the District (including Edwinstowe and Southwell). |
| 029 – SGA LLP | The consultee believes one standard should be applied to the District. It may be reasonable to try and have fewer cars in urban areas, but if that is the case, there are many other areas in the district that are just as urban as Newark | Comments noted. The Council have further reviewed the evidence available (both census data and the case studies) and will update the standards to reflect the following zones: Newark Town Centre, Inner Newark, NUA, Service Centres and Rest of the District (including Edwinstowe and Southwell). |
| 030 / Barton Willmore c/o Urban & Civic | The consultee does not object to the parking standards set out in Table 1 but a plan to define these locations would be useful to provide clarity. | Commented noted. A plan will be provided showing the extent of Newark Urban Area. |

Question 5: Do you think that 1 bedroom dwellings should be required to provide 1 parking space or 2 parking spaces? Please provide an explanation.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 001 / Resident from South Muskham | The consultee believes a 1 bed dwelling should have two spaces to account for couples who may live together. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written as on balance we don't consider dedicated provision beyond that to be appropriate as it will potentially lead to car parking dominated schemes. The SPD will however be amended to require visitor parking where appropriate. |
| 006 / Collingham Parish Council | The consultee believes 1 space is sufficient provided there is some visitor parking within close proximity. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so that 1 bed dwellings provide 1 parking space. |
| 007 / Resident from Sutton on Trent | The new bungalow at Crow Park Avenue / The Meerings (Sutton on Trent) appears to be for a single bedroom occupancy yet has two parking spaces to the front presumably one is for the tenant, and the other for a visitor (?) I think this should be the norm for single occupation properties and particularly in rural areas. I also appreciate that in this case (above) that the roads are narrow and not really suitable for visitors parking on the highway. The new estate at Saxon Fields also appears to have a narrow road and is apparently going to have space for a retail unit in the future and this could lead to parking problems within the estate. | Comments noted. The SPD will seek 1 space for a 1 bed dwelling but will encourage visitor parking to be provided within close proximity to smaller dwellings. The width of the highway is outside the scope of the SPD. |
| 008 / Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board | It is often argued that a couple living in a one bed dwelling will both have a car and so two spaces should be provided. However, appropriate design can make such properties unappealing to two car couples. Also the use of incentives by developers to encourage people to use other modes of transport in the form of cycle vouchers and secure parking or subsidised public transport can make these properties more appealing to those people who do not have a reliance on the motor car. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so that 1 bed dwellings provide 1 parking space. The use of incentives is outside the scope of the SPD. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 012 / TOWN-PLANNING.CO.UK | The consultee believes 1 bedroom properties should have 1 parking space with additional provision of visitor parking where needed. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so that 1 bed dwellings provide 1 parking space. Visitor parking will be encouraged around smaller dwellings but will not be quantified. |
| 013 / Fernwood Parish Council | The consultee believes 1 bedroom properties should have 1 parking space but a number of visitor spaces within close distance. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so that 1 bed dwellings provide 1 parking space. Visitor parking will be encouraged around smaller dwellings but will not be quantified. |
| 016 / Persimmon Homes East Midlands | 1 space for a 1 bedroom property is suitable. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so that 1 bed dwellings provide 1 parking space. |
| 022 / William Davis Homes | The consultee believes 1 bedroom properties should have 1 parking space. 2 spaces per 1 bedroom dwelling would not support the desire to shift towards the use of sustainable transport means. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so that 1 bed dwellings provide 1 parking space. |
| 024 / Persimmon Homes Nottingham | A 1 bedroom dwellings should provide 1 parking space. Anymore will clutter the street scene and harm the character of the area. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so that 1 bed dwellings provide 1 parking space. |
| 025 / Southwell Town Council | Probably two, although concerned about cars dominating the house frontages. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so that 1 bed dwellings provide 1 parking space. |
| 028 / Globe Consultants | The consultee believes that 1 parking space per 1 bed dwelling is sufficient for a town centre location but perhaps not so much in other locations. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so that 1 bed dwellings provide 1 parking space, but it is noted that these are <u>minimum</u> parking standards. |
| 029 / SGA LLP | The consultee believes that 1 parking space per 1 bed dwelling is sufficient although visitor parking may be required. | Comments noted. The SPD will remain as written so that 1 bed dwellings provide 1 parking space and there is sufficient flexibility in the SPD to accommodate visitor parking where appropriate. |
| 030 / Barton Willmore c/o Urban & Civic | The consultee supports the parking standards for Newark Urban Area. | Comments are welcomed and noted. |

Question 6: Do you think the residential parking standards should include provision for visitor parking? Do you think apartments should provide visitor parking spaces?

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 001 / Resident from South Muskham | Absolutely, various visitor only spaces should be provided dotted around the site so as not to inconvenience visitors. | The SPD will be amended so that visitor parking is encouraged around smaller dwellings but will not be quantified so as to reduce the likelihood of car parking over dominating the streetscene. |
| 006 / Collingham Parish Council | The consultee believes there should be some provision for visitor parking. | The SPD will be amended so that visitor parking is encouraged around smaller dwellings but will not be quantified so as to reduce the likelihood of car parking over dominating the streetscene. |
| 007 / Resident from Sutton on Trent | The consultee believes parking standards must include provision for visitor parking and have regard to deliveries to homes. Elderly people also require a number of people to visit them and need somewhere to park once or twice a day. | The SPD will be amended so that visitor parking is encouraged around smaller dwellings but will not be quantified so as to reduce the likelihood of car parking over dominating the streetscene. |
| 008 / Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board | The consultee believes visitor parking is required but not necessarily in a formal arrangement. A well designed layout can provide a more informal arrangement that can accommodate an element of visitor parking on street. Dependent upon location and connectivity of given site. | The SPD will be amended so that visitor parking is encouraged around smaller dwellings but will not be quantified so as to reduce the likelihood of car parking over dominating the streetscene. |
| 012 / TOWN-PLANNING.CO.UK | The consultee believes if visitor parking is required then the parking standards should be lower. | The SPD will recommend that visitor parking is encouraged around smaller dwellings but will not be quantified so as to reduce the likelihood of car parking over dominating the streetscene. The standards will not be lowered because visitor parking is not quantified. |
| 013 / Fernwood Parish Council | The consultee believes visitor parking should be included in the parking standards and provided for apartments. | The SPD will be amended so that visitor parking is encouraged around smaller dwellings (incl. apartments) but will not be quantified so as to reduce the likelihood of car parking over dominating the streetscene. |
| 015 / Historic England | New developments should ensure that sufficient off street parking is provided so that development has the best outcomes for the historic environment. On-street parking and street clutter can affect one's appreciation of the character of an area, particularly in | The SPD will be amended so that visitor parking is encouraged around smaller dwellings but will not be quantified so as to reduce the likelihood of car parking over dominating the streetscene. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | Conservation Area's or within the setting of other heritage assets. | |
| 016 / Persimmon Homes East Midlands | Visitor parking should not be a mandatory requirement but equally there should be some flexibility to allow for this where appropriate within developments depending upon local circumstances. | The SPD will be amended so that visitor parking is encouraged around smaller dwellings but will not be quantified so as to reduce the likelihood of car parking over dominating the streetscene. The levels of visitor parking will be determined on a case by case basis. |
| 024 / Persimmon Homes Nottingham | If a road is single sided the perhaps layby visitor parking could be considered. However, Persimmon have experienced negative reactions to visitor parking from the Highway Authority who adopt the roads because layby parking introduces additional maintenance issues. The SPD should defer to the adopting body in this instance to avoid imposing a standard which developers cannot get adopted. | Comments noted. Following discussion with the Highway's Authority, laybys for visitor parking will be generally discouraged however there may be some circumstances where they may be considered a suitable alternative but are likely to attract a commuted sum for future maintenance. |
| 025 / Southwell Town Council | Visitor parking should only be provided for apartments with allocated spaces. | The SPD will be amended so that visitor parking is encouraged around smaller dwellings but will not be quantified so as to reduce the likelihood of car parking over dominating the streetscene. The levels of visitor parking will be determined on a case by case basis. |
| 028 / Globe Consultants | The consultee believes visitor parking should be included for apartment schemes particularly if parking provision may not be sufficient and lead to on street parking. | Comments noted. The SPD will be amended so that visitor parking is encouraged around smaller dwellings (including apartments) but will not be quantified so as to reduce the likelihood of car parking over dominating the streetscene. The levels of visitor parking will be determined on a case by case basis. |
| 029 / SGA LLP | The consultee believes visitor parking should be provided but only for a minor percentage of dwellings (say 30%) with two spaces of fewer. The consultee also believes that apartments should have say 50% of dwellings with visitor parking spaces. | Comments noted. The SPD will be amended so that visitor parking is encouraged around smaller dwellings (including apartments) but will not be quantified so as to reduce the likelihood of car parking over dominating the streetscene. The levels of visitor parking will be determined on a case by case basis. |
| 030 / Barton Willmore c.o Urban & Civic | The consultee considers the residential parking standards proposed to be acceptable. Considers the use of on-street parking to be generally supported and for each development to be considered on a case by case basis. | Comments welcomed and noted. |

Additional Comments

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 001 / Resident from South Muskham | Provision should be made for disabled parking for residents of, and visitors to, the development. | The County Council provide disabled parking bays on a need by need basis within residential areas based on application criteria; however, as parking is always at a premium we would not provide it as a matter of course. |
| 002 / Conservation Officer at NSDC | The bespoke cartsheds / car ports would be over-engineered. It is suggested a caveat is included for conservation areas / listed buildings whereby garaging might be acceptable if modestly below those standards. | Comments noted. The text will be amended to reflect this. |
| 004 / Severn Trent Water | It is recommended that the statement about requiring a smooth hard surface for driveways is amended to include reference to the use of permeable surfacing where possible and to highlight the need to incorporate SuDs thinking into the development. | Comments noted. The text will be amended to reflect this. |
| 005 / Environment Programme Officer at NSDC | Welcomes the inclusion of cycle parking within the Guidance, especially in areas of multiple occupation such as flats. | The support for the inclusion of cycle parking standards in the SPD is welcomed. |
| 006 / Collingham Parish Council | No questions have been asked about cycle parking. | Comments noted. The Council only asked questions where it was unclear what the best approach might be. |
| | The images used in the document of cycling infrastructure are wide streets with designated off carriageway cycle facilities. This should be possible but is it realistic when there is no existing infrastructure in place and no space to install them on the existing highway. | Comments noted. The images are examples of good design and best practice, however the scope of the SPD does not include the provision of off carriageway cycle facilities. |
| 007 / Resident from South Muskham | Will the requirement for EVCP's be on posts or sockets near the front door, how will the electric current be provided and will it have an impact on current electricity supplied? How will new EV owners connect | All new homes will be encouraged to provide an electric charging point. Whether this is on a post or wall mounted will depend on the developer / homeowner but will have to comply with Building Regulations. Western Power confirm there is sufficient capacity in the network for electric charging points at most substations. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | to electric supply when they don't have a charging point? | |
| | The consultee agrees with 4.1 Frontage Rule but asks whether it will not be necessary for a pavement area to be incorporated into the design for the benefit of postmen and other delivery services etc. and what safety features will be incorporated for them. | Commented noted. Developers will include clear access to the front door. |
| | Given the current narrow roads (particularly in the old urban and rural areas) and pavements in rural areas how will it be possible to accommodate pedestrian and separate cycle paths both within new residential areas as well as within urban areas and rural areas of the sort shown in the photograph on page 14 of the SPD? | Comments noted. Unfortunately the width of roads and cycling infrastructure is outside the scope of the SPD. These are examples of good design and for illustration purposes only. |
| 008 / Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board | The consultee asks who will be responsible for the maintenance of unallocated off street parking provision. | Commented noted. This will be dependent on the nature of the proposed development. |
| | Frontage Parking reads as those a block of four spaces should have the equivalent width of landscape area adjacent (i.e. 4 bays). The consultee suggests the wording is clarified. | Commented noted. The text has been amended accordingly. |
| | Parking bay sizes seem overly generous at 5.5m x 3m with an additional 0.5m width where adjacent to a boundary feature. Is there appropriate justification that could be defended at appeal? | Comments noted. The text has been amended to reduce 0.5m to 0.3m as this was a typo. This increase is the size of the parking space however, is in line with the recommendation from the Highways Authority. The reason being is that a standard parking space in a car park is 2.4m. This is usually between other spaces. The average width of a car is c1.8m plus mirrors so on average you would have 0.6m between vehicles to open a door and enter or exit a car. On a driveway you would not be able to reasonably get out of an average car parking within a 2.4m wide space if between walls or you would likely need to step onto the garden if open plan. It would also be unlikely to provide sufficient passage to the side of a vehicle given that, in accordance with Regulation 5 of 'The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) (Amendment) (No. 4) Regulations 2005', |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | mirrors may project up to 200m beyond the overall width of a car, so another 0.4m as usually on both sides. At 3.0m you would have room to comfortably open a car door and walk down the side of the vehicle. Parking spaces need to be fit for purpose and convenient for the homeowner. The Topic Paper (Case Studies) highlights that where drives are narrow, on street parking becomes more frequent. |
| | Agrees with discouraging rear parking courts. | The support for discouraging rear parking courts in the SPD is welcomed. |
| | Who will pay for electricity supply and maintain equipment for EVCP's in unallocated parking spaces? | A software based management system can be procured that bills drivers directly for the charging they consume. Tariffs can be set by a responsible party (i.e. management company or resident board member) with flexibility to change pricing to include a small fee for maintenance. |
| | Photo on Page 17 looks like a ransom strip. Strong policies within a development plan and appropriate conditions and possibly S106 obligations can help provide better connectivity between sites. | Comments noted. |
| 009 / Harby Parish Council | Appears to be a sensible approach for future development and support the proposals. | The comments are noted and welcomed. |
| 010 / Resident from Bleasby | Supports the provision of Electric Charging Points. | The support for encouraging the provision of electric charging points is welcomed. |
| | Long waiting lists for home charging points and lack of publicly available charging points (particularly in Southwell) | Comments noted but this is outside of the Council's control. |
| 012 / TOWN-PLANNING.CO.UK | Consultation has been unusually low key and does not comply with provisions on the 2015 SCI or 2020 Annexe. | The Council believes the consultation was undertaken in line with the provisions set out through the SCI (and 2020 Annexe) with additional publicity put in place to allow reasonable opportunity for those whose details we don't hold to have sight of the draft document. |
| | Non-residential parking standards cannot be relied upon from a document which has not yet been produced and such standards should be contained in an additional SPD. | The text has been amended to refer to the Highway's Authority rather than the Design Guide document. Advice should be sought from the Highway's Authority as to the level of provision of non-residential parking standards. |
| | Directs the Council to review Arkwood's scheme at Bowbridge Road under 20/00275/FULM in respect of | The purpose of the SPD is to encourage higher standards of design and layouts where the car does not dominate the streetscene. |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | parking. It relies upon continuous frontage parking, rear parking courts and tandem parking. | |
| 013 / Fernwood Parish Council | Welcomes the discouragement of rear parking courts and to provide parking in locations where cars can be seen from within their homes. | The comments are noted and welcomed. |
| 017 / Resident from Newark | The consultee believes no kerbside parking should be allowed and new builds should have their own parking. | Comments noted. |
| | All new homes should have a lockable electric charging point. | All charging points will be constructed in line with Building Regulations. |
| | No new homes should be built on green belt areas (Clay Lane) which are utilised for recreation or exercise. | Comments noted however this is outside the scope of the SPD. |
| | The area needs more rentable accommodation for the elderly and disabled. | Comments noted, however this is outside the scope of the SPD. |
| 018 / Individual | The consultee believes all new builds should have their own parking and probably an EVCP. | Comments noted. |
| 019 / Individual | The consultee believes the SPD is well thought out, well planned and has enough provision for cars, cycles and electric charging points. | The comments are noted and welcomed. |
| 020 / Resident from Bilsthorpe | The consultee suggests that residents could be convinced to cycle based on providing a cost / benefit angle. | The comments are noted but this is outside the scope of the SPD. |
| | Questions how in table 4 of the Topic Paper, the average number of cars per household figure is arrived at. | The average number of cars per household is extrapolated from the 2011 Census. This is most recent data we have access to on car ownership levels. |
| | The consultee recommends updating page 15 of the Topic Paper to reflect the hourly bus service to Ollerton. | Comments noted, and has been amended accordingly. |
| 021 / Individual | The consultee believes the proposals look good but need safe lanes for bicycles and mobility scooters | Comments noted, but cycle lanes are outside the scope of the SPD. |
| 022 / William Davis Homes | The consultee believes discouraging tandem parking will have a major impact upon density, viability and | Comments noted. The Council have amended the wording to discourage overreliance on tandem parking rather than completely discourage it, |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | ultimately delivery. It also offers natural surveillance as well as breaking up the dwelling / parking ratio. | however tandem parking restricts the ability for the car at the front to exit the drive and encourages residents to park on the road, which we are seeking to avoid. |
| | The consultee suggests amending Figure 1 to locate parking to the frontage of the dwelling rather than just the garage and would reinforce the Key Principle whilst maintaining densities. | Comments noted. The Council will seeks to amend figure 1 to illustrate all examples of acceptable parking solutions. |
| | The consultee recommends that the SPD does not slow down the delivery of sites, but leave opportunity for discussion relating to parking design and standards to be had between applicant and the Council on a site by site basis as required by Para 38 of the NPPF. | Comments noted. The Council believes there is sufficient flexibility in the SPD to ensure the delivery of sites does not slow down. |
| | The consultee has concerns that because there is no standardised format for EVCP, they may become obsolete. It would be more appropriate to let the end user purchase the EVCP. In some cases, parking solutions do not allow EVCP's where the wires would trail across another space. Suggests the wording 'where suitable' is added to Key Principle 3 and / or seek provision of a dedicated electric spur for future EVCPs. | Comments noted. Building Regulations are due to be updated in early 2021 which will require all new homes to provide electric charging points. The Council believes the SPD supports the direction of change. |
| | The consultee is concerned of the impact EVCP's will have on the local electricity network and the cost required to upgrade areas with little capacity. Recommends any impact these costs will have on housing supply should be mitigated through EVCP exemption so as not to affect the delivery of homes. | Comments noted. Western Power provides an online 'EV Capacity Map' which has assessed the available capacity at each site and have represented this as a generic level of EV Charging Capacity. It explains that for the lowest level ('some capacity available') management of charging may need to be considered but it is only expected to be a reactive solution in certain cases whilst Western Power create additional capacity. This map identifies that there are 459 sub stations in the District, and of these 388 have either 'capacity available' or 'extensive capacity available'. Only 15% have 'some capacity available'. Therefore it is considered that there is sufficient capacity in the network to accommodate charging points in new developments. |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | https://www.westernpower.co.uk/smarter-networks/electric-vehicles/ev-capacity-map |
| | The viability of achieving EVCP on each dwelling must be thoroughly tested through the Local Plan to accord with NPPF Paragraph 57 and supporting PPG. It is not for an SPD to develop new policy and must be removed from the document. | The Council believe that no viability testing needs is required as the SPD is Guidance and should EVCP's not be viable across the development, there is an alternative mechanism in place with no impact on viability (dummy charger). |
| 024 / Persimmon Homes Nottingham | The consultee believes the SPD contains onerous requirements that developers will find difficult to meet whilst trying to deliver housing numbers for the District. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 3 parking spaces for 3 dwellings 2. Cycle and mobility scooter parking 3. Discouraging tandem parking 4. 4:1 parking ratio | Housing developments should be both well designed and fit for purpose. Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 127 outlines that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area. There is the need to strike an appropriate balance between good design and housing delivery. Good design should not be at the expense of that delivery. It is considered that the guidance and principles contained within the SPD provide that balance. Reflecting the contents of the Development Plan and its approach towards delivering objectively assessed housing need, maintaining a five year land supply and promoting high standards of design. |
| | The consultee believes the SPD lacks justification in certain areas. Why is tandem parking not supported and why is NUA subject to less onerous parking requirements than everywhere else. | Commented noted. All justification is contained in the Topic Paper or is supported by National Planning Policy. Tandem parking is not encouraged because it restricts the first car in the space as it is blocked in by the second car. Inconvenient parking arrangements are likely to increase the number of cars parked on the street. After reviewing the evidence again, the District will be divided into more categories in respect of parking standards however, NUA has different parking standards because it is more sustainable and has better access to public transport networks. |
| | The SPD lacks flexibility. | Comment noted. However the Council believe there is sufficient flexibility in the SPD to deal with sites on a case by case basis if appropriate if issues are identified. |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | 4:1 Ratio is problematic for developers and creates an array of problems for design of development and is unrealistic. Developers will struggle to achieve a suitable density and therefore impact upon housing numbers. | Comments noted. The Council believes it is important that parking spaces do not dominate the street scene and the SPD seeks to encourage a better balance of parking solutions. |
| | The SPD states that soft landscaping should be taller than cars which will create visibility issues when reversing / driving on and off driveways. Soft landscaping is already practice by many developers to enhance street scene and screen frontage parking and can be done without 4:1 rule. | Comments noted. This recommendation has been removed. |
| | The EVCP requirements should be changed from requiring a 32amp socket to a 13 amp socket to reduce impact on electricity network. An external fuse spare is more than sufficient and provides users with flexibility to use all kinds of chargers (with an adaptor). | Building Regulations is due to be updated in early 2021 which will require all new builds to accommodate an electric charging point therefore the Council consider their Guidance to be appropriate. |
| 025 / Southwell Town Council | The consultee is delighted to see a requirement for EV charging and cycle parking. | The comments are noted and welcomed. |
| | The consultee believes there is a need to find a way of creating dedicated cycle ways (particularly on school routes). | The comments are noted but cycleways are outside the scope of the SPD. |
| 026 / Coddington Parish Council | The consultee has queried the apparent lack of future provision of electric charging points for terrace housing where there is no vehicular access. | Comments noted. This is outside the scope of the SPD as it only focuses on new residential development rather than existing housing. |
| 027 / Balderton Parish Council | The consultee has requested that any future residential development should have slightly wider roads to accommodate the on-road parking that will almost certainly occur, which would allow for emergency vehicles in particular to pass freely and safely. | Comments noted. The width of the carriageway is outside the scope of the SPD. |
| 028 / Globe Consultants | The guide is called 'Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards and Design Guide' and it begins in the | Comments noted. The Council agree that this has occurred in error and has been corrected. |

| | | |
|---------------|--|---|
| | <p>Executive Summary with reference to car parking before cycle parking. (However, this is different in the main text). In order to promote the importance of active and sustainable travel the document should consistently cover cycle parking first and car parking as a secondary consideration.</p> <p>Globe welcomes the addition of EV charging points to new residential development but in practical terms it is hard to provide charging points for apartments unless the provision is 1 parking space and 1 charging point per apartment. In some cases the provision of car parking could be a communal provision especially if active and sustainable travel modes are being promoted in a town centre location. It also might be that visitors to the apartments wish to access an EV charging point. How would the EV charging point be located in these circumstances?</p> | <p>The SPD is written as such to anticipate the situation where apartments do not provide one space per dwelling and will recommend one charging point per space. A software based management system can be procured that bills drivers directly for the charging they consume. Tariffs can be set by a responsible party (i.e. management company or resident board member) with flexibility to change pricing to include a small fee for maintenance.</p> |
| 029 / SGA LLP | <p>There is a danger that cars will over dominate the street scene.</p> <p>If the SPD is to be used as a design guide, all needs to be looked at in much more detail to ensure that feasibility of housing provision is not jeopardised.</p> | <p>Comments noted. The Council believe the proposed parking standards and supporting design guidance will prevent such from occurring.</p> <p>The SPD is based on the design principles of Building for a Healthy Life which is a recognised urban design standard, and one endorsed by the National Design Guide as a key reference, which seeks to create places that are better for people by making more attractive places with well-designed streets and well-integrated car parking. Housing developments should be both well designed and fit for purpose. Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 127 outlines that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area. There is the need to strike an appropriate balance between good design and housing delivery. Good design should not be at the expense of that delivery. It is considered that</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | the guidance and principles contained within the SPD provide that balance. |
| 030 / Barton Willmore c/o Urban & Civic | Key Principle 2 should be amended to ensure soft landscaping, including tree planting where appropriate, compliments the street scene and takes account of highway safety. | Comments noted. Reference to tree planting has been amended to include reference to 'where appropriate'. |
| | Key Principle 3 should be amended to require all homes to be provided with passive provision for electric vehicles. | Comments noted. Key Principle 3 has been amended to reflect the most up to date advice from electric charging point providers. |
| | Key Principle 3 sets out that residential developments that do not provide one space per dwelling or provide unallocated parking spaces must accord with the minimum specification. The consultee believes the Council should consider a mixture of active EV points (i.e 1 in 10 spaces) and passive infrastructure for the remaining spaces. | Comments noted. The encouragement of EVCP's is consistent with the requirements of National Policy in Paragraph 105 and 110 of the NPPF. Changes to Building Regulations requiring electric charging points are anticipated early in 2021 and in light of this we think the Guidance is appropriate. |

Appendix 4a: Compliance with Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

Regulation 5 must be read in light of Regulation 2 which defines a ‘Local Plan’ as “any document of the description referred to in regulation 5 (1) (a) (i), (ii) or (iv) or 5 (2) (a) or (b)”. Regulation defines a “supplementary planning document” as “any document of a description referred to in regulation 5 (except an adopted policies map or a statement of community involvement) which is not a local plan”. The SPD falls within Regulation 5 (1) (a) (iii) since the SPD seeks to expand on the broad design principles contained in the DPD documents.

| | |
|--|---|
| Regulation 5 (1) (a) (i) - the development and use of land which the local planning authority wish to encourage during any specified period. | The SPD does not encourage the development and use of land because all land concerned with the SPD is residential (and in some cases a mixed use). The use of the land which the local planning authority wish to encourage is residential development, so the SPD is not contrary to this criterion of the Regulations. Policies related to housing are contained within the Amended Core Strategy (2019) and the Allocations and Development Management DPD (2013). |
| Regulation 5 (1) (a) (ii) - the allocation of sites for a particular type of development or use. | The SPD does not allocate any land for any purpose including residential development so it follows that Regulation 5(1)(a)(ii) does not apply. |
| Regulation 5 (1) (a) (iv) - development management and site allocation policies, which are intended to guide the determination of applications for planning permission | Any planning policy document (whether a DPD or SPD) is designed to guide the determination of applications for planning permission; if it did not do this, it would serve no purpose. It is therefore important to read Regulation 5 (1)(a)(iv) alongside (iii), which indicates that a document will be an SPD where it is setting out particular objectives, i.e. details, so as to achieve a broader development goal contained in the parent policies. The SPD is purely guidance which sets out particular objectives as to how to achieve “appropriate and effective parking provision” and by ensuring that “vehicular traffic generated does not create new, or exacerbate existing on street parking problem” as outlined in SP7. The SPD alone will not guide or regulate applications for planning permission. |
| Regulation 5 (2) (a) - any document which— (i) relates only to part of the area of the local planning authority (ii) identifies that an area as an area of significant change or special conservation, and (iii) contains the local planning authority's policies in relation to the area; and | The SPD does not meet any of the criteria within Regulation 5 (2) (a) so it does not apply. |
| Regulation 5 (2) (b) - any other document which includes a site allocation policy. | There are no site allocation policies within the document so it does not apply. |

Appendix 4b: Compliance with Paragraph 105 of the NPPF

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>A) The accessibility of the development</p> | <p>The recommended parking standards reflect the accessibility of the development with lower standards applying in those parts of the District where greater opportunity exists for travel on foot, by bicycle and by public transport. Reflecting different accessibility levels, the District is split into xx areas for the purpose of applying the recommended parking standards:</p> <p>Area 1: Newark Town Centre Area 2: Inner Newark Area 3: Newark Urban Area (NUA) Area 4: Service Centres Area 5: Rest of the District</p> <p>The location of the development will define the recommended parking standards.</p> |
| <p>B) The type, mix and use of development</p> | <p>The standards provide flexibility for different types, mixes and use of development (such as mixed use developments, redevelopment and reuse of historic buildings and change of use proposals) where such standards may not be achievable.</p> |
| <p>C) The availability of and opportunities for public transport</p> | <p>The requirement for residential development to provide car parking is relaxed in the Town Centre (and in some other circumstances), where accessibility levels are high due to the availability of public transport and the need to own a car is therefore reduced. Beyond these locations, particularly Newark have ‘good’ public transport connectivity, car ownership levels and projections are such that the application of the proposed standards are appropriate. Implementation of the Guidance will be closely monitored and where public transport usage increases and / or car ownership levels drop this will trigger a review.</p> |
| <p>D) Car ownership levels</p> | <p>Current and expected car ownership levels are outlined in the supporting Topic Paper.</p> |
| <p>E) The need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.</p> | <p>The SPD encourages the provision of EVCP’ to support this policy objective.</p> |

Appendix 5

Main Issues Raised by Final Public Consultation and LPA Response

Each of the questions are set out below. Responses are summarised and the Council has responded to each comment directly in the table below. The consultation responses summary does not include the personal details of private individuals.

Question 1: Do you have any comments on the changes made to the Draft SPD?

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| 002 – NSDC Conservation | We are supportive of the principle of providing consistent design advice and improving the design of residential parking and bike storage. | The support for the principle of providing consistent design advice and improving the design of residential parking and bike storage is welcomed. |
| | <p>Many heritage assets in the district are residential or have part-residential use (e.g. flats in upper floors). Consequently, a recommended standard for the provision of cycle storage, car parking availability and the design of parking layouts may negatively impact the setting and significance of many designated and non-designated heritage assets in the district as it may distract from their architectural or historic value.</p> <p>The ‘Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide’ SPD has been amended to include some flexibility in the policy wording to ensure the setting of any heritage assets is not compromised by the application of a strict criteria. This will be important to ensuring that the local authority can best conserve the setting and significance of the district’s heritage assets when determining applications, in accordance with Section 16 of the <i>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</i>. We, therefore, have no objections to the additional wording in Key Principle 1 and 2 of the document.</p> | The support for the amendments to the SPD are welcomed. |
| 004 – Severn Trent Water | Severn Trent have no major concerns regarding the approach outline within the Residential cycle and car parking standards & design guide SPD. We appreciate the additional reference to permeable surfacing that has been included in Key Principle 2 to address concerns raised in our previous response. | Comments are noted and welcomed. |

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 007 – Resident of Sutton on Trent | It would be desirable if all vehicles could be parked both off road and also pavement in both urban and rural areas so that they do not impede public transport vehicles, emergency vehicles, and delivery vehicles. | Comments are noted. It is agreed that it is desirable for all vehicles to be parked both off road and off pavement however it is acknowledged that this will not always be achievable. The SPD is a mechanism to encourage future residents to utilise parking in the best possible way but cannot ensure no road parking occurs. |
| | I am still of the opinion that all 1 bedroom accommodation should have two parking spaces which will allow for the resident's car and also those of a family member who may be calling on the resident and also for a care worker's car as and if necessary. | As noted in the Council's response to initial consultation comment, the SPD will seek 1 space for a 1 bed dwelling but will encourage visitor parking to be provided within close proximity to smaller dwellings. We do not consider dedicated provision beyond that to be appropriate as it will potentially lead to car parking dominating the streetscene. |
| | EVCP's should be placed so that they are available to all. | All charging points will be constructed in line with Building Regulations. Ensuring EVCP's are placed so that they are available to all is outside the scope of the SPD. |
| 012 – Town-Planning.co.uk | Paragraph 2.14 refers to a local transport note; these do not form national planning policy or guidance and are not referred to by the NPPF or Planning Practice Guidance. These local transport notes provide advice to local highway authorities. As such this paragraph 2.14 should be deleted as it incorrectly suggests that this is national planning policy, which it is not. | LTN 1/20 has been prepared by Department for Transport and 'provides guidance to Local Authorities on delivering high quality, cycle infrastructure'. It is a document which provides national guidance and is of importance to the SPD and therefore no changes are required to the aforementioned SPD. |
| | Table 1 still includes reference to non-residential development, the words on the advice of the highway authority does not overcome the fact that this SPD deals with residential parking standards. Therefore, no reference to non-residential development should be covered anywhere in the SPD. | Comments noted. It is an important tie for the reader that brings both documents together referencing the fact that while the SPD only deals with residential development, there are in fact also standards for non-residential development contained in a separate document. The Highway's Design Guide has now been adopted by the County Council and therefore has been subject to consultation and subsequent adoption, therefore can refer to document. |
| | The cycle parking requirements have been amended to become recommendations rather than mandatory. However, they should still be differentiated between the largest settlements i.e. Newark, Ollerton / | The level of encouraged cycle parking is aimed at encouraging ownership and use of cycles, both recreationally and for commuting purpose. There should be opportunity for cycle |

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Boughton. Southwell & Edwinstowe and elsewhere. The opportunity to use cycles as a primary means of day to day transport is greatest in these large settlements where services / facilities can be accessed in a 2 mile radius. Elsewhere cycle usage remains primarily a form of recreational transport.</p> <p>As a minor point however the text in table 2 states that applicants should explain this in the Design and Access Statement. A DAS is not required for non-major development outside designated areas, the text should just therefore say 'applicants are encouraged to explain their approach in the planning application submission'.</p> <p>References in Key Principle 2 to '(or relevant measurements at the time of submission as advised by the Highway's Authority)' should be deleted. An SPD must provide certainty for those who use it and cannot be dependent upon future changes that may or may not occur undertaken by a third party. The SPD sets the recommended standards of the LPA, not the Highway's Authority.</p> | <p>storage for both those commuting on cycles and those who cycle recreationally. It is reasonable to assume that most households who cycle, particularly families, will own one bike per family member. The guidance allows some flexibility in the number of cycle parking spaces in certain situations (i.e. site specific constraints such as change of use proposals).</p> <p>Noted and updated where relevant.</p> <p>Comments noted and reference removed.</p> |
| 015 – Historic England | Historic England welcomes the revisions made to the draft SPD in relation to the historic environment including additions to Table 2, the inclusion of Core Policy 9: Sustainable Design and Policy DM5: Design text which adds context and clarity to the document, the addition of Paragraph 4.6, and revisions to Key Principle 2- Design, location and layout of car parking spaces. | Comments are noted and welcomed. |
| 016 – Persimmon Homes East Midlands | <p>We do however object to the requirements of Key Principle 2 which sets out that for integral garages to count as a car parking space they should have internal dimensions of 6m x 3.3m. Our concern with this requirement is that the 3.3m width is excessive and the SPD fails to demonstrate why this is required.</p> <p>When parking in a garage it would normally only be the driver who would need to exit the car, with other passengers having already exited the car on the driveway. On the basis that a typical car has a width of between</p> | <p>The garage internal dimensions are consistent with the requirements outlined in the County Council's Highway Design Guide. NSDC have included an additional 0.3m to reflect the cycle parking standard requirements and need for adequate storage in addition to car parking requirements.</p> <p>The car shown in the house type plan provided by the consultee has dimensions smaller than a Volkswagen Golf and this is clearly not a family car. The SPD is borne out of poorly</p> |

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>1.8m to 1.9m this would allow for up to 1 metre for the driver to be able to easily exit the car (shows Burnham house type). Any further space required for storage could be provided through other external storage solutions.</p> <p>The currently adopted Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide states that to count as a car parking space garages should have internal dimensions of 6 metres by 3 metres. This approach to car parking is taken by a number of local authorities in the locality including Bassetlaw District Council, Bolsover District Council, Chesterfield Borough Council, North East Derbyshire District Council, Peterborough City Council and Fenland District Council. Some local authorities adopt even smaller size requirements for a garage including South Holland District Council and Boston Borough Council where the required dimensions are 2.6m x 5.6m. This current draft SPD fails to demonstrate why larger garage spaces are required in Newark and Sherwood District Council in comparison to other local authorities.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes are of the view that the internal space standards for a car parking space provided within an integral unit should be 3m x 6m. This provides for more than sufficient space to park a car and accords with the currently adopted Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide and adopted policies of other nearby local Authorities.</p> | <p>designed schemes that discourage use of garages for their intended purpose of parking due to being inadequately sized (either because the car is wider than the garage door or the garage is needed for storage). It is also noted that the housetype plan provided does not demonstrate that cycle storage could be accommodated in the garage.</p> <p>It is essential that all homes, especially family homes, are fit for purpose. It should not be assumed that only the driver needs to exit the car from the garage. For instance, a single parent or one parent who has taken their children out in the car alone, is not going to want to use their garage if doing so means they need to leave the children on the driveway outside unsupervised.</p> <p>Developers can provide smaller garages if they so wish, but they will not be counted as parking spaces.</p> |
| 024 – Persimmon Homes Nottingham | I note the change in wording in the document to reinforce its purpose to provide guidance and recommendations for developers, rather than the contents of the SPD being a strict requirement in development proposals. Whilst I appreciate this effort, the SPD as amended is still prescriptive upon the number of parking spaces, the type/style of parking and its arrangement, which performs a Development Management Policy role and falls within the scope of Regulation 5(1)(a)(i),(ii) and (iv) of the Town | The SPD is not contrary to the regulations as outlined in Appendix x of the Initial Response to consultation comments. |

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as highlighted in my previous consultation response.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes objects to the requirement for garages in Key Principle 2 which states that for garages to count as a parking space they must be 3.3m x 6m. 3.3m wide is excessive and the SPD does not justify the width required. Normally, only the driver needs to exit the car from the garage as passengers have already exited the car on the driveway. Based on a typical car width (1.8-1.9m), a further 1m is required to allow for a driver to exit the car. The recently adopted Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide states that 3m x 6m is sufficient for garages and this is the approach taken by many authorities; therefore Persimmon are of the strong opinion that a 3m x 6m integral garage is sufficient for car parking.</p> | <p>The garage internal dimensions are consistent with the requirements outlined in the County Council's Highway Design Guide. NSDC have included an additional 0.3m to reflect the cycle parking standard requirements and need for adequate storage in addition to car parking requirements.</p> <p>The SPD is borne out of poorly designed schemes that discourage use of garages for their intended purpose of parking due to being inadequately sized (either because the car is wider than the garage door or the garage is needed for storage). It is also noted that the house type plan provided does not demonstrate that cycle storage could be accommodated in the garage.</p> <p>It is essential that all homes, especially family homes, are fit for purpose. It should not be assumed that only the driver needs to exit the car from the garage. For instance, a single parent or one parent who has taken their children out in the car alone, is not going to want to use their garage if doing so means they need to leave the children on the driveway outside unsupervised.</p> <p>Developers can provide smaller garages if they so wish, but they will not be counted as parking spaces.</p> |
| | <p>The SPD states that the use of garages will only be acceptable where it can be demonstrated that both cycles and cars can be stored simultaneously (page 18). This is a loaded statement to make, in assuming that all residents own a bike and store it in the garage.</p> | <p>The Council are not suggesting that all garages need to accommodate cycle parking. The SPD is suggesting that such parking should be provided, but does not stipulate where. This is consistent with Spatial Policy 7 of the Amended Core Strategy.</p> |

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>I note that the SPD still states that a maximum of four bays (as four parking spaces) are to be permitted in a line before a minimum break equal in size (length and width) of one parking space should be provided for soft landscaping, and frontage parking which faces each other across the street will be discouraged. As per my previous consultation response, this provides significant obstacles in achieving a certain level of density of developments (contrary to NPPF paragraph 122), the number of plots that can be built, the overall scheme viability, and the size and number of sites that need to be allocated to achieve a 5 Year Housing Land Supply. It will indirectly penalise smaller, 2 bedroom dwellings plotted as terraces, which will reduce the number of starter homes available and overall housing choice. I note that elsewhere in the document, the words 'recommended' and 'encouraged' are used but with regards to this particular point, this language is not present.</p> | <p>It is also noted NCC's 2021 Highway's Design Guide (adopted) now requires 1 cycle storage space per bedroom.</p> <p>As outlined in our previous response to the initial consultation, housing developments should be both well designed and fit for purpose. Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 127 outlines that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area. There is a need to strike an appropriate balance between good design and housing delivery. The reason this SPD has been prepared is because this balance has not yet been achieved. Good design should not be at the expense of that delivery. It is considered that the guidance and the principles contained within the SPD provide that balance. Reflecting the contents of the Development Plan and its approach towards delivering objectively assessed housing need, maintaining a five year housing land supply and promoting high standards of design.</p> |
| | <p>There have been no changes made to tandem parking (figure 2, page 29) which lacks logic. The document approves tandem parking in front of a double garage, but deems tandem parking on its own or in front of a single garage unacceptable. This is completely contradictory and also lacks justification. Tandem parking is a useful solution to deliver sufficient parking spaces whilst not dominating the street scene, which is the whole aim of the 4:1 parking ratio in the SPD.</p> | <p>Figure 3 in the SPD highlights that tandem parking in front of a double garage is only acceptable where the garage is not counted as a parking space(s) (denoted by a '+' which explains that there is additional parking or storage space in the garage but this is not counted as a space). Double width tandem parking allows for greater flexibility for occupants as less cars are effectively 'trapped' behind the front car.</p> |
| 026 – Coddington Parish Council | <p>The changes don't go far enough. The wording should be more positive and less optional.</p> | <p>Comments noted. The Planning Regulations do not allow us to be less optional as the SPD only provides guidance.</p> |
| | <p>There is still insufficient provision for domestic vehicle charging points.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> |
| 030 – Barton Willmore c/o Urban & Civic | <p>See comments below to Question 2.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> |

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 032 – Sport England | We would wish at this stage to add our support to the measure contained in policy and the SPD with regard to active travel, cycle parking and would take this opportunity to reiterate our guidance on active design. | Comments noted and welcomed. |
| | Sport England, in conjunction with Public Health England, has produced 'Active Design' (October 2015), a guide to planning new developments that create the right environment to help people get more active, more often in the interests of health and wellbeing. The guidance sets out ten key principles for ensuring new developments incorporate opportunities for people to take part in sport and physical activity. The Active Design principles are aimed at contributing towards the Government's desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design. Sport England would commend the use of the guidance in the master planning process for new residential developments. | Comments noted and supported. |

Question 2: Do you have any additional comments?

| Respondent ID / Organisation | Summary of Comment | Response / Action |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| 007 / Alan Waddington | There are still problems in existing streets in Central Newark where the flow of traffic is impeded by parked vehicles e.g. Sleaford Road, Beacon Hill Road, Barnby Road, Sherwood Avenue. Why cannot part of the 'green area' in front of the flats be used for residents parking? If there are 'town residents' in flats/apartments over shops etc. and they need a vehicle for work where will they be able to park? | Commented noted. This is outside the scope of the SPD. |
| 012 / TOWN-PLANNING.co.uk | The comments we made previously about the impact on viability from the individual and cumulative impact of the requirements including for electric vehicle charging; the size of car parking spaces; the desire for different types of parking layouts; and garage sizes still remain valid. | As previously outlined by the Council, we believe there is no viability testing needed as the SPD is Guidance. We would not expect all elements of the SPD to be satisfied in every case and the implications from the design guidance represents good urban design principles taken for the most part from Building for a Healthy Life, a recognised standard. It is incumbent on applicants to demonstrate high standards of design and layout in order to satisfy DM5, SP7 as well as Paragraphs 110 and 124 of the NPPF. Notwithstanding this is now a requirement in the County Council's Highway Design Guide. It is advised that applicants factor in the need to meet these high standards from the outset. |
| | It is noted that in response to the question regarding legal validity of the SPD by other parties the LPA has states in Appendix 1 of the response to consultation that: "The SPD alone will not guide or regulate applications for planning permission." As such the LPA has committed itself to the SPD not being a development management policy tool. Therefore, it will be inappropriate for the SPD to be relied upon as a reason for refusal or indeed as a reason for imposing any condition. The LPA has got itself into an unfortunate position in now trying to justify its actions. SPDs should build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on policies in an adopted Local Plan. As they do not | The Council is not justifying the legality of the SPD but responding directly to consultation responses which challenge the legality of the SPD. The Council is providing guidance to developers on a key and prevalent issue, the purpose of which is to support existing planning policies in the Development Plan. The Council has taken on board the concerns about the language of the SPD and has clearly responded to concerns about issues of legality. |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>form part of the development plan, they cannot introduce new planning policy into the development plan and introduce new financial burdens. As we indicated previously, this SPD should either form part of the Site Allocations DPD review or be produced alongside it to allow viability to be properly assessed. If the LPA proposes to refer the SPD in Policy DM5 of the ongoing DPD Review then the entire content of the SPD will be reopened for debate by default in any event. Consequently, the LPA will not be disadvantaged by waiting to finalise the SPD alongside the DPD review.</p> | |
| 026 / Coddington Parish Council | <p>Key Principle 1: the phrase ‘encouraged to’ should be replaced by the word ‘should’.</p> | <p>Comments noted. However, the SPD remains as guidance and not policy so the wording cannot prescribe.</p> |
| | <p>Cycle storage should be made available even within historic / change of use constraints</p> | <p>Comments noted. However, not all historic or change of use proposals will have the curtilage available to provide cycle storage and so there should be flexibility allowing for this in the SPD.</p> |
| | <p>Key Principle 2: Visitor parking and overflow parking – there should be an expectation that all houses and apartments have access to off-street parking.</p> | <p>The SPD seeks to encourage off street parking wherever possible.</p> |
| | <p>Key Principle 3: Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure – new residential developments should provide access to an electric charging point. If a dedicated bay cannot be provided, the development should fail.</p> | <p>The SPD is guidance and cannot be used in its own right to refuse planning permission. Building Regulations are due to be introduced shortly which will require all homes to have an electric charging point. It is also now a requirement in the adopted County Council Highway Design Guide (2021).</p> |
| | <p>Core Policy 9 Sustainable Design. Policy DM5 Design:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access – omit the phrase ‘where practical’ 2. 2. Parking – insert ‘there should be no development that results in the loss of parking provision’ 3. 3. Amenity – insert ‘there should be no loss of amenity space’ | <p>Comments noted, but policies within the development plan cannot be updated through the SPD consultation process.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>4. 5. Trees, Woodland and Biodiversity – omit ‘wherever possible’</p> <p>5. 7. Ecology – omit ‘as a last resort’, insert ‘significant impacts should be avoided’</p> <p>6. 9. Flood Risk and Water Management – omit ‘will aim’</p> | |
| 030 / Barton Willmore c/o Urban & Civic | <p>Key Principle 1 – Welcomes the addition of the parking standard zone maps and that Map 2 confirms the built area of Newark South as within Newark Urban Area (NUA). We do not object to the standards for the NUA and welcome flexibility for the recommended parking standards to be reduced in certain circumstances where justification is provided.</p> | Comments noted and welcomed. |
| | <p>Key Principle 2 – As set out in our representations to the First Draft SPD, we consider that parking should not dominate the street scene, and soft landscaping assists with this. We welcome the amendment to Bullet Point 4 of Key Principle 2, which removes the requirement for soft landscaping to be taller than cars and supports provision of trees where appropriate (rather than requires tree planting regardless of the street scene or highway safety).</p> <p>However, this amendment does not appear to be reflected in Figure 4 (The 4:1 Rule for Frontage Parking), which continues to require soft landscaping to be taller than cars and requires the provision of trees.</p> | Comments noted. This has been amended, it remained in error and should have been updated. |
| | <p>Key Principle 3 – We welcome the Council’s response to our previous comments on Key Principle 3, in that it is now less prescriptive and, consequently, better able to adapt to evolving technologies. Notwithstanding this, and whilst supporting the principle of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging</p> | Comments noted. Building Regulations are due to be updated which will require all dwellings to be provided with one charging unit. It is also noted that it is now a requirement in the recently adopted Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide (2021). Therefore we do not consider the recommendations of the SPD to be inappropriate. |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>infrastructure, we continue to have some concerns over Key Principle 3 in the Final Draft SPD.</p> <p>We consider Key Principle 3 should be more supportive of the installation of ‘dummy’ chargers (with installation of the charging point at a later date). As set out in our representations to the First Draft SPD, we do not consider that providing every dwelling with a charge point, regardless of whether or not its owner/ occupier drives an EV, to be the best approach, as this results in provision of many redundant charge points. We consider the approach of a ‘dummy’ charger should be extended to all dwellings and, as set out in our earlier representations, Travel Plans used to support homeowners/ occupiers to install a charge point when they are ready to buy an EV vehicle.</p> | |
| | <p>The above approach would enable provision in line with market growth, and we maintain that this should also apply to the final part of Key Principle 3, which sets out that where residential developments do not provide one space per dwelling or provide unallocated parking spaces it is still expected that each parking space meets the minimum specification. As set out in our representations to the First Draft SPD, it will be a phased move to EV and, as such, we consider a mixture of active EV charging points, for example 1 in 10 spaces, with passive infrastructure for the remaining spaces to enable further provision in the future if necessary to be more appropriate.</p> | <p>Comments noted. See above.</p> |
| <p>033 / Resident in NSDC</p> | <p>Since much of the document was produced, we have seen the introduction of electric scooters. These are currently illegal on all but private land, but they are beginning to proliferate on cycling paths, pavements and roads. Can you therefore please ensure that there is no signage encouraging</p> | <p>Commented noted and understood. However this is outside the scope of the SPD.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | such use (as has recently appeared in Southwell'), whilst use of these remains subject to government consultation. | |
|--|--|--|

